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This field statement critically engages comparative politics literature, with particular attention to the ways in which the literature references, defines and/or elides culture and social forces. Critiquing the comparative study of domestic political structures from the perspective of cultural politics creates new conceptual frameworks and methodologies that are useful for the following two reasons. First, cultural politics offers tools to analyze competing theoretical paradigms and to search out alternative narratives that provide new insights within a broadened terrain of social action. Second, cultural politics foregrounds the mutually constitutive relationship between theory and practice, in other words methodologies and theoretical frameworks are directly linked to social forces and policy making. I will argue that comparative politics overlooks much of what is exposed by a cultural politics approach, such as the complex role of social forces as related to democracy. This statement employs a cultural political lens to critically evaluate comparative politics with a focus on modernization, dependency and new institutionalism in addition to postcolonial, poststructural and feminist contributions.

The most epistemologically innovative aspect of cultural politics, that underlies its critical engagement with comparative politics, is its trans-disciplinary approach. Political science defines the realm of the political as a distinct sphere in which specific activities are linked to questions or issues within a bounded set of institutions or organizational settings. Cultural politics loosens these bounds and questions the designated parameters of the realm of the political, its implicit power relations and the implications of such a divisive modernist logic. By conceptually unbinding the political realm cultural politics faces the methodological challenge of theorizing within an undefined social terrain. On the other hand, cultural politics re-frames conceptual and theoretical efforts to account for disjunctive processes of change in political,
economic and social spheres since the clear lines between spheres are blurred or erased. Yet, each research must develop criteria and rationales for delineating the scope of the social terrain that it will engage and theorize.

One strategy for unbinding the political realm questions conceptual divides such as state-society and politics-culture. I argue that the demarcations between these concepts are especially valuable to modernization theory, and this statement will critically evaluate the concept of political culture for its contribution to maintaining these divides. Dependency theory is sensitive to the interrelated qualities of politics-culture and state-society. New institutionalism explores the relationship across these bounded realms yet favors the state or political side of the dichotomies. In response to the general lack of in-depth attention to social struggles and culture in modernization, dependency and new institutionalism, post colonial, post structural and feminist approaches contribute to a reconfiguration of the political through the cultural turn. Cultural politics gives careful attention to the political consequences of social networks, social movements and the symbolic political value and meaning in everyday activities of resistance and dissent.

As for the term culture, there are various definitions that need clarification. According to Raymond Williams in *Keywords* (1983), the first definition of culture is a general process of aesthetic development that one can cultivate and possess related to class affiliation. Along these lines, culture also refers to "the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity" such as music theater, film, etc. (Williams 1983, 90) In the discipline of anthropology, culture is a way of life, "whether of a people, a period, group or humanity in general" with reference to collectives or temporalities and a shared set of meanings. (Williams 1983, 90)
The definition of culture generally employed by political scientists and forms the basis for modern social sciences is closely related to the notion of civilization. Culture describes a secular process of intellectual, aesthetic and spiritual human development that assumes universal linear progress from savagery to domestication to freedom. Modernization theorist Sidney Verba employees this definition is in his use of political culture.

Lastly, culture from a poststructuralist understanding denotes the signifying and symbolic systems through which a social order is communicated reproduced, experienced, and explored. Culture is most commonly used in the plural to defuse the ethnocentric moral superiority attached to singular notions of Culture. So, cultural politics takes the definition of politics as an unbound terrain and the poststructuralist definition of culture to analyze processes of meaning making that denaturalizes political objects of study and looks at how they are constructed and produced culturally. Pratt underscores that the concept of the cultural functions to "reposition the metropolitan intellectual with respect to the field of the social and particularly with respect to its traditional hinterlands and peripheries." (Pratt 1998, 432) This repositioning facilitates a refusal of authority on the part of the researcher by recentering participant knowledge production. In contrast, the modernization concept of political culture commonly applies the definition of culture as a civilizing process within the terrain defined by the discipline of comparative politics, thereby maintaining the authoritative positioning of the researcher.

While cultural politics is strongly influenced by poststructuralism, it maintains a clear analysis of power dynamics within all social relations and their material implications. An analysis of positionality is fundamental because the construction of meaning, deployment of power and access to resources depends on the social positioning of the given individual, institution or group. The poststructuralist current urges disciplinary blurring, which influences
the drive to unbind politics. From this perspective, the theoretical divides between state - society and politics - culture are a problematic and divisive imposition. Furthermore, social movements are the focus of this bottom up approach and their struggles over meanings and representation in the cultural realm "are deeply entangled with their struggles for rights and economic and political-institutional power."(Alvarez et al 1998, xi)

Another analytical component of the cultural politics lens addresses the ways in which culture is used inside the formally distinct realm of the political. This field statement will analyze how social and cultural policy is used to mold notions of nationalism through the construction of an imagined community. I argue that cultural politics offers tools to analyze how nationalism is constructed, the way culture and symbolism are deployed, who is included and excluded and the social struggles involved. I will argue that cultural politics' sensitivity to gender, race, sexuality and class expands the limits of the study of nationalism within comparative politics.

