

Prof. Jan Kubik
Department of Political Science
Rutgers University

School of Slavonic and East European Studies
University College London

BEYOND POLITICAL CULTURE: CULTURE OF POLITICS AND POLITICS OF CULTURE

Online, May 18 – June 18, 2020
(Version 1, May 10, 2020)

j.kubik@ucl.ac.uk

Rationale and goals of the course

Have you ever wondered if a theater performance can change the course of history? Or why inter-religious conflicts are sometimes so vicious? Or to what degree revolutions are religious-like rituals? Or how poetry can challenge the power of an autocrat? Or how people's image of themselves can influence their economic performance? Or how popular attitudes are related to political choices? These and similar topics are explored in this course. We begin by reviewing the state-of-the-art theory on the relationship between politics (particularly power) and culture and explore how "cultural" approaches help us understand such momentous processes as the fall of state socialism, the emergence and consolidation new democracies, the rise of "new" populism around the world, the globalization and the re-definition of the modern state, or the recent wave of ethnic and religious conflicts.

The link between politics and culture belongs to the classical themes studied in social sciences. Arguably, the most famous, seminal work is Max Weber's *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Karl Marx, a materialist, was thinking a lot about culture (a dimension of the social he sometimes called superstructure). Another classic, Emil Durkheim proposed a systematic analysis of collective representations (culture). In political science and sociology, during the *behavioral revolution* of the post World War II era, social scientists tried to build a grand theory that would explain political change and political culture was part of that quest. Research focused on the *beliefs, values and attitudes* of people in different countries, from "primitive" communities to large, industrial societies, but political culture studies increasingly concentrated on the United States or Western Europe where findings from comprehensive, longitudinal *surveys of attitudes* were readily available. Cultural analyses of other societies were have remained a major focus for anthropologists or cultural sociologists.

During the 1970's and early 1980's, the political culture approach (particularly in political science) – as it was then practiced – faced strong criticism and its popularity within the discipline of political science diminished sharply. Over the last thirty or so years, however, there has been a remarkable revival of cultural approaches both in sociology and political science, coinciding with the far-reaching reconsideration of culture's role in the social science theory, cultural anthropology, gender studies, art history, game theory, economics, and the study of globalization and transnationalization. The change was primarily driven by the revival of thinking about culture not merely in terms of *values* and *attitudes* but also *texts*,

symbols, and *discourses*. This new conceptualization, most influentially championed by the influential anthropologist Clifford Geertz and heavily indebted to Michel Foucault, allows researchers to focus more clearly on the complex and multifaceted relationship between politics (power) and culture and investigate an intriguing hypothesis that many if not all cultural productions, though not always “explicitly” political, are nonetheless reflective or constitutive of the competition for power.

The course examines several approaches and issue-areas in the fields of political science, anthropology, history, sociology, memory studies, and developmental economics.

Six tensions in the conceptualization of culture will be introduced in the lecture and class discussions: (1) culture as a semiotic phenomenon versus culture as a psycho-social phenomenon, (2) culture as a dimension of social/political life that can be studied on both individual and social (collective, inter-subjective) level, (3) culture as a resource versus culture as a constraint for/of political action, (4) culture as seen by the “natives” (*emic* perspective) versus culture as an analytical category of the observer (*etic* perspective), (5) and (5) culture as a relatively stable attribute of social wholes (civilizations) versus culture as a contested terrain subjected to competing interpretations by individuals or groups, and (6) culture as a system of meanings versus culture as a type of (social) practice.

Requirements

This is a lecture course, but students are expected to read the assigned materials before each session. Our discussions will be possible only if you read assigned texts.

Students’ performance will be assessed on the basis of FOUR elements:

1. **Reading preparation, attendance and active participation in class discussions. All students are expected to prepare for each session 2-3 questions or brief comments based on the readings.**
2. Proposal. For **Friday, June 5, at 2:00 pm ET (after Session 6)** all the students taken the class for credit must prepare a two-page (maximum 600 words) proposal of their final essays AND a short bibliographic essay.
3. A presentation of the final project (last 3 meetings or so).
4. Final essay. Due before the end of the grading period (final date TBA).

