TG02 2007
NEWSLETTER (VOL. 1/2007)

Newsletter of the International Sociological Association's Thematic Group # 02 on Historical and Comparative Sociology

An Open Call

To Thematic Group Members, Colleagues, Friends, and interested parties:

This is the first annual newsletter of the Thematic Group # 02 on Historical and Comparative Sociology. This newsletter will promote our activities & will also provide a forum to publicize our field. Standard features might include:

1. Short articles, comments or reflections on historical sociology
2. Your news regarding article and/or book publications, awards, or other professional accomplishments. Post-doctoral appointees, doctoral candidates and graduate students are encouraged to join our section & submit samples of their work. Brief descriptions of dissertation topics will also be included.
3. Opportunities and initiatives, including calls for papers, funding opportunities and calls, conference news, etc.
4. TG02 business information and related items from our Board and officers.

Please send all submissions to Victor Roudometof at roudomet@ucy.ac.cy. Current plans are to publish this newsletter annually. But if the volume of material submitted increases, it is possible to publish this newsletter bi-annually. The deadline for submissions for the 2008 issue of the Newsletter is May 30 2008. The 2008 Newsletter will be circulated prior to the ISA 1st interim conference.

I am looking forward to receiving your contributions.

Victor Roudometof
University of Cyprus
Newsletter Editor

In this issue:

TG02 President Willfried Spohn offers a programmatic statement of his understanding of the necessity to move the field of historical and comparative sociology toward the direction of a global, transnational and international sociology. In a research note, Paul Blokker is discussing the application of the multiple modernities perspective to the topic of Eastern European democratization. You will also find the panel themes of TG02 for the 2008 ISA interim conference in Barcelona & the first installment of our "Members´ New Publications."

From the TG02 President

Globalization, Multiple Modernities and Comparative-Historical Sociology: A Programmatic Statement

Willfried Spohn
Free University of Berlin

As stated in its foundational declaration, the aim of ISA's Thematic Group *"Historical and Comparative Sociology"* is to further develop the approaches, investigations and methodologies in historical and comparative sociology in the direction of an *international, transnational* and *global* sociology. These objectives are based on the research traditions of comparative-historical sociology as established in the course of the last fifty years. These research traditions were originally developed within the American Sociological Association and recently replicated within the European Sociological Association.

The American and European varieties of historical and comparative sociology have developed primarily as a critique of structural-functionalist modernization theory and research and thus have been also strongly influenced by the related methodological nationalism inherent in most classical modernization approaches. Therefore, simultaneously, the institutionalization of comparative-historical sociology in an international, transnational and global direction also implies crucial theoretical, methodological and analytical challenges. It is the purpose of this research note to address some of these challenges and to invite a discussion of the strategic research agendas of this thematic group, future working group and eventually research committee on historical and comparative sociology within the ISA. In the following, I will first comment on three recent attempts to take stock of the development and current research situation of historical and comparative sociology and then, on this background, specify some research orientations in an international, transnational and global direction in comparative-historical sociology.

The most comprehensive recent overview on the American development in comparative-historical sociology is *Remaking Modernity. Politics, History, and Sociology* (2005) edited by J. Adams, E. Clemens and A. Orloff. The editors (in a parallel to others, e.g. Smith 1991, Spohn 2000) categorize the rise and development of historical and comparative sociology in three distinct waves.

In their view, the first wave refers to the renewed historical and comparative sociology in 1960s and 1970s, building on the classical foundations of historical sociology, criticizing structural-functional modernization sociology and developing a variety of path-breaking historical macro-sociological studies. The second wave in the 1980s established a primarily social-scientific program of historical sociology, directing research to systematic comparative-historical analysis and explanation of varying (national) modernization paths in a combination with meso- and micro- sociological social history. The third wave since the 1990s has been strongly influenced by the cultural turn in the social sciences, critically reflecting the modernist premises of the second wave, but continuing the micro- sociological

trends in combination with cultural history, historical institutionalism, rational choice, feminist orientations and postcolonial studies and thus pluralizing the approaches, methodologies and topics in historical sociology.

With the aim to criticize, reconstruct and overcome the modernist premises of the second wave, the editors clearly define themselves as trendsetters of the third wave and accordingly arrange the discussion of the current state of the art in five thematic sections of historical-sociological analysis: (i) the epistemological foundations regarding agency, globality and postmodernism; (ii) state formation in relation to religion, social policy and bureaucracy; (iii) political contention in the forms of ordinary peoples' political participation, collective action and revolution; (iv) the economic realm regarding actors and networks, the transition to capitalism and the development of modern professions; as well as (v) collective identities with reference to nation-building, the genealogy of citizenship, and the formation of ethnicity. From an international, transnational and global perspective, these sections demonstrate that the third-wave core of comparative-historical sociology has considerably extended the predominantly Western-centered scope of international comparisons and has taken up with respect to postcolonialism some of the transnational and global challenges. At the same time, with their predominantly postmodern, reconstructivist and cultural & micro- sociological orientations, the editors only marginally consider the macro-analytical: comparative-civilizational, transnational and global strands in the three waves of historical sociology (so the criticism of Koenig 2006).

The second major attempt to define the current state of historical sociology is *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (2003), edited by J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer. Building particularly on the second wave of a systematic social-scientific version of historical sociology (as represented by Skocpol 1984/1996 and Tilly 1984; see also Spohn 2006), the editors are less interested in giving an encompassing overview on the multiple strands in historical sociology, but rather in defining the accumulative progress made by the application of comparative historical analysis in the social sciences. Both editors pursue a vision of comparative historical analysis that is oriented to the explanation of substantively important outcomes of socio-political change in the modern world and defined by a concern with causal analysis, an emphasis on processes over time, and the use of systematic and historical-contextual comparison. In the context of the broader trends in the third wave, the editors are clearly critical of overly postmodernist, constructivist and historicist orientations (and are inversely characterized by Adams, Clemens, and Orloff as friendly amendments of the modernist second wave). They extend the second-wave orientation to macro-historical processes particularly with historical-institutionalist approaches toward the notion of path-dependent development. Furthermore, they are particularly interested in combining quantitative and qualitative research; while they view sympathetically the inclusion of contextualized rational-choice approaches and other causally oriented perspectives in the cultural-scientific strands of historical sociology (e.g. those perspectives that aim at

systematically explaining socio-historical processes).