Cultural politics are enactive and relational (Alvarez et al 1998, 7) and call for a theoretical balance between structure and agency. Closely linked to this analytical component are culturally informed methodological approaches that draw from anthropology, sociology and history. Institutional ethnography, for example, exposes the inner workings of institutions, their internal power relations and organizing logics by focusing on the internal coherence of structural entities. Social or civil society ethnography complements this orientation by focusing on communities, reading for agency and the value and meaning of everyday moments. Generally speaking, ethnographers look at patterned interactions while political scientists look at causality. Cultural approaches provide nuanced and detailed analysis of particular cases often through
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lengthy fieldwork. Since the methodological goal of cultural politics is to offer a textured analysis with attention to the particular, operationalizing cultural politics research is a challenge.

Modernization theory and its developmentalist methodology are easily operationalized, which facilitates policy implementation. Yet, Ido Oren argues the reverse logic. The underlying reason for modernization theory's policy relevance is the ongoing federal support for research in political science that reflects U.S. national interests and supports U.S. foreign policy. (Oden 2004, 54) While cultural politics contemplates broader questions, it is not so well funded. To study democratic relations within an expanded political realm, cultural politics draws together eclectic and mixed methodologies.

Cultural politics introduces alternative *methodological approaches* that can be brought to bear on the contemporary era's critical questions such as the impact of neoliberalism as a restructuring force for state and society.

Cultural politics are enacted when movements intervene in policy debates, attempt to resignify dominant cultural interpretations of politics, or challenge prevailing political practices. (Alvarez et al 1998, 6)

One example of the operationalization of cultural politics is to map the impact of neoliberalism on social and political relations within civil society. Neoliberal policy transfers the state's traditional responsibility of meeting marginalized peoples basic survival needs through social services and infrastructural onto civil society. Calls for more civic participation masks state abandonment. This expanded civic responsibility is accompanied by shrinking access to governmental decision making. This combination has been dubbed the paradox of participation and social movement critiques of neoliberalism directly inform efforts to theorize and map these shifting relationships between the state, society, culture and economics.
Latin America serves as the regional reference for this field statement. Dependency theory came out of Latin America in the 1960's and 1970's, highlighting the interdisciplinary legacy of Latin American academics and the links between social movements, policy advocacy and academia. Cultural politics is directly influenced by the interdisciplinary and integrated vision of dependency theory, in addition to its postcolonial and anti-imperialist aspects.

By applying a poststructural cultural analysis, cultural politics assists in exploring the limitations of modernization, dependency and new institutionalism in theorizing Latin American politics, especially the political implications of social struggles. Moreover, cultural politics expands and redefines the study of the politics of social forces and the role of culture in the formally recognized political realm.

Historical factors in Latin America lend themselves to this critical review of comparative politics from a cultural politics optic. Modernization theory studies political transitions from military authoritarianism to popular sovereignty from a structuralist perspective emphasizing the state and the role of the military. Yet during these transitions, social movements became central to political shifts and introduced new issues, agendas, and strategies, redefining the concept of democracy. Gender and ethnicity came into focus as issues for democratic participation since they were themes around which social movements crystallized. Latin America has had powerful revolutionary struggles and more currently is articulating a fierce rejection of economic restructuring state reform under neoliberalism and U.S. imposition of economic trade agreements through both civil society efforts and more formal political and economic channels. Cultural politics offers analytical tools to examine the role of social struggle in democratization processes in addition to exploring cultural and symbolic aspects of both social struggle and the formal political realm.
Using cultural politics as the lens, this field statement will start by examining comparative politics approaches with specific attention to their application to Latin America. This review of comparative politics, its historical, theoretical, methodological and conceptual trends includes: modernization, dependency, new institutionalist, feminist, postcolonial and poststructural influences. Each approach will be evaluated for its treatment of culture. In a basic sense, how does each frame and conceptualize, include or exclude cultural issues? Do the theories originate from Latin America, are they imposed upon Latin America from afar and to what degree are they attentive to questions of social location and positionality? Dagnino writes:

The new perception of the political meaning of culture, of its constitutive imbrication with politics, has been to a significant extent a consequence of change in the general perception of the meaning of politics itself: where, how, by whom and over what politics shall be done. (Dagnino 1998, 45)

This line of inquiry will be elaborated and employed to critically review developmentalist and dependency theories in addition to various contemporary theoretical trends.