The topic of the final paper must be linked to the role of “culture” (in one of the meanings discussed in class) in a political event, phenomenon or process. It has to utilize at least two theoretical approaches or models discussed in class.

The outline of the papers MUST specify the problem to be investigated, propose at least TWO approaches that will be used, and outline the methods employed in data gathering (even if this will be an “imaginary” project).

Syllabus

Session One (Monday, May 18, 17:30-19:30 GMT+2)

Introduction. Culture and politics: foundations, questions, problems, and issues.

The first unit of the course introduces students to the basic questions, problems, concepts and methods involved in the study of the politics-culture relationship. Its goal is to show how cultural and political (or economic) dimensions of social life are intricately intertwined and how they influence each other. The basic approaches and concepts (such as culture, politics, discourse, symbol, etc.) are introduced. A brief overview of various methodologies is also presented. Several ways of studying the relationship between culture and politics are identified and briefly discussed. Students are asked to propose examples from their own work (or readings) that illustrate the way culture and politics intermesh.

Required readings:

- Abdulali, Sohaila. 2013. "I Was Wounded; My Honor Wasn't." *New York Times*, January 8.
Gladwell, Malcolm. 2008. "The Ethnic Theory of Plane Crashes." *Outliers*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, pp. 177-223.
Sauerbrey, Anna. 2016. "What Is German?" *New York Times*, May 26.

And start reading:

- Aronoff, Myron and Jan Kubik. 2013. "Beyond political culture," in *Anthropology and Political Science: Anthropology and Political Science: A Convergent Approach*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 106-42.

Recommended readings:

- Johnson, James, 2003. "Conceptual Problems as Obstacles to Progress in Political Science." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15, 1, 87-115.
Johnson, James. 2002. "How Conceptual Problems Migrate: Rational Choice, Interpretation, and the Hazards of Pluralism." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 5: 223-48.
Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *American Political Science Review*, Vol.96, No. 4 (December 2002): 713-28.
Laitin, David. D. 1999. "National Revivals and Violence," in John Bowen and Roger Petersen, eds. *Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 21-60.
Kertzer, David I. 1996. *Politics and Symbols. The Italian Communist Party and the Fall of Communism*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
----- . 1988. *Ritual, Politics, and Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Edles, Laura Delfors. 1998. *Symbol and Ritual in the New Spain. The Transition to Democracy after Franco*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Aronoff, Myron. 1991. *Israeli Visions and Divisions. Cultural Change and Political Conflict*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Session Two (Thursday, May 21, 17:30-19:30 GMT+2)

Basic concepts (hegemony, legitimacy, value, symbol, ritual, etc.). Sociology of culture or cultural sociology?

In Session 2 we will continue laying down the basic conceptual framework and look at some thorny issues of the “culturalist” explanations. The distinction between sociology of culture and cultural sociology will be introduced (Alexander).

Required readings:

- Aronoff, Myron and Jan Kubik. (2013). “Beyond political culture,” in *Anthropology and Political Science: Anthropology and Political Science: A Convergent Approach*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 106-42.
- Alexander, Jeffrey and Phillip Smith. 2010. “The Strong Program. Origins, achievements, and prospects.” In *Handbook of Cultural Sociology*, edited by John R. Hall, Laura Grindstaff, and Ming-Cheng Lo. London: Routledge, pp. 13-24.

Recommended readings:

- Sewell, William H. Jr. (1999). “The Concept(s) of Culture.” In Victoria Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, editors, *Beyond the Cultural Turn*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 35-61.
- Wagner-Pacifici, Robin Erica. (1986). *The Moro Morality Play: Terrorism as Social Drama*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Session Three (Monday, May 25, 17:30-19:30 GMT+2)

Methodology: interpretation, understanding, explanation. Ethnography. (Emic versus etic perspectives).