Within such a social-scientific framework of historical sociology, the editors assemble contributions that (i) summarize the accumulation of research in the three substantive areas of revolutions, social policy, and authoritarian versus democratic paths of political modernization; (ii) reconsider analytical tools such as the conceptualization of macro-social processes, institutions, networks and purposive action; and (iii) discuss methodological issues regarding the causal relevance of case studies, the strategies of causal explanation and the ontological adequacy of methodological devices. Again seen from an international, transnational and global perspective, the contributions document the considerable methodological and analytical progress in this social-scientific version of historical and comparative sociology since its foundation in the second wave as well as the development of a more global scope of international comparisons. But they also reveal its limitations in marginalizing the postmodernist, constructivist and global issues of the third wave by reducing the transnational, civilizational and global dimensions to external factors of path-dependent trajectories.

The third major endeavor of summarizing the current research situation represents *The Handbook of Historical Sociology,* edited by G. Delanty and E. Isin (2003). In contrast to the two American syntheses, this handbook assembles, in a more European reflective style, articles with the aim to rethink and re-orient the undertaking of historical sociology from a postmodern, post-disciplinary and post-Orientalist perspective. Historical sociology is identified less with a social-scientific methodology of explaining and interpreting socio-historical processes (as in the second wave), but rather on a more general plane (in a certain parallel with the third wave) with the interpretation and deconstruction of the formation and transformation of modernity. The postmodern perspective thereby relates to a historically reflexive approach to modernity and its transcendence by transnational and global forces; the post-disciplinary perspective attempts to overcome the divide between social-scientific and cultural-scientific approaches; whereas the post-Orientalist orientation tries to transcend the still predominant Euro-centrism as well as its vague Orientalist critique.

In such a three-tiered vision of re-orienting historical sociology, the handbook assembles in three sections discussions on (i) the theoretical foundations of historical sociology in Marx and Weber, the evolutionary and functionalist approaches to social change, the *Annales* school, namely Braudel as well as the civilizational perspectives by Elias, Nelson and Eisenstadt; (ii) different historical-sociological approaches such as historical materialism, modernization theory, historical geography, institutional history, cultural history, intellectual history and genealogical approaches; and (iii) various themes and problems of historical-sociological analysis as regards the cultural logics of periodization, the comparative-civilizational deconstruction of East and West, the interaction of classes and nations, the formation of the modern state, the role of parliaments and social movements as key actors of democratization, the persistence of nationalism; as well as various topics such as architecture, city, collective memory, gender, patriarchy, religion

and moral regulation. Taken together, this postmodern, post-disciplinary and post-Orientalist re-orientation of historical sociology as a part of a broader conceived third (or potentially fourth) wave attempts to transcend the opposition between the second-wave social-scientific and the third-wave cultural-scientific varieties of historical sociology and introduces, though in a rather reflective than analytical-methodological direction, a variety of transnational, civilizational and global orientations that complement the third-wave analytical topics, methodological orientations and theoretical approaches in more macro-sociological and social-theoretical directions in historical sociology.

From an international, transnational and global perspective, this overview of three recent syntheses of the field allows for giving some answers to the core question of this research note: *in which ways does the established research field of historical and comparative sociology transcend the predominant domain of Euro- and Western-centric analysis and in which ways should it further develop in a more focused international, transnational and global perspective?* Related to the major meanings of transnationalism and globalization, I see *four ways* of transcending the Western-centric core of historical and comparative sociology.

The *first* meaning of transnationalism and globalization refers to the scope or degree of the universalization of modernity over the globe. Accordingly, the question is: to what extent should historical and comparative sociology extend the scope of international comparison in a global direction? The *second* meaning of transnationalism and globalization relates to the civilizational dimension of

modernity and globality. Here, the question has to be framed as follows: To what degree should we develop a globally encompassing form of a historical-comparative civilizational analysis? The *third* sense of transnationalism and globalization refers to the scope of transnational and tentatively global sociohistorical processes. The related question to be raised is: How should historical and comparative sociology focus on these transnational spaces? Finally, in a *fourth* meaning, the "transnational and global" refers to the global system as a whole, to the world system, world society or globality. Accordingly the question is: in which ways historical and comparative sociology has contributed and should further contribute to the analysis of the global system?

Firstly, in considering the global scope of international comparisons in the context of the three waves of historical sociology, it is clear that the first wave concentrated primarily on the international comparison of the main Western cases of Great Britain, France, Germany and the USA. It also included some geo-politically relevant cases such as Russia, China and Japan, but only very seldom did it take notice of other non-European cases. The second wave in its predominant social-scientific orientation has seen extensions particularly to Southern Europe and Latin America and, with the collapse of the Soviet Union, in the context of transformation research to post-communist Eastern Europe. The third wave has analyzed and re-analyzed in a primarily cultural-scientific and micro-sociological orientation the predominant social-scientific cases of the first and second world, but included increasingly also postcolonial societies

in the non-European world of Asia and Africa.

At the same time, with this globalizing move in the scope of historical and comparative sociology, a central methodological issue concerns the ways in which the received historical-sociological models and accumulated knowledge about the Western cases can be transferred to non-Western cases or have thereby to be modified or revised in the context of non-Western trajectories in the formation of modernity. An excellent example of this theoretical re-orientation is the edited volume by M. Centeno and J. Lopez-Alves, *The Other Mirror. Grand Theory in the Lens of Latin America* (2001). However, there should be many more such mirrors from other world regions, scrutinizing the general applicability of Western-centered social theories; developing time/space-specific forms of historical-sociological analysis of non-Western and particularly post-colonial patterns of modernity; and comparing them to the European/Western experiences as well as to each other.