Following the examination of theoretical approaches, I will briefly illustrate how a cultural politics analysis of nationalism elucidates inclusion and exclusion within the formal political realm. This examination shows how cultural politics expands the conceptual and analytical frame of comparative politics. Next I will present a condensed review of the varied approaches to thinking about democracy, highlighting how a cultural politic approach broadens the scope of the political. Following these short explications of key aspects of cultural politics' interventions in comparative politics, I will develop a more thorough analysis of political culture, which will serve as an entry point for a deeper discussion of the treatment of culture within comparative politics and relevant debates on democracy. Generally, I will highlight the utility and limitations of the approaches to political culture and elaborate on how cultural politics broadens and/or refines an understanding of culture in relation to democracy.
ARProaches

The study of democratization in the Global South has been historically inhibited by the conceptual, ideological and theoretical limitations inherent in the developmentalist approach. The relationship between capitalism and democracy underlies the developmentalist trend in comparative politics from its beginnings in the Post World War II era. Modernization theory was formulated in part as a response to the growing socialist tendencies throughout the world as a preferable way to deal with inequality between states. Modernization methodology in particular tends to be deductive and predictive. These obstacles became obvious when developmentalism was applied to the Global South and researchers experienced incoherence between their universalist theories and their empirical findings when applied to specific sites. Yet some scholars, such as Howard Wiarda in New Directions in Comparative Politics (2002), claim that the potential for correlation has returned between political, economic and social development and democracy. The developmentalist approach, with its top-down, prescriptive and quantitative orientation, is informed by current U.S. foreign economic policy based on the formula that free trade equals economic development, which will in turn foster democratization, narrowly conceived in electoral terms. The process of naturalizing this formula has given developmentalists reason to reinvigorate concepts such as political culture, the basic values, beliefs and behavioral patterns as a society. Wiarda asserts that while developmentalism, is a positive, systematic, sophisticated approach, it should be reconfigured and updated to address the lingering problems of ethnocentrism, neglect of international economic forces, the dichotomy between traditional and modern, and its universalist tendencies.

Alternative interpretations of the contemporary era bring to light vast and growing socioeconomic inequality, increased displacement and migration due to economic exigencies, the
increasingly qualified nature of democracy, exponential environmental degradation, and the deepening exclusion of growing numbers of people from political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights. Whitehead argues that "the term democracy has been stretched to cover a great variety of political arrangements" and U.S. security objectives and economic interests trump democracy promotion (Whitehead 1986, 39). The moral virtue associated with liberal democratic goals is manipulated to facilitate national interests. Cultural politics' bottom up, inductive and qualitative method questions and redefines politics and the political drawing connections between the aforementioned disturbing global trends and political contradictions. The definition of democracy, its meaning, parameters and quality, has become the terrain of one of the various acute interpretive contests between the two aforementioned approaches, developmentalism and cultural politics (among other left leaning analysis).

Escobar in *Encountering Development* (1995) makes the point that the consolidation of capitalism through global restructuring was accomplished through "the 'discovery' of mass poverty in Asia, Africa, and Latin America." (Escobar 1995, 21) Ironically, poverty as understood in the modern sense can be credited to social and economic disarticulation caused by market economics. New mechanisms of control, such as the politics of poverty, require intervention under the naturalized solution of economic liberalization.

Development, couched in the social scientific assumptions of unilinear social evolution, is considered the global salvation. Escobar studies developmentalism as a discursive field, exploring the way regimes of representation are deployed through a systematized set of relations between elements including institutions, practices, concepts, theories and strategies that facilitate intervention in and control of the Third World. (Escobar 1995, 42) His call for alternative, more autonomous regimes of representation demands a methodological shift of focus to highlight
Cultural politics answers this appeal by searching out descriptive correlation between new theoretical approaches to the relationship between cultural and politics and "the political directions emerging from concrete political contexts of democratization." (Dagnino 1998, 45)

Peter Smith in *Latin America in Comparative Perspective* (1995) argues that to study economic, social and/or political change due to neoliberal orthodoxy and political liberalization of the 1990's, one must conduct a full review of contemporary debates. Within the limited scope of this field statement section, I will consider Smith's claim first by reviewing the legacy of developmentalism through an exploration of the theoretical and conceptual precedents and the underlying logics that persist in adapted form since their establishment in the mid 20th century. Approaches to the study of comparative politics including dependency and various approaches that have emerged in the contemporary context such as state-society, new institutionalist, postcolonial, poststructural and feminist approaches, will be reviewed here for their treatment of culture and social forces. In the later two sections, this review will examine the concept of nationalism through a cultural politics lens and contextualize the varied definitions of democracy.