The debate concerning the “proper” methodology of the social sciences never stops. Should we explain or interpret? Is the reality social sciences study of the same kind as the reality investigated in the natural sciences? Naturalism and anti-naturalism are two ontological positions associated with two different epistemologies and methodologies. We will continue discussing this debate while studying a classic article by one of the “gurus” of the interpretivist social science: Clifford Geertz. We will also discuss the role of ethnography in other than anthropology disciplines and review the basic dilemmas of interpretive social science.

Required readings:

- Geertz, Clifford. (1972). “Deep Play: Notes on a Balinese Cockfight.” In Paul Rabinow and William Sullivan (eds.). *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), 181-223. Also in *The Interpretation of Cultures* 1973, 421-53.
- Kubik, Jan. (2009). “Introducing rigor to teaching interpretive methods (To interpret or not to interpret, that is the question).” *Qualitative Methods Newsletter*, American Political

Science Association, 11-17.

Myron Aronoff and Jan Kubik. (2013). "Chapter 2: Methods: Ethnography and Case Study." In Aronoff and Kubik, *What Political Anthropology and Comparative Politics Can Learn from Each Other?* Oxford: Berghahn Books, 50-107.

Recommended readings:

McCann, Michael. (1996). "Causal versus Constitutive Explanations (or, On the Difficulty of Being so Positive...)," *Law & Social Inquiry*, 21, 2 (Spring), 457-482.

Georg Henrik von Wright. (1971). "Two Traditions." In *Explanation and Understanding*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1-33.

Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward and Interpretive Theory of Culture." *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, 3-32.

Charles Taylor, "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," in Paul Rabinow and William Sullivan (eds.), *Interpretive Social Science: A Second Look* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987), 33-81.

Albert O. Hirschman, "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding," *World Politics* 22 (April 1970), 329-43.

Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. 2006. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*.

Raymond Martin, "The Essential Difference between History and Science," *History and Theory* 36 (1997), 1-14.

Session Four (Thursday, May 28, 17:30-19:30)

Semiotic approaches. Strong program in the sociology of culture.

During the last 20-30 years the concept of culture and the understanding of the complex relationship between culture, society, and power have been reformulated and refined. Culture is no longer seen as a relatively static attribute of large collectives, but rather as an incessantly contested field of discourses produced by actors who have uneven access to cultural, economic, and political resources. The unit introduces some of the key writings on the cultural and post-cultural turn in the social sciences. The implications of these new conceptualizations of culture for the understanding of political phenomena are considered. Swidler's seminal article and her influential work in the development of "cultural" theory and methodology are analyzed. The tone-setting, but now somewhat forgotten, mini-debate between Laitin and Wildavsky is discussed. One text by the classic of Russian/Soviet semiotics, by Lotman, Uspensky and Mihaychuk is also discussed.

Required readings:

Swidler, Ann. (1986). "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review*, 51, pp. 273-286.

Laitin, David. (1988). "Political Culture and Political Preferences" and Aaron Wildavsky's "Reply." *American Political Science Review* 82 (2) (June): 589-97.

Lotman, Yuri, B. A. Uspensky and George Mihaychuk. (1978). "On the Semiotic Mechanism of Culture." *New Literary History*, 9, 2, Soviet Semiotics and Criticism: An Anthology (Winter), 211-232.