Secondly, the comparative-civilizational multiple modernities perspective as developed by Shmuel Eisenstadt and his world-wide collaborators (Eisenstadt 2002, 2003; Arnason 2003; Arnason, Eisenstadt & Wittrock 2004; Arjomand & Tiryakian 2004) represents an important critique of the "Westernization of the world" thesis through globalizing modernization processes. This perspective transcends the nation-state modernization paradigm in so far as it presupposes civilizational complexes as a social reality beyond the nation-state. It also conceives of culture and religion as central dimensions of social change and the formation of modernity. Accordingly, related to the multiple

world religions and civilizations, it is assumed that there also develop varying cultural and political programs of modernity impacting on the variations of modernization trajectories. While conventionally interpreted as part of the first wave, S. Eisenstadt's early historical-institutionalist comparative analysis of pre-modern empires can be viewed as a precursor of this comparative-civilizational approach. It was followed by a systematic *Weberian* turn to Axial Age civilizations and world religions and their impacts on multiple modernities in the second wave. After the fall of communism and the disappointment of renewed modernization approaches in the forms of transition and transformation research on the development of post-communist societies, it has gained a growing influence as a systematic inter-civilizational and international comparative approach to Western and non-Western societies.

From a historical-comparative sociological perspective with a global scope, however, there are several issues to be further clarified: First, the inter-civilizational comparisons focus primarily on the centers of civilizational complexes and instead, they should concentrate more on civilizational peripheries. Second, the historical comparisons of different civilizational time periods analyze the crystallization of civilizations and their structural transformations in a long-term historical perspective. Instead, they should focus more concretely on time-specific socio-historical processes. Third, while the civilizational-comparative analyses concentrate primarily on culture and religion, they should also consider their interrelations with institutions as well as the political and socio-economic dimensions. Finally, like the much

criticized international-comparative modernization research, the multiple modernities perspective primarily looks at the infrastructure of civilizational units instead of concentrating also on the entanglements of civilizations as transnational and trans-civilizational bases of globalization and globality. In other words, there should develop a closer interconnection between the historical-comparative civilizational analysis, on the one hand, and the main topics of historical-comparative sociology, on the other (see also Knoebl 2006).

Thirdly, another way of transcending methodological nationalism is the historical-comparative sociological study of the development of transnational spaces that range from bi-national and bi-civilizational to multi-national, multi-civilizational and potentially global exchanges, networks, institutions, and power relations. These transnational and tangentially global spaces are multi-dimensional: socio-economic, political-military as well as cultural and cognitive, carrying different weight in relation to national spaces and trajectories (Mann 2006). In between the growing field of global history exploring and investigating the history of trans-regional interconnections and encounters, on the one hand, and the exploding sociological research on globalization concentrating on the current forms of transnationalism and globalization, on the other, a historical-comparative sociological study should systematically compare the different forms, dimensions, waves and processes of transnationalism and globalization. In relation to transnational and global history, such a historical sociological orientation is more systematic-comparative and in relation to the sociology of

transnationalism and globalization, it rather historicizes and contextualizes the transnational and global processes in the present (Osterhammel & Petersson 2003). At the same time, there is particularly in sociology but also in history the danger of globalism, i.e. to abstract from the local, national or civilizational bases of transnational or global spaces. Accordingly, it would be important to investigate and compare systematically different configurations of local, national, civilizational and global levels in time and space. In a global orientation, this research direction could be called a historical-comparative study of glocalizations. Some interesting examples of such studies have been done with regard to globalization and national forms of capitalism, globalization and welfare state, globalization and religion as well as globalization and nationalism (Held et al. 1999, Martinelli 2005, Scholte 2005). But these studies should also combine more systematically with historical-comparative investigations of shared histories and entangled modernities.

Fourthly, a final way to transcend methodological nationalism is to analyze the global system, world society or world system as an overarching structure of globality. Immanuel Wallerstein's historical sociology of the capitalist world system has been one of the important contributions in the first wave (Wallerstein 2000). Certainly, through its separate institutionalization as political economy of the world system, it has largely lost its impact on comparative historical sociology. While, due to its economism, it has become contested by political and cultural world society approaches; and, due to its Euro-centrism, it has been recently also criticized as a re-

Orientalization of global history (Hobson 2004). However, Wallerstein's analysis of the modern world system remains one of the corner stones for a historical sociology of the global system. Taking up these criticisms, it should be completed by a more multi-dimensional historical sociology of world society, including the political and military dimensions (Hall 1996, Mann 2006), the cultural and cognitive components (Lechner & Boli 2005, Robertson 1992) as well as the civilizational dimension (Roudometof & Robertson, 1995, also Arnason, Eisenstadt & Wittrock 2004). In comparison to global history, the historical-comparative sociology of globality should not aspire to an encompassing multi-dimensional history of world society, but rather concentrate on systematic comparisons of different phases, dynamics, crises and turning points in the history of world society; different kinds of constellations between the multiple dimensions (socio-economic, political-military, cultural-civilizational) of world society; the varying influence of the global system on different kinds of society (core, semi-peripheral, peripheral); and thus contribute to the historicization and contextualization of the contemporary globalization and world-system phase which in sociological, structuralist as well as constructivist, approaches are often analyzed in a-historical, time/space-less terms.