Poststructuralist theories offer analytic tools to study the way power functions inside and outside the mainstream political science gaze, thereby furthering the study of dynamic and changing political matrices. Such approaches respond to the ineffective attempts on the part of developmentalist approaches to cleanly divide the various areas of development from one another, economic, political, cultural and social. Garretón et al in *Latin America in the 21st Century* (2003) propose a socio-political matrix as an organizing frame for understanding the interrelations between economics, politics, society and culture. This line of inquiry will be employed to critically review the following approaches to comparative politics.
Developmentalism

In the mid-1950’s, post-WWII training in political science shifted from a formal and legalistic focus on the state to an interest in the more informal aspects of politics. (Bill and Hardgrave, 1981) The changing context of newly independent states, the growing Cold War, peasant rebellions, revolutions and national liberation struggles presented new political systems that vexed the theoretical and conceptual models developed up to that point (Lichbach and Zuckerman 1997, 2). Roy Macridis' *The Study of Comparative Government* (1955) ushered in a shift in academic preoccupation to the developing world. Almond and Coleman marked this shift within political science, heeding Macridis' call for the study of dynamic aspects of political systems and regions outside of Europe. Developmentalism can be characterized as an institutional, governmental approach strongly influenced by functionalism and behavioralism and based on the presupposition that all systems must perform the same universal functions whatever their makeup. Common features of this approach include a systemic focus, assumption that particular functions are necessary for the maintenance of the system, and an interest in demonstrating the functional interdependence of the system and the processural nature of political interactions (Wiarda 2003, 203). The overarching research question is; what structures perform what functions in a given political system?

Easton defines system as "an analytical tool designed to identify those integrally related aspects of concrete social reality that can be called political" (Easton 1953, 61). Systems are abstract constructions that facilitate the analytical and conceptual inclusion of non-state factors such as the cold war, NATO, and issues such as the introduction of the atomic bomb or environmental degradation. (Kamrava 1996, 11) Yet, Easton critiques the lack of attention to subsystems and the obsession with stability, which assumes conflict and change to be deviant.
These critiques, in addition to others such as parochialism and ethnocentrism, can be applied to *Politics of Developing Areas* (1960). In this book, Almond and Coleman attempt to construct a universal and functional theoretical framework for the comparative analysis of political systems with a focus on the newly independent nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In their study of changes in scale, structure and culture of political systems, Almond and Coleman reformulate their conceptual tools by employing the term political system instead of state, functions instead of powers, roles instead of offices, structures instead of institutions, and *political culture* and socialization instead of citizenship training and public opinion. Almond and Coleman develop a hypothesis for a formal theory of political modernization: "political systems may be compared with one another in terms of the frequency and style of the performance of political functions by political structures." (Almond and Coleman 1960, 61) They aspire towards a "probabilistic theory of politics" as their contribution to political science without concern for their imposition of an ethnocentric and parochial model.

The political scientist who wishes to study political modernization in the non-Western areas will have to master the model of the modern, which in turn can only be derived from the most careful empirical and formal analysis of the functions of the modern Western polities. (Almond and Coleman 1960, 64)

U.S. armchair scholars imposed the "model of the modern" upon states in the Global South. New nations became the laboratories for the analysis of social and political change, and the central concepts of this analysis came to be modernization and political development with the West as the unquestioned referent. Therefore, modernization can be understood as a function of the Cold War in that it theorized how to shape industrializing countries to the mold of U.S. capitalist interests. As Ido Oren writes of political science, "Since the beginning of the Cold War, if not earlier, the foreign policy agenda of the U.S. government impinged on the discipline at the institutional as much as the personal level." (Oren 2004, 54)
David E. Apter in *The Politics of Modernization* (1965) acknowledges the normative quality of any model and identifies moral-political problems of modernization and political development, a step that Almond and Coleman do not take. Apter critiques Almond and Coleman's work as "comfortable formulated descriptive models that are assumed to embody abstract principles of virtue." (Apter 1965, 15) He points out the role of the researcher's preferences and prejudices in defining the moral basis of politics and legitimate authority. (Apter 1965, 16) Martin C. Needler in *The Concepts of Comparative Politics* (1991) takes up Apter's interest in assessing the moral and normative aspects of comparative politics concepts. He tests them for the coherence between theory and empirical reality with the strong qualification that cultural, class based and political prejudices influence the development of theoretical models and have political repercussions.

Apter and Needler's assertions regarding the normative quality of political ideology are substantiated by examining the social location and multiple affiliations of key modernization theorists. Gabriel Almond for example worked for the Office of War Information and the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey during WWII. After the war he was closely affiliated with the State Department and consulted with multiple federal agencies. (Oren 2004, 53)

In the conclusion of Almond and Coleman's *Politics of Developing Areas* (1960), Coleman offers the definition of a modern society. The following quote illustrates the underlying assumptions of modernization theory.

A modern society is characterized, among other things, by a comparatively high degree of urbanization, widespread literacy, comparatively high per capita income, extensive geographical and social mobility, a relatively high degree of commercialization and industrialization of the economy, an extensive and penetrative network of mass communication media, and, in general, by widespread participation and involvement by members of the society in modern social and economic processes. (Almond and Coleman 1960, 532)
The logic supporting modern society and its inverse, traditional society, assumes linear progression from one end to the other of an evolutionary continuum based upon the ideas of "natural history," progress and social evolution. "The traditional end of the dichotomy is largely a residual category, established by logical opposition to the modern end." (Valenzuela 1978, 538) Six premises inform the concept of change understood through social evolution in the West: change is natural, directional, immanent, continuous, necessary, and uniform in causes.