Recommended readings:

- Wuthnow, Robert. 1989. *Communities of Discourse. Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and European Socialism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (particularly: Introduction, pp. 1-22).
- Wilson, Richard. 2000. "The Many Voices of Political Culture: Assessing Different Approaches." *World Politics* 52:2: 246-73.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. "On Symbolic Power." In *Language and Symbolic Power*. Edited and Introduced by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 163-70.
- Ross, Marc Howard. 1997. "Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis" In M. I. Lichbach and A. S. Zuckerman, eds. *Comparative Politics. Rationality, Culture, and Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berezin, Mabel. 1997. "Politics and Culture: A Less Fissured Terrain," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23:361-83.
- Wilson, Richard W. 1992. *Compliance Ideologies: Rethinking Political Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dittmer, Lowell. 1977. "Political Culture and Political Symbolism: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis." *World Politics*, 29(4), July, 552-583.
- Cohen, Abner. 1976. *Two-Dimensional Man. An Essay on the Anthropology of Power and Symbolism in Complex Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Somers, Margaret R. 1995. "What's Political or Cultural about Political Culture and the Public Sphere? Toward an Historical Sociology of Concept Formation." *Sociological Theory*, 13(2), 113-44.

Session Five (Monday, June 1, 17:30-19:30)

Classics of the psycho-social approach to political culture.

Among the social sciences, political science has had the hardest time to find a place for "culture" among its canonical concepts. While anthropologists, sociologists or historians developed powerful "culturological" approaches, many political scientists - often enamored with the rational choice models derived from microeconomics or strictly behavioral models of human action - fret and often relegate "cultural" approaches to the margins of their discipline. The unit investigates this intriguing tension and look at the dominant manner in which culture is approached in political science: the psycho-social approach. The students read three articles by the classics of the discipline: Almond and Verba, and such major authors as Inglehart, Norris, Welzel, and Dalton.

Required readings:

- Inglehart, Ronald and Christina Welzel. (2009). "How Development Leads to Democracy: What We Know About Modernization." *Foreign Affairs*, 88, 2 (March/April), 33-48.
- Dalton, Russell J. and Christian Welzel. (2014). "Political Culture and Value Change." In *The Civic Culture Transformed. From Allegiant to Assertive Citizens*. Cambridge University Press, 1-16.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Pippa Norris. (2003). "The True Clash of Civilizations." *Foreign Policy*, March-April, 67-74.

Websites to study:

- (1) World Values Survey: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>
- (2) The Hofstede Centre: <http://geert-hofstede.com/united-states.html>
- (3) Portland: The Soft Power 30: <http://softpower30.portland-communications.com/>

Recommended readings:

- Almond, Gabriel A. (1989, 1980). "The Intellectual History of the Civic Culture Concept." In Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba, eds. *The Civic Culture Revisited*. Newbury Park: Sage, pp. 1-36.
- Inglehart, Ronald. (1988). "The Renaissance of Political Culture." *American Political Science Review* 82(4), (December): 1204–30.
- Inglehart, Ronald. (2000). "Modernization, Cultural Change and the Persistence of Traditional Values." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 65 (February): 19-51.
- Klingemann, Hans-Dieter. (1995). "Party Positions and Voter Orientations," In *Citizens and the State*. Edited by H-D. Klingemann and Dieter Fuchs. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp. 183-205.
- Harrison, Lawrence E. and Samuel P. Huntington. Eds. 2000. *Culture Matters. How Values Shape Human Progress*. Basic Books.
- Inglehart, Ronald. (1999). "Globalization and Postmodern Values," *The Washington Quarterly* 23(1):215-28. <http://www.twq.com/winter00/231Inglehart.pdf>
- Fuchs, Dieter and Hans-Dieter Klingemann. 2002. "Eastward Enlargement of the European Union and the Identity of Europe," *West European Politics* 25 (2), April 2002 (Special Issue edited by Peter Mair and Jan Zielonka), pp. 19-54.
- Gamson, A. William. (1992). *Talking Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryzek, John S. and Leslie Holmes. 2002. *Post-communist democracies. Political Discourse across Thirteen Countries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Session Six (Thursday, June 4, 17:30-19:30)

Populism as discourse/ideology and political style. Polarization. How to measure populism?