In sum, then, from an international, transnational and global perspective, historical and comparative sociology should concentrate strategically on (i) the global scope of international comparisons, including centers and particularly peripheries; (ii) the multiple connections between civilizational complexes and national trajectories, (iii) the varying configurations of transnational/trans-civilizational spaces and national trajectories; and (iv) the varying constellations among the global system, global forces, civilizational/national frameworks and local life-worlds. Historical-comparative sociological research lies between and connects general sociological theories of national, civilizational, transnational and global change, on the one hand, and transnational, trans-civilizational and global approaches to history, on the other. It should historicize the multiple connections between the various levels of social reality from the global to the local in their multiple socio-economic, legal-institutional, political-military and cultural-cognitive dimensions; and should systematically interpret, compare and explain the varying multi-level and multi-dimensional socio-historical processes and constellations. Lastly, the development of these research strategies would also include more systematic comparison, combination and integration of the different social- and cultural-scientific, macro- and micro-analytical as well as disciplinary, inter-disciplinary and post-disciplinary approaches.

References:

Adams, Julie, E. Clemens, and A. Orloff (eds.) (2005) *Remaking Modernity. Politics, History, and Sociology.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Arjomand, Said and E. Tiryakian (eds.) (2004) *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis.* London: Sage.

Arnason, Johann (2003) *Civilizations in Dispute: Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions.* Leiden: Brill.

Arnason, Johann, S. Eisenstadt and B. Wittrock (eds.) (2004) *Axial-Age Civilizations and World History.* Leiden: Brill.

Centeno, Miguel and J. Lopez-Alves (eds.) (2002) *The Other Mirror: Grand Theory in the Lens of Latin America.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Delanty, Gerard, and E. Isin (eds.) (2003) *Handbook for Historical Sociology.* London: Sage.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel (ed.) (2002) *Multiple Modernities.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel (2003) *Multiple Modernities and Comparative Civilizations.* Leiden: Brill.

Hall, John A. (1996) *International Orders.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Held, David et al. (1999), *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture.* Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Hobson, John (2004) *The Eastern Origins of the West.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Knoebl, Wolfgang (2006) Multiple Modernities and Political Sociology, in: S. Costa, J. Domingues and J. Silva (eds.), *From the Global Modernity to Multiple Modernities.* München: Hampp Verlag.

Koenig, Matthias (2006) "Historical Sociology – Limitations and Perspectives. Review Essay," *Archives Européennes de Sociologie* XLVII, No. 3 : 397-406

Lechner, Frank and J. Boli (2004) *World Culture.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Mahoney, James and D. Rueschemeyer (eds.) (2003) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, Michael (2006) "A Response," in J.A. Hall and R. W. Schroeder (eds.), *The Anatomy of Power.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Martinelli, Alberto (2005) *Global Modernization. Rethinking the Project of Modernity.* Leiden: Brill.

Osterhammel, Jürgen and N. Petersson (2003) *Globalization: A Short History.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Robertson, Roland (1992) *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.

Roudometof, Victor Roland Robertson (1995) "Globalization, World-system Theory and the Comparative Study of Civilizations," in: S. Sanderson (ed.), *Civilizations and World-systems: Studying World-historical Change,* Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press, 273-300.

Scholte, Jan A. (2005) *Globalization. A Critical Introduction.* New York: Palgrave.

Skocpol, Theca (ed.)(1984/1996) *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Dennis (1991) *The Rise of Historical Sociology.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Spohn, Willfried (2000) "Historische Soziologie, " *Soziologische Revue* 2000

Spohn, Willfried (2005) "Neue Historische Soziologie – Charles Tilly, Theda Skocpol and

Michael Mann, " in D. Kaesler (ed.), *Aktuelle Theorien der Soziologie.* München: Beck.

Spohn, Willfried (2006) "Globale, multiple und verwobene Moderne, " in. Th. Schwinn (ed.), *Die Vielfalt und Einheit der Moderne. Kultur- und strukturvergleichende*

Analysen. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 101-128.

Tilly, Charles (1984) *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge*

Research Note

Political Cultures and a Multiple Democracies Approach [1]

Paul Blokker
University of Liverpool

Now that the fifth wave of enlargement of the European Union to include 10 (mostly former communist) countries has come to an end, the widely held assumption is that the new member states have more or less converged to a shared European model of democracy, defined by the rule of law, respect for human and minority rights, and constitutional states. In the last decade and a half of 'transition', the empirical, comparative study of the emerging democratic systems has indeed been predominantly concerned with the identification of stable and liberal regimes in Central and Eastern Europe. In other words, comparative politics has mostly engaged in the assessment of the rapprochement of the formerly communist countries to a specific - but minimally defined - institutional model of democracy, largely derived from liberalism and Western experiences.

In this, it is widely acknowledged that democratic political regimes cannot be merely identified by reference to a set of 'hard' institutions (a constitution, the separation of powers, and the rule of law), but also need to take into account 'soft' institutions in the form of what is variably referred to as a 'background culture', 'political culture', 'civic' or 'public culture' (cf. Dryzek and Holmes

Comparison. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (2000) *The Essential Wallerstein.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press

2002). A simple 'transfer of institutions' to Central and Eastern Europe is thus not deemed sufficient for the construction of functioning and viable democracies, and democratic systems are seen as in need of wider societal legitimation as well as habituation to democratic practice. In short, such necessary soft institutions have to do with the relation between the political system and the public, in particular in terms of the public legitimation of the political system and the participation of citizens in democracy.

However, in the debate on democratization in the former communist societies, there seems so far to be a rather astonishing absence of attention regarding how such soft institutions or cultural underpinnings of democracy might develop differently between (and within) societies in the region, the extent to which political cultures are entangled with the specific historical-cultural contexts in which the new democratic regimes emerge, and how contextual differences might relate to normative models of democracy. In comparative political research, the focus is predominantly on a minimalist account of democracy, in which the functional necessity of a supportive democratic political culture is presupposed, in particular regarding the consolidation of democratic systems, and whose nature is widely understood in an aprioristic sense. Hardly any systematic attention is paid to existing and potential substantive diversity in perceptions, attitudes, and understandings of democracy held both by political elites and by citizens. In

this, the possibility that differing perceptions of democracy might underpin (varieties of democratic regimes is not considered.