Blanksten's chapter in the *Politics of Developing Areas* (1960) gives a sense of how culturally deterministic developmentalism maps onto Latin America in the mid 20th century. “While "Latin Americanists" did not write the major theoretical or conceptual works of the modernization literature, the modernization perspective soon became the dominant approach influencing the methodology and conclusions of the most important and trend-setting studies." (Valenzuela and Valenzuela 1978, 536)

Modernization was imposed upon Latin America and the spread of Western political culture was understood as necessary for political integration and stability. Modernization theory asserts that the influence of technology and development will bring the Latin American societies forward from tradition to modernity. Underdevelopment is correlated with *non-Western* culture, which constructs indigenous populations as a liability. Indians are studied as living artifacts with remarkable durability; "many Mexicans and Guatemalans today still live as Indians." (Blanksten 1960, 460) According to this logic of linear progression, urbanization, industrialization, commercialization, secularization, education and restratification have Westernizing effects on societies in Latin America and therefore should bring about political integration and national cohesion. Although political integration is slow, for various reasons including cultural resistance and extreme regionalism "it is afoot everywhere and is one of the fundamental aspects of the spread of Western political culture." (Blanksten 1960, 529) Yet, coercion and authoritarianism are the main factors that force political integration in Latin America.
The ideal of progress and democracy promotion provides a perfect justification for U.S. imperialism and its manifold forms of intervention, while it simultaneously nurtures complacency within U.S. society. Pattern variables as developed through series of polarities by the likes of Durkheim and Parsons were adopted by Gabriel Almond and tend to exaggerate differences between Western and non-Western systems, further entrenching the parochial and ethnocentric assumption that the stable Western model is normal and non-Western conflictual societies are deviant. Cultural politics draws from postcolonialism and poststructuralism to unsettle such assumptions.

Poststructural and postcolonial theories broaden and complicate traditional frameworks for the comparative study of Latin America. Alvarez et al (1998) theorize culture and politics by linking power to knowledge production, questioning categories and unsettling dichotomous thinking. This approach explores who gets to produce truth through representational practices that reproduce domination based on difference. Fernando Coronil (1996) and Walter Migñolo (1996) develop the notion of Occidentalism and postOccidentalism to reveal representational practices that rely on specific spatial imaginaries produced during colonial times. Coronil discusses three representational practices of dichotomous thinking; rendering people as ahistorical with no interrelations, territorializing history and naturalizing space. Migñolo discusses postOccidentalism as a critical intellectual trajectory different from Edward Said’s Orientalism due to Latin America's geographic and temporal relationship with the West. He suggests we must think in terms of race and ethnicity because Occidentalism bases structures of power on difference. Attention to vectors of oppression exposes the inner logic of modernization's cultural determinism. Lastly, Migñolo is concerned with area studies, which makes Latin America an object of study rather than a site of knowledge production. Even as an
object of study, modernization theorists could not deny that the plan for political integration was not running smoothly.

**Crisis in Modernization**

Dankwart Rustow warned that the effects of modernization could be disruptive, leading to discontent and social conflict, which causes a crisis in modernization. In response to this crisis of modernization, Huntington in "Political Development and Political Decay," (1965) concerns himself with the construction of political organizations to facilitate stable political institutionalization in developing countries. In addition to this Institutionalist response, dependency theory was another important reply that originated in Latin America. Spaulding, Nash and Corradi in *Ideology and Social Change in Latin America* (1977) present a dependency perspective on Blanksten's interpretation of resistance to political integration. Following both Apter and Needler's tendencies for moral and normative transparency and honesty, Spaulding, Nash and Corradi contend that idea structures and social structures are linked. As transitions in rural and urban areas due to global economic imperatives increase, the changes are not adequately understood though tradition/modern analysis. Intensified class struggle "will forge new forms of organization and of ideological expression."(Nash et al. 1977, 6) Here I will address the institutionalist theoretical trajectory before expanding further upon dependency theory in the next section.

Huntington's analysis of the crisis of modernization is that rates of social mobilization and political participation are inversely related to rates of political institutionalization in developing countries. For the study of Asia, Africa and Latin America, Huntington argues that more attention must be placed on this balance, since rapid modernization produces political
decay in the form of instability, corruption, authoritarianism, domestic violence, institutional
decline and political disintegration. Political development assumes a one way progressive and
evolutionary inertia, with no provision for reversibility. He distinguishes between political
development and modernization, identifying political development with the institutionalization
of political organizations and procedures. (Huntington 1965, 386) Modernization, on the other
hand, affects all segments of society and its political aspects constitute political development.
(Huntington 1965, 387)