In this session we will discuss various definitions of populism, focusing on two: populism as discourse or ideology and populism as a political style. A useful method of "measuring" the intensity of populism via content analysis will be also introduced. We will also examine an example of the work that utilizes many concepts and theories introduced in this seminar. In *The Power of Symbols Against the Symbols of Power* Kubik argued that the success of the Solidarity movement in Poland had its roots in the unprecedented mobilization of the counter-hegemonic culture. A cultural revolution preceded and accompanied the political revolution of Solidarity. Its essence was strong symbolic polarization that allowed "the people" to construe themselves in a sharp contrast to the communist regime. The utility of such polarization in a polity consolidating liberal democracy is however questionable. As many theorists argue, a well-functioning democracy needs a pragmatic political culture that enables the search for compromises. A symbolically overheated and polarized culture is not helpful, as it exacerbates any tendency to understand the society as sharply divided into two camps, "us" and "them."

A version of such polarization, the division of polity into “good people” and “bad authorities,” is the hallmark of populism. Under this definition, Solidarity was a populist movement, as its ideology challenged the communists in the name of the mythically or ideologically constituted “people.” But it is not the type of populism most observers think about these days. Over the last several years a number of populist parties and movements emerged in Poland, in a manner recognizable in several other countries. The most prominent is the currently ruling Law and Justice (PiS). We have thus identified two populist phenomena: Solidarity (1980-89) and PiS (with a few supporting groups). Do they represent the same type of populism? Do they rely on the same or similar repertoire of symbolic tools? In order to answer these questions, we work with the distinction between thin and thick populism and compare their respective symbolic systems.

Required readings:

- Kotwas, Marta and Jan Kubik. (2019). “Symbolic Thickening of Public Culture and the Rise of Right-Wing Populism in Poland,” *East European Politics and Societies, and Cultures* 33, 2: 435-471. Access here: <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/10066884/>
- Moffitt, Benjamin and Simon Tormey. (2014). “Rethinking Populism: Politics, Mediatisation and Political Style.” *Political Studies* 62, 2, 381-97.
- Hawkins, Kirk A. and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser. (2018). “Measuring populist discourse in the United States and beyond.” *Nature Human Behaviour*, Vol. 2, April, 241–242.
- Hawkins, Kirk A. (2009). “Is Chávez Populist? Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative Perspective.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42, 8, August, 1040-1067.

Recommended readings:

- Kubik, Jan. (2018). FATIGUE and POPREBEL: What Are They All About? A Programmatic Statement, March.
- Ostiguy, Pierre. (2017). ‘Populism. A Socio-cultural Approach,’ in Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser, Paul Taggart, Paulina Ochoa Espejo and Pierre Ostiguy. *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Session Seven (Tuesday, June 9, 17:30-19:30)

The politics of collective memory.

In the neighboring disciplines of political science, especially history and sociology, there has been a long tradition of investigating the sources and implications of (collective) memory for society. Within political science the study of memory has not been totally neglected, but the existing works tend to focus predominantly on questions of historical and transitional justice and tend to have more of a normative focus. Mainstream comparative politics has been slower to explore the politics of memory, but this sub-field has much to contribute to the study of the politics of memory. It expands the study of memory from a normative to an empirical and analytical question. The shift allows us to foreground how the understanding of the past shapes the pursuit and exercise of power. And among the tools that comparative politics has at its disposal, actor-centered models that look at the self-interest (of politicians) as the driving force of politics, including “cultural politics,” are proven tools. We will investigate the strengths and limitations of studies based on these tools.

Required readings:

- Kubik, Jan and Michael Bernhard. 2014. "Introduction. A Theory of the Politics of Memory." In Michael Bernhard and Jan Kubik, eds. *Twenty Years Later: The Commemorations of the End of Communism*.
- Case studies from Michael Bernhard and Jan Kubik, eds. *Twenty Years Later: The Commemorations of the End of Communism*. 2014.
- Olick, Jeffrey K. 1999. "Collective Memory: The Two Cultures." *Sociological Theory*, 17 (3) (November), pp. 333-48.