Political culture re-emerged as a normative concept already in the 1980s, partially also to explain the drawbacks and failures of democratization in post-authoritarian societies, in particular as a result of incompatible collective identities (ethnic nationalism) and cultural predispositions (paternalism, clientelism). In this, the understanding of political culture is predominantly affirmative of the classical liberal understanding as defined in Almond and Verba's classical work on civic culture (Almond and Verba 1963), where a democratic political culture is understood as a composite of subjective attitudes with regard to an objective democratic state. In this, empirical studies of democracy have hardly taken notice of the widespread contestation of the liberal model of democracy in political theory regarding, for instance, its minimalist-proceduralist, individualist, and 'conservative' nature. And in contrast to the consensus on the 'rule of law'-model in empirical studies, in political theory it can hardly be said that there is a normative consensus on the relation between culture and politics in modern democracy.

Instead, political theory shows a variety of competing understandings of democratic political culture that are mostly not reducible to the strong distinction between culture and politics in liberalism, and a number of competing approaches towards democracy can be identified. For instance, in reaction to the strong restatement of liberalism in the 1970s, communitarian thinkers argued against the impoverished individual or 'unencumbered self', and his/her

privately enjoyed cultural life in liberal theory and argued for an individual that is entangled in a communal culture that provides him/her with meaning and choice. At the same time, the re-appraisal of republicanism in the 1970s led to a renewed attention for participatory forms of democracy, in which, in general, there is a much stronger link between civic virtues, democracy, and a shared understanding of the common good than in liberalism. This attention for civic participation and popular self-rule was further enhanced by the emergence of new social movements in the 1980s and strongly informed the emergence of the theorization of participatory and deliberative perceptions of democracy. These latter understandings of democracy point in general to the crucial importance of civic participation for democracy and, therefore, to a participatory democratic culture. In sum, political theory shows a variety of competing understandings of democratic political culture that are mostly not reducible to the strong distinction between culture and politics in liberalism.

The paradox that needs to be addressed in cross-national, comparative research is, in my view, that political culture and the cultural dimension to democracy are increasingly considered important in the empirical analysis of democracy, while the actual meaning, substantive content, and varieties of political cultures remain insufficiently reflected upon. Political culture predominantly takes the form of a 'background consensus', as a shared, universal and liberal culture providing social and political stability, derived from interpretations of the 'historical democracies', without being historicized and without the display of any structural interest in how the

cultural context of democracy shapes and defines democracy itself. The wide variety of understandings of political cultures that is displayed in political theory is hardly taken as a starting point for researching existing variety in democratic political cultures. Rather, such variety is normally seen as consisting of variation on a continuum ranging from authoritarian to 'hybrid' to democratic regimes, but not as substantive difference in democratic outlook (for two conspicuous exceptions of the rule, see Dryzek and Holmes 2002 and Fuchs and Klingemann 2006). Such a re-consideration could importantly deepen our understanding of the variety of meaning underpinning emerging democracies, including the post-communist societies.

The conventional understanding of political culture is problematic in that it favors a narrow rather than an open-ended reading of democratic political cultures. Conventional analyses ignore at least three interrelated aspects that, if considered, would induce a much stronger sensibility to multiple forms of democratic political culture, i.e., the historical and contextual nature of 'really existing' political cultures; the dual rather than singular imaginary of democracy on which democratic political cultures are based (i.e., a rights-based, constitutional imaginary on the one hand, and a substantive, participatory, or emancipatory imaginary on the other); and, the inherent indeterminacy and contestability of modern democracy.

With regard to the first aspect, the distinct historical, particularist premises of liberal political culture are not reflected upon, even if the concept is derived *grosso modo* from a distinct reading that abstracts from the Western modern experience. In this, the universal value of the rights-based, constitutionalist perception for democracy elsewhere is presupposed rather than evidenced or problematized. The portrayal of liberal political culture as a universally valid underpinning of democracy avoids the question of the self-constitution of democracy and the related question of the democratic subject. This might be formulated differently in that it can be argued that democratic political cultures always emerge in, and constitute a reflection of, a specific historical context, are endorsed within a historically formed cultural field, and need to relate to the distinct experiences of real people.

With regard to the second aspect, the assumption is that the liberal-constitutionalist perception exhausts democracy and its supportive political culture as such. But, in this, it reflects a one-dimensional vision of democracy, while participatory or emancipatory interpretations of democracy (grounded in republican ideas) are mostly ignored. The minimal vision of democracy as constitutionally-based elite competition over political power needs, however, to be contrasted to the aspirational or emancipatory dimension of the democratic imaginary that points to the gap between 'what is' and 'what ought to be'. A one-dimensional, constitutionalist vision of democracy is partly the result of a focus on politics as confined to the formal political system (as an autonomous political sphere) rather than as including a wider understanding of the political framework of modern democracy and the problématique of its political constitution. The attention in democratization studies for the predefined preconditions of procedural democracy and its consolidation is a contemporary instance of this bias.

A third aspect follows directly

from the observation that democracy is grounded in a dual rather than a singular imaginary. The impossibility of structurally reducing democracy to either one of the imaginaries and the continuous tension between its 'pragmatic' and 'redemptive' sides (Canovan 1999) means that modern democracy is inherently indeterminate and always open to new interpretations. The rather strong insistence in studies of political culture on the order-creating nature of modern democracy disregards the possibility of the emergence of relatively unprecedented, potentially innovative, or even radically new forms of democratic political culture.