Huntington asserts political organizations and procedures can be explored and measured
through their scope of support: the degree of embeddedness in the population and the level of
institutionalization. Scope of support can be examined through the following four categories:
adaptability (function of environmental challenge and age), complexity (multiplication and
differentiation of organizational sub-units, hierarchically and functionally), autonomy
(independence from other social groupings and methods of behavior), and coherence (some
measure of consensus and unification). Huntington's methodological focus is to measure
institutionalization in order to "buttress or disprove hypotheses about the relation between social,
economic, and demographic changes, on the one hand, and variations in political structure, on
the other."(Huntington 1965, 405)

Huntington's fascination with status quo is reflected in his conception of political
development as stability oriented. This change through modification approach can also be found
within new institutionalism. Huntington is not concerned with the fact that stability and
increased institutionalization can lead to repression as a mechanism to slow social mobilization
and political participation. This lack of concern with the democratic process of political
integration is a dominant principle within modernization, as exemplified by Blanksten's acceptance of coercion and authoritarianism as vehicles for political integration.

As mentioned earlier, developmentalism has encountered serious obstacles in the application of modernization and political development. Howard J. Wiarda, in *New Directions in Comparative Politics* (2002) points out that by the 1970's this developmentalist functional approach crashed against the reality of field work in the Third World, exposing the problematics related to ethnocentrism, parochialism, universalism, and methodological imprecision. In response to this ongoing crisis of modernization, Wiarda offers the corrective that Third World systems are fundamentally and qualitatively different, and one can not assume smooth and consisted development. Development is actually disjunctural, chaotic and contradictory; an elaboration on Huntington's political decay.

Howard Wiarda in *Politics of Social Change in Latin America: Still a Distinct Tradition?* (1992) reworks modernization and political development to fit the specificities of Latin America. The volume focuses on the socio-cultural and political-institutional bases of Latin American systems because traditional institutions "have proved to be remarkably flexible and persistent, bending and adapting to change instead of giving way or necessarily being crushed under the onslaught of modernization." (Wiarda 1992, 2) He highlights the limitations of the development model and claims to provide "an understanding of the historical and cultural conditions and determinants of Latin American social and political behavior that shows also the implications of these factors for understanding concrete contemporary issues of political change and social and economic development." (Wiarda 1992, 4) Wiarda attempts to break out of parochialism and ethnocentrism yet the *West* remains as the unquestioned referent, reinforcing its cultural determinist and social evolutionist value-laden theoretical roots. More than a decade earlier,
Valenzuela and Valenzuela critique this type of modernist reformism present in Wiarda's work. "Discrepancies are accounted for not by a reformulation, but by adding a new definition or a new corollary to the preexisting conceptual framework." (Valenzuela 1978, 552)

In contrast, Garretón et al in *Latin America in the 21st Century* (2003) address the same set of issues Wiarda attempts to account for by reframing the issue. "We cannot speak of a single modernity--but of various different modernities. Each society embodies its own diverse set of modernities."(Garretón et al 2003, 60) This approach destabilizes and critiques the underlying assumption of the *West* as unquestioned referent. The concept of socio-political matrix highlights the need to understand current social, economic and political trends in relation to each other. The nexus between globalization and domestic trends has generated new interrelated trends "that are crucial to understanding the tensions and contradictions that confront a potential, effective new model of development and sociopolitical matrix that would be more economically viable, politically democratic, socially progressive, and culturally genuine."(Garretón et al 2003, 46-47) To trace the genealogy of Garretón et al's critique, I must now turn to dependency theory.

**Dependency Theory**

Besides Huntington's institutionalist response to the crisis of modernization, Andres Gunder Frank and Theotonio Dos Santos, Peter Evans, J. Samuel Valenzuela and Arturo Valenzuela and F. H. Cardoso and E. Faletto are a few examples of political theorists that forward one of the strongest responses to the limitations and problems of developmentalism. In reaction to the modernization based assumption that cultural values and beliefs are determining factors for development and the unit of analysis is the political system, dependency asserts that the internal politics of a country is strongly influenced by its position in international economics.
While dependency does not replicate the problems of cultural determinism and ethnocentrism found in modernization, neither does it elaborate a culture analysis. Methodologically, dependency theory is an inductive inquiry into the structural and historical factors of underdevelopment, responding specifically to Latin American economic stagnation in the post world war II period. The fundamental difference between modernization and dependency is the way in which they theorize underdevelopment. What modernization understands to be political or social anomalies that contribute to a theoretical crisis, dependency theory contextualizes historically and structurally drawing upon Marxist class analysis.

Dependent, peripheral development produces an opportunity structure such that personal gain for dominant groups and entrepreneurial elements is not conducive to the collective gain of balanced development. (Valenzuela and Valenzuela 1978, 545)

Culture, in Marxist terms, is relegated to the peripheral analytic status of super structure.