Recommended/additional readings:

- Art, David. 2006. *The Politics of the Nazi Past in Germany and Austria*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Assmann, Jan. 1995. "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique* 65, 125-133.
- Brubaker, Rogers and Margit Feischmidt. 2002. "1848 in 1998: The Politics of Commemoration in Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44 (4), 700-44.
- Cruz, Consuelo. 2000. "Identity and Persuasion. How Nations Remember Their Pasts and Make Their Futures." *World Politics* 52 (April), 275-312.
- De Brito, Alexandra Barahona and Lawrence Whitehead. 2012. "Transitional Justice: Reframing the debate." In *After oppression: Transitional justice in Latin America and Eastern Europe*, edited by Vesselin Popovski and Monica Serrano. Tokyo, United Nations University, 439-62.
- Davis, Eric. 2005. *Memories of State. Politics, History, and Collective Identity in Modern Iraq*. Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Gillis, John. 1994. "Memory and Identity: The History of a Relationship." In J. Gillis, ed., *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1950. *La mémoire collective*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France [The collective memory. 1980. New York, Harper & Row Colophon Books.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1952. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France [originally published in *Les Travaux de L'Année Sociologique*, Paris, F. Alcan, 1925 and translated as *On collective memory*. 1992. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press].
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger, eds. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Huyssen, Andreas. 2000. "Present Pasts: Media, Politics, Amnesia." *Public Culture* 12(1), 21-38.
- Kansteiner, Wolf. 2002. "Finding Meaning in Memory: Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies," *History and Theory*, 41 (2002): 179-197.
- Lebow, Richard Ned, Wulf Kansteiner, and Claudio Fogu, eds. 2006. *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Maier, Charles S. 1988. *The Unmasterable Past*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Mink, Georges and Laura Neumayer. 2013. *History, Memory and Politics in Central and Eastern Europe*. London, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Müller, Jan-Werner. 2002. "Introduction: the powers of memory, the memory of power and the power over memory." In Müller, ed. *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe*.

- Studies in the Presence of the Past. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1-35.
- Nalepa, Monika. 2010. *Skeletons in the Closet. Transitional Justice in Post-communist Europe*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Nets-Zehngut, Rafi. 2011. "Origins of the Palestinian refugee problem: Changes in the historical memory of Israelis/Jews 1949–2004." *Journal of Peace Research* 48(2): 235–248.
- Nets-Zehngut, Rafi. 2012. "The Passing of Time and the Collective Memory of Conflicts: The Case of Israel and the 1948 Palestinian Exodus." *Peace and Change* 37 (2): 253–85.
- Nora, Pierre. 1989. "Between memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 26: 7-25.
- Nora, Pierre. 2001. "General Introduction." In *Rethinking France. Les Lieux de Mémoire. Volume 1: the State*. Pierre Nora, ed. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, pp. vii-xxiii.
- Olick Jeffrey K. and Joyce Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24:105–40.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. 2011. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pakier, Malgorzata and Bo Strath. 2010. *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. New York, Berghahn Books.
- Popovski, Vesselin and Mónica Serrano, eds. 2012. *After Oppression: Transitional Justice in Latin America and Eastern Europe*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Radstone, Susan and Katherine Hodgkin. 2003. "Regimes of Memory: An Introduction." In Radstone and Hodgkin, eds. *Regimes of Memory*. London, Routledge, pp. 1-22.
- Rothstein, Bo. 2000. "Trust, Social Dilemmas and Collective Memory." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 12 (4), 477-501.
- Shevel, Oxana. 2011. "The Politics of Memory in a Divided Society: A Comparison of Post-Franco Spain and Post-Soviet Ukraine." *Slavic Review* 70 (1) (Spring), 137-164.
- Stan, Lavinia and Nadya Nedelsky, eds. 2012. *Encyclopedia of Transitional Justice. Three volumes*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Starr, S. Frederick. 1991. "A Usable Past." *The Soviet System in Crisis: a Reader of Western and Soviet Views*, edited by Alexander Dallin and Gail W. Lapidus. Westview Press, pp. 11-15.
- Wilde, Alexander. 1999. "Irruptions of Memory: Expressive Politics in Chile's Transition to Democracy." *Journal of Latin American Studies* 31, 473-500.
- Wood, Nancy. 1999. *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*. Oxford, Berg.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 2003. *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Zerubavel, Yael. 1995. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Meeting Eight (Monday, June 15, 17:30-19:30)