The consequence of a non-historicized, a-historical, and one-dimensional perception of democracy is the neglect of questions of significant variety *between* democratic political cultures based on specific combinations of the dual dimension. It also tends to equate democratic political culture with a liberal, national culture and to disregard divergent perceptions of democracy *within* democracies, as these might emanate in both the public sphere and political society. In contrast to the confinement of democracy to its orderly, constitutional imaginary, I argue that democracy should be seen as multi-interpretable and 'essentially contestable'. The suggestion is here that the analysis of democratic political culture needs to go beyond a conceptualization that understands political culture as the (passive) internalization of the political system in individual attitudes, and should be rather understood as involving the continuous (active) construction of a variety of discourses of democracy.

Carole Pateman has stated with regard to Almond and Verba's *Civic Culture* that 'the meaning of democracy itself is never discussed' (Pateman 1980: 61). In their quality as the successors of classical studies on civic culture, empirical democratic theory and democratization studies can be criticized in similar terms. The assumption in these approaches is that democracy can be in essence narrowed down to a classical liberal theory of constitutional, representative democracy, on the one hand, and an Anglo-Saxon empirical model of democracy, on the other. Such a one-dimensional and minimal understanding of democracy is well-conveyed in the notion of 'waves of democratization' introduced by Samuel Huntington, who indeed reads the history of 'The Meaning of Democracy' as the victory of the procedural, Schumpeterian model (See the title of the section in chapter 1, Huntington 1991: 5-13).

Democratic political cultures, as becomes evident from even a cursory review of the current debate on democracy in political theory, can, however, be conceptualized in different and sometimes mutually exclusive ways. In addition, on a normative point, participatory and deliberative forms have critical potential, i.e., they can correct the erosion of liberal democracy that results from civic passivity, the fragmentation of modern society, and reduced state capacities. Regarding the political reality of democratic societies, not only can one find a range of perceptions of democracy and its primary justifications among both elites and masses (cf. Dryzek and Holmes 2002), but institutionalized democracies are also continuously open to normative critique. An *a priori* confinement of democracy to the minimal, procedural definition does not do justice to such variety and risks mistaking alternative, participatory understandings for non-democratic discourses.

In analogy to Shmuel

Eisenstadt's designation of modernity as consisting of 'multiple modernities', it makes therefore sense – in the specific context of political modernity - to speak of 'multiple democracies' or varieties of democracy, in that democratization is not only about the institutionalization of a procedural democracy, but involves and produces various cultural, emancipatory orientations that can be related to specific civilizational-religious backgrounds and routes to modernity (Eisenstadt 1999). Democracy perceived in this way implies that the creation and institutionalization of democracy is always bound to a specific historical and societal context, is the outcome of distinct local struggles, is always particularist in some sense, but at the same time informed by the major liberal and republican traditions of democracy.

A 'multiple democracies' approach has then, next to its sensitivity regarding a variety of democratic perceptions, three main advantages over the conventional understanding of democratic political culture. First of all, a 'multiple democracies'-approach proposes to bring out the distinct historical and contextual nature of the perception (-s) of democracy in a particular society, by conceiving of the universal norms of democracy as always embedded in a specific situation. Second, such an approach suggests the 'essentially contestable' nature of democracy, which results from the tension between the two imaginaries of democracy, and proposes to reconstruct the political struggle between different perceptions of democracy within a society and the institutionalization of a specific vision. In this, democracy is seen as always open to contestation and, therefore, to possible change. Third, in particular in the contemporary European situation, a multiple democracies approach has critical potential in that the possibility for innovative perceptions of democracy to emerge is kept open. Innovative visions might involve the articulation of post-national and europeanized political cultures. A multiple democracies approach is sensitive to such developments in that it does not take the grounding of culture, identity, and politics in the nation-state for granted.

If we accept such a diversified and historicized view of democracy, the delineation of a single, universally valid democratic political culture becomes indeed a chimera. Democratic political culture can be understood as 'produced' in particular political struggles in distinct historical situations, based on cultural orientations grounded in the dual imaginary dimension of democracy. The institutionalization of political culture and its influence on institutional constellations will reflect such historical groundings by being related to the values and meanings that the relevant social agents invoke and reproduce as well as modify in the process. This means that any democratic political culture includes traditional, religious, as well as political-ideological elements, and ultimately is not reducible to a 'thin', liberal political culture that is generally supportive of a liberal-constitutionalist democracy. Instead of contributing to the affirmation of the 'ultimate' form of democracy, a multiple democracies approach proposes a critical theory of a variety of democratic forms instead.

References

Almond, G. and S. Verba (1963), *The civic culture: political attitudes and*

democracy in five nations, Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown.

Canovan, M. (1999), 'Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy', in: *Political Studies,* XLVII, pp. 2-16.

Dryzek, J. and L. Holmes (2002), *Post-communist democratization: political discourses across thirteen countries*, Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstadt, S. (1999), *Paradoxes of Democracy*, Baltimore, The John Hopkins University Press.

Huntington, S. (1991), *The Third Wave. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century,* Norman and London: University of Oklahoma Press.

Pateman, C. (1980), 'The Civic Culture: A Philosophic Critique', in: G. Almond and S. Verba (ed.), *The civic culture revisited*, Boston: Little, Brown.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Thematic Group TG02 on Historical and Comparative Sociology is organizing two sessions for the First ISA Forum of Sociology "Sociological Research and Public Debate"(Barcelona, Spain, September 5 - 8, 2008). Two additional sessions are also organized jointly with RC09. Below you will find the details for each session. The deadline for submitting the TG02 final roster of panels to the ISA is January 31 2008.