A.G. Frank in "The Development of Underdevelopment" (1969) defines underdevelopment as causally related to the process of development in the West. He counters arguments that underdevelopment is due to the tenacity of archaic institutions or the existence of capital shortage in regions that have remained internationally isolated. On the contrary, capitalism understood as a historical process generates both underdevelopment and economic development. According to Theotonio Dos Santos in "The Structure of Dependence" (1970), developmentists explain underdevelopment as a culturally inflected problem of traditional society while dependency constructs a theory of laws of internal development as linked to world capitalist expansion. Combined development is the combination of inequalities and "the transfer of resources from the most backward and dependent sectors to the most advanced and dominant ones which explains the inequality, deepens it, and transforms it into a necessary and structural element of the world economy."(Dos Santos 1970, 231)
Underdevelopment is an economic system with a center and a periphery in which capital is pulled inward to economically developed countries. A dependent relationship deepens and aggravates the fundamental problems of developing countries and their peoples while expanding the economy to which it is subjected. (Dos Santos 1970, 231) Cardoso and Faletto add the need to study the historicity of underdevelopment in terms of social forces and structural determinants to expose the internal roots and the external links of social structures. (Cardoso and Faletto 1979, 26) Dos Santos studies the historical forms of dependence through the world economy, types of global economic relations, and the types of internal economic relations. Paralleling Cardoso and Faletto and Frank, Dos Santos contends that relations of dependence must be studied to understand "the fundamental structural limits they place on the development of these economies." (Dos Santos 1970, 232) The obstacles to full development can be understood by studying their relationship to the international system and its laws of development. The system prevents itself from arriving at a stable situation and developmentalists do not have a way out. Extremes will be the result, and Dos Santos predicts violent confrontation, which will lead to either fascism or socialism.

In response to economic exploitation and instability, Peter Evans contents that for poor countries the nation state "becomes the focus of political organization, an instrument to be used to secure economic autonomy and thereby to foster economic progress." (Evans 1971, 677) To evaluate the role of national autonomy in fostering economic progress one must evaluate the effects of international corporate investment and the impact of multinational corporations (MNCs). (Evans 1971, 676) As H.W. Singer proves, MNC activity is "unconductive to self-sustained economic growth." (Evans 1971, 680) Also, MNCs exacerbate the disjunction between consumerism and collective welfare. They transmit standards that distort consumer desires and
thereby retard economic progress. Evans argues that states need autonomy to define consumptive norms. This argument could be reframed as a call for sovereignty in the area of political culture. Evans makes a postcolonial pro-nationalism argument, that by relying on indigenous ideas the possibility of innovations shaped by the particular situation may increase. While close relations between elites and masses are necessary for such internal development, MNC socialization inhibits such development by fostering social polarization.

In response to this problem, Evans makes the following suggestion. "Replacing a private, asymmetric type of integration with a more public, symmetric connectedness may offer the best hope of greater autonomy" (Evans 1971, 692). Socialist forms of economic organization offer the local entrepreneurial class more autonomy and allow for a more collective vision. Evans sustains that the state is the only organization that can defend this agenda. Nationalist sentiments can create leverage and be useful for governments in their negotiation process. Garretón et al's multicentered socio-political matrix is a conceptual model that elaborates upon Evans' notion of public symmetric and connected integration, drawing theoretically from F. H. Cardoso and E. Falleto.

Cardoso and Faletto in *Dependency and Development in Latin America* (1979) illustrate how social, economic and political development are interconnected in Latin America, building upon studies conducted by members of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). The two main research trajectories included the study of "the historical connections between class structure and development" and the examination of "the social and political implications of the local social structures that emerged from the long history of Latin America's interaction with the metropole." (Evans 1993, 231) They take a structural historical methodological approach to study dependency as both a practical and theoretical problem,
examining the global and dynamic aspects of social structures. Drawing from Marx, Cardoso and Faletto study the dialectical relationship between society's structures and processes of change and established modes of production. Such an approach allows for the exploration of both the mechanisms of domination and the possibilities for change within structural limits. This is the most balanced approach to agent - structure among the dependency theorists reviewed here.

Methodologically, this approach demands close historical and global analysis of differences and diversity. With the goal of producing concrete knowledge about dependency, a "dialectical analysis of that complex process exposes how internal and external processes of political domination relate to one another." (Cardoso and Faletto 1979, xviii) Cardoso and Faletto identify dependency "when the accumulation and expansion of capital cannot find its essential dynamic component inside the system." (Cardoso and Faletto 1979, xx) They look at situations of dependency and reject both projections of permanent stagnation and capitalism as the solution for development.

In addition to the previous critiques of developmentalist theory, Cardoso and Faletto point out that it does not link economics to social structure in an integrated and consequential way. Parsonian pattern variables are not useful, and Cardoso and Faletto rather look at the series of relations among social groups, forces and classes. Yet, culture is not a central line of analysis within dependency. They define development as "less dependency and self-sustained growth based on the local capital accumulation and on the dynamism of the industrial sector." (Cardoso and Faletto 1979, 10) As Peter Evans' argument elaborates, the study of structural determinants and social forces facilitates an analysis of how economic relations set the limits of development and political action. Valenzuela refines this point in relation to modernization. Instead of
focusing on the national society, dependency analyzes the global system and its interaction with national societies. (Valenzuela 1978, 550)

In response, developmentalists consider non-Western or postcolonial approaches to be home grown theories of development. Wiarda rejects non-Western particularist approaches.