Seminar: discussion and analysis of students' projects

Meeting Nine (Tuesday, June 16, 17:30-19:30)

Seminar: discussion and analysis of students' projects

Meeting Ten (Thursday, June 18, 17:30-19:30)

Seminar: discussion and analysis of students' projects

Extra session (?)

Culture(s) of social movements. Culture(s) of protest.

The study of protest and social movements has gone through several distinct theoretical stages. The inspiration would come from macro-sociology (Marxism), social psychology (studies of relative deprivation), or micro-economics (collective action dilemma). Eventually, partially due to the emergence of “new social movements” in the late 1960s, the field – like so many other areas of the social science – turned to the concept of culture.

Required readings:

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. “Making Meaning,” in *Power in Movement. Updated and Revised Third Edition*, pp. 140-156. (The whole book available here:

<http://voidnetwork.gr/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Power-in-Movement.-Social-movements-and-contentious-politics-by-Sidney-Tarrow.pdf>.

Della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani. 1999. “Social Movements: An introduction.” *Chapter 3. The Symbolic Dimension of Collective Action*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Swidler, Ann. 1995. “Cultural Power and Social Movements,” in *Social Movements and Culture*, Hank Johnston and Bert Klandermans, eds. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1995, pp. 25-40.

Recommended/additional readings:

Zald, Mayer N. 1996. “Culture, ideology, and strategic framing,” in D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, M.N. Zald, eds. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*, pp. 261-81.

Paolo Gerbaudo. 2013. “Protest Diffusion and Cultural Resonance in the 2011 Protest Wave.” *The International Spectator*, 48:4, 86-101.

Alexander, Jeffrey C., Ron Eyerman, Bernhard Giesen, Neil J. Smelser, and Piotr Sztompka. 2004. *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benford, Robert and David Snow. 2000. “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26, 611-639.

Geertz, Clifford. 1980. *Negara. The Theater State in Nineteenth-century Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Scott, James C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human*

- Condition Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2008. *Peripheral Visions. Publics, Power, and Performance in Yemen*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2004. "Concepts and Commitments in the Study of Democracy." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Terek E. Masoud, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 274-306.
- Cruz, Consuelo. 2005. *Political Culture and Institutional Development in Costa Rica and Nicaragua: World-Making in the Tropics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Jessop, Bob. 1999. "Narrating the Future of the National Economy and the National State: Remarks on Remapping Regulation and Reinventing Governance," in Steinmetz, ed., *State/Culture. State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 378-405.
- Tilly, Charles. 1999. "Epilogue: Now Where?" Steinmetz, ed., *State/Culture. State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 407-19.
- Kubik, Jan. 1994. "The Official Public Discourse of the Gierak Era (1971-1980)," in *The Power of Symbols against the Symbols of Power. The Rise of Solidarity and the Fall of State Socialism in Poland*. University Park: The Penn State University Press, pp. 31-74.
- Holmes, Stephen. 1996. "Cultural Legacies or State Collapse? Probing the Postcommunist Dilemma," in M. Mandelbaum, ed. *Postcommunism: Four Perspectives*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations.
- Putnam, Robert D. with R. Leonardi and R. Y. Nanetti. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. "Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field," in George Steinmetz, ed., *State/Culture. State-Formation after the Cultural Turn*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 53-75.
- Chabal, Patrick and Jean-Pascal Daloz. 2006. "The Meanings of the State," in *Culture Troubles. Politics and the Interpretation of Meaning*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 226-68.