Session 1:
Multiple Modernities, Comparative Civilizations
and Comparative-Historical Sociology

Session Organizers:
Johann Arnason (LaTrobe University Melbourne, Australia)
Willfried Spohn (Free University of Berlin)

On the background of the recent merger of RG02 "Historical and Comparative Sociology" and AH 1 "Civilizational Analysis", this session invites to theoretical, methodological and analytical core issues of both approaches. To be sure, both approaches are essentially historical and comparative and have a common origin in criticizing and revising modernization theory and comparative modernization research in mainstream sociology. However, historical and comparative sociology in its major

three waves (e.g. Adams, Clemens, Orloff eds., *Remaking Modernity* 2005; Mahoney, Rueschemeyer, eds., *Historical Analyses in the Social Sciences* 2003) has developed primarily in a meso- and microanalytical direction in combination with social and cultural history in order to explain historical processes of nation-state modernization; whereas the comparative-civilizational approach has moved rather towards a macro-sociological re-conceptualization of the formation of modernity in a long-term civilizational perspective in bringing back in particularly the cultural and religious dimensions in multiple modernities (e.g. Arnason, Eisenstadt, Wittrock, eds., *Civilizations and World History* 2004; Delanty, Isin, eds., *Handbook for Historical Sociology* 2003). As a consequence, both approaches are criticized by each other: historical and comparative sociology as missing the civilizational dimension, and comparative-civilizational analysis as lacking time/space specific orientations to historical-social processes. This session attempts to bring together both sides in order to map out and discuss theoretical, methodological and analytical core issues in combining both approaches.

Session 2:
Globalization, Religion and Collective Identities:
Theoretical, historical and comparative perspectives

Session Organizers:
Victor Roudometof (University of Cyprus)
Willfried Spohn (Free University of Berlin)

This session invites contributions that analyze the relationship among globalization, religion, and collective identities (national, transnational, ethnic, social, gender, metropolitan, colonial/postcolonial) in theoretical, historical and comparative perspective. Most current sociological research on globalization, religion and collective identities is oriented toward the contemporary global era, using contemporary experience to construct generalizations. This trend has contributed to the relative underdevelopment of a historical-comparative perspective toward different civilizations in different time-periods in world history. Particularly welcome are contributions that address theoretical and methodological problems in analyzing the relationships between globalization and/or transnational relations, on the one hand, and religion and collective identities, on the other hand in a comparative civilizational and historical perspective.

Joint Session TG 02 and RC09:
Multiple Modernities, Sociology of Development and Postcolonial Studies

Organizers:
Willfried Spohn (Free University of Berlin)
Ulrike Schuerkens (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris)

Sociological approaches to the non-Western world are still moving in separated traditions. The sociology of development is broadly speaking based on revised modernization and Marxist approaches, having moved from structural-functional and evolutionist to more agency-oriented forms of neo-modernization and neo-Marxist

analysis. Post-colonial studies originating from a postmodernist critique of modernist and Marxist approaches toward colonial and post-colonial societies have their home more in the fields of literary criticism and anthropology than in the field of sociology. The multiple modernities perspective has developed as a neo-Weberian alternative to modernist approaches to non-Western societies, but more with regard to other world-civilization and world centers rather than peripheral or post-colonial societies. This session invites theoretical and comparative-historical contributions to discuss and bridge these divides in analyzing post-colonial and peripheral societies.

Joint Session TG 02 and RC09:
Historical and Comparative Research: The Legacy of
"Stable Cultural Realities", Colonialism, and Beyond

Organizers:
Said A. Arjomand (SUNY-Stony Brook)
Ulrike Schuerkens (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris)

The empirical facts created in global world regions put in question the notions of "North-South", "centre-periphery", "First, Second, and Third World". Braudel (1994) underlined some decades ago that there were stable cultural realities, readapted to structural constraints according to wider civilizations. The development discourse of the last decades let us forget these findings, which were rather unpopular with elites who founded their political measures on an understanding of development as an improvement of socio-economic conditions in every country. J. Adda (2006) underlines in his recent book La mondialisation de l'économie that "the particular characteristics of these regional areas explain the manner of insertion in the global economy and their capacity to profit from the globalization process" (p. 164, my translation). This means that there are winners and losers, and even for those that are situated in-between, such as Eastern Europe that could base economic success on its industrial culture created under the communist regimes, the question continues to exist whether these societies are capable to assimilate to the western capitalist logic. The new periphery in the global world seems to be the Sub-Saharan Africa, the Arab World, and Central and South Asia. In these regions, we find prevalent poverty, structural unemployment, feeble salaries, and high fecundity rates. Moreover, political structures are weak, and ethnic and religious violence is widespread. In this session, we look for papers that study larger cultural entities and civilization zones on the basis of empirical findings and talk about the topic of development outlined above. Author should discuss their empirical findings by relating to the book of Fernand Braudel *A history of civilizations*, translated by Richard Mayne. London: A. Lane, The Penguin Press, 1994.

****

Call for Papers for the Session
Process Generated Data
at the Seventh International Conference on Social Science Methodology
organized by ISA RC 33 (Research Committee on Logic and Methodology)

Process-generated data have several advantages in comparison to data "classically" used in social research, i. e. surveys, interviews and observation: Process-generated data are non-reactive. They can be used, if other means of data collection are not applicable, for example, if infrastructure for large-scale surveys does not exist (which is the case in many countries of transition), if response-rates in surveys are expected to be to low, if researchers might not get access to interview partners or if the social phenomenon of interest is not observable (e.g. when analyzing past events or hidden populations). At the same time, discussion on how to methodologically handle these process-generated data has been long neglected. The session aims at comparing a wide range of process-generated data and discussing how they can be used for social research. Examples for standardized data are customer data bases, web logs, and administrational forms and GIS data. Examples for less structured data are documents, novels, diaries, letters, websites, paintings, films, photos, maps, mechanical drawings, construction plans, landscapes, buildings, monuments and objects.

Papers should discuss a specific type of process-generated data, addressing the following questions: What are the specific characteristics of this data type? How does this effects data analysis and interpretation? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this data type? How does this data type differ from other forms of process-generated data, and how does it differ from surveys, interviews and observation? For which kind of theoretical and thematical research question are these data suitable? Where and how can these data be sampled and collected? Are these data limited to a specific geographical area and historical period? Are data of the same data type collected in different periods or geographical areas comparable? How valid are results drawn from these data?

Papers debating general methodological questions in handling a specific data type and papers discussing specific methodological problems in a specific research project are both equally welcome. In order to gain a common ground of discussion, authors should also state their disciplinary and theoretical background and – in case of presenting a thematic case study – shortly present the thematic background of the study.

Please email an extended abstract (1-2 pages) to the session organizer: Nina Baur • Technical University Berlin • Germany • Email: nina.baur@tu-berlin.de

Call for Papers for the Session
Data for Historical Sociology and for Analyzing Long-Term Social Processes
at the Seventh International Conference on Social Science Methodology
organized by ISA RC 33 (Research Committee on Logic and Methodology)
September 1st – 5th, 2008, Naples

History (as a science) and sociology have always been closely intertwined: Many of the classical social scientists were both sociologists and historians (e.g. Karl Marx, Max Weber, Norbert Elias), and although historical sociology has been long neglected, there have always been historically oriented social scientists such as Michael Mann, Charles Tilly, Randall Collins and Michael Foucault. Currently, historical sociology is re-

organizing itself (as can be seen, for example from the ISA TG02). At the same time, many theoretical debates within sociology address long-term social processes. Examples are the debates on welfare regimes, on gender regimes, on varieties of capitalism, on institution building, on World Systems, on modernization, on democratization and on globalization. Questions might be both why certain phenomena are so stable over very long time periods and why and how they change (e. g. path-dependently). If these questions are to be addressed empirically, researchers need data covering time-spans of sometimes 50 years, 100 years or maybe even several centuries, or they need to go back in time as many years. Meanwhile, most empirical (especially quantitative) research covers only the most recent past (i. e. the last 5 to 20 years). Thus, if longitudinal research is to be taken seriously, methodological problems arising when studying the *longue durée* have to be addressed. One of the most urgent questions is: which kind of data can be used for historical sociology and/or for analyzing long-term social processes.

Papers for this session should address one ore more of the following questions:
Is it possible to learn about the distant past from "classical" sociological data types (i. e. surveys, interviews or observation)? How can these data be used and where are their limits? What alternative data types do exist that can be used for analyzing long-term social processes (e. g. documents, literature, diaries, paintings, films, mechanical drawings, maps, landscapes, buildings, objects)? What are there similarities and differences, and how do they differ from surveys, interviews and observation? Do historians and social scientists differ in interpreting these data types, or do they just differ in experience with handling specific data types? How can validity of data be assessed? What specific data problems do arise, if researchers want to analyze social process of the longue durée? Which data are suitable for which kind of questions? For each specific data type, it is important to ask about their specific characteristics and how this effects interpretation. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this data type? For which kind of theoretical and thematical research question are these data suitable? Where and how can these data be sampled and collected? Are these data limited to a specific geographical area and historical period?

Papers debating general methodological questions and papers discussing specific problems using a concrete data type in a specific research project are both equally welcome.

Please email an extended abstract (1-2 pages) to the session organizer:
Nina Baur ● Technical University Berlin ● Germany ● Email: nina.baur@tu-berlin.de

Deadlines for both sessions

Submission of extended abstracts (1-2 pages): January 31st, 2008 Notification of authors: February 15th, 2008.

Further Information on the conference: http://www.rc332008.unina.it & for RC 33 at http://www.isa-sociology.org/rc33.htm

Members´ New Publications

Kalberg, Stephen (ed.), *Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005 [came out in Jan. ' 06]

Kalberg, Stephen (ed.), *Max Weber Lesen*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag; 2006.

Kalberg, Stephen "Ascetic Protestantism and American Uniqueness: The Political Cultures of Germany and the United States Compared." Pp. 231-48 in Hermann Kurthen, Antonio. V. Menendez-Alarcon and Stefan Immerfall (eds.), *Safeguarding German-American Relations in the New Century*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006

Kalberg, Stephen "Der Einfluss der politischen Kultur auf Fehlwahrnehmungen von Verbuendeten und die Aussenpolitik. Die Vereinigten Staaten und Deutschland."   In: *Socologia Internationalis* 44 (2006), 1: 85-122

Roudometof, Victor "Greek-Orthodoxy, Territoriality, and Globality: Religious Responses and Institutional Disputes," *Sociology of Religion* (Forthcoming)

Roudometof, Victor (ed.) "Collective Memory and Cultural Politics" Special Issue of the *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 2007, Vol. 35 No1, Summer, pp. 1 – 159

Roudometof, Victor "Collective Memory and Cultural Politics: An Introduction" *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 2007 Vol. 35 No1, Summer, pp. 1 – 16

Roudometof Victor and William Haller "Social Indicators of Cosmopolitanism & Localism in Eastern and Western Europe: An Exploratory Analysis": In Chris Rumford (ed.), *Cosmopolitanism and Europe*. Liverpool, UK: University of Liverpool Press, 2007, pp. 181-201.

_____

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
THEMATIC GROUP # 02

Historical and Comparative Sociology

Established in 2003

Board 2006-2010

President
Willfried Spohn
(Free University Berlin, Germany)

Vice-President
Wolfgang Knoebl
(Georg-August-University, Göttingen, Germany)

Secretary-Treasurer
Manuela Boatca
(Catholic University, Germany)

Board Members

Said Arjomand (SUNY-Stony Brook, USA)
Johann P. Arnason (La Trobe University, Australia)
José Mauricio Domingues (IUPERJ, Brazil)
Ewa Morawska (University of Essex, UK)
Elisa Reis (Brazil)
Victor Roudometof (University of Cyprus, Cyprus)
Ulrike Schuerkens (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris France)
Björn Wittrock (SCASS, Sweden)