Globalization and the Cold War have also taken their toll on the indigenous preference by showing that universally, and not just in the West, the overwhelming majority of peoples in all areas prefer democratization in the political realm and a modern mixed economy that provides for growth and higher living standards. (Wiarda 2002, 217)

Contemporary efforts to reinvigorate developmentalism must discredit non-Western approaches because of their potential to undermine the foundational assumptions of developmentalism including the universal logic of democracy and economic development. Dependency influenced postcolonial approaches that account for global interdependence and enduring inequalities in a transnational context are central to cultural politics.

Garretón et al. follow the structural and historical contextualizing and integrative analytic thread of dependency theory. Through the inductive methodological tradition, Garretón et al critique neoliberalism from a postcolonial position and propose an alternative framework. One of Garretón et al's critiques of neoliberalism is that it prescribes a rationalist-technological view, reducing "social interactions to economic exchanges."(Garretón 2003, 61) This trend is part of the burgeoning neoliberal market-driven matrix that is imbricated with both the dissolution of the state-national-popular matrix and the responses of resistance and dissent to the imposition of the neoliberal model. (Garretón 2003, 94) Garretón et al propose their multi-centered socio-political matrix that "would be shaped fundamentally by the nature of its linkages with the world economy and by the strengthening, autonomy, complementarity, and mutually reinforceable interactions among the state, the system of representation, and civil society."
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(Garretón 2003, 100) This nascent proposal introduces a space for cultural analysis in theorizing state-society relations.

Developmentalists claim that dependency is a reductive analysis that posits economic imperatives of capitalism as the sole cause of stalled social and economic modernization. While dependency theory assumes that human behavior is constant in economic matters due to structural conditioning, developmentalists assume that cultural differences determine patterns of economic behavior and action. (Valenzuela and Valenzuela 1978, 550-551) Another pertinent critique of dependency is a lack of concrete political analysis of actual state structures or electoral systems and internal obstacles such as bureaucratic or military influence and power, and weakness of legitimate political institutions. Dependency theory's economic determinism places too much blame on external factors and not enough analysis of internal factors. The demand for an analytical balance between external and internal factors is sound because neither aspect has sufficient explanatory capacity to absorb the other. New institutionalism addresses this point which will be developed in the next section.

Modernization theory would tack on a critique of socialist leaning ideologies associated with dependency that are not compatible with modernization and its vision of political integration. The underlying postcolonial and anti-imperialist currents of dependency theory continue to inform the materialist aspect of cultural politics. Yet, dependency lacks attention to other types of exploitation besides class and largely neglects culture. A more subtle analysis of intersecting vectors of oppression, such as racism, sexism and heterosexism, render a more textured understanding of global - local relations and cultural politics expands the analysis of oppressive structures and dynamics.

One of the most significant critiques of dependency is that it is difficult to operationalize.
"The dependency perspective is primarily a historical model with no claim to "universal validity."" (Valenzuela and Valenzuela 1978, 550) This is why it has paid less attention to the formulation of precise theoretical constructs, such as those found in the modernization literature, and more attention to "the specification of historical phases, which are an integral part of the framework."(Valenzuela and Valenzuela 1978, 546) Methodologically speaking, dependency is opposite to developmentalist approaches because it demands attention to the particular. The challenge of operationalizing dependency theory is part of the legacy cultural politics has inherited since its methodology is oriented towards place based ethnographic, textual and discursive analysis, as the following books by Arturo Escobar and Fernando Coronil illustrate.

Escobar (1992) foregrounds the tension between Western theory and efforts to maintain and create spaces for agency and theoretical production in Latin America. In *Encountering Development* (1995), Escobar makes an intervention through his discursive and institutional ethnography, rethinking development, domination and resistance. The discourse of the Third World has created an "efficient apparatus for producing knowledge about, and the exercise of power over" the geographical areas and peoples that inhabit the socially produced space. (Escobar 1995, 9) Escobar studies the way regimes of representation such as "Third World" take concrete form through practice by examining how "truth claims are related to practices and symbols that produce and regulate social life." (Escobar 1995, 12) Ethnographic methodologies are the preferred frame through which to examine both institutional logics and people's actions in daily life, the meanings they create, and their internal coherence. While ethnography is not the only method, an anthropology of modernity demands significant contact with non-academic, non-institutionalized social actors that are central to "the reappropriation of the space of hegemonic sociocultural production." (Escobar 1995, 223) Yet such methodologies is not easily
translated into policy prescriptions since they do not produce authoritative and neatly quantifiable outcomes. Yet, cultural political research can inform "political strategies and self-defined and self-directed socioeconomic experiments." (Escobar 1995, 223)

Fernando Coronil's *The Magical State* (1997) is another example of cultural politics methodology. He uses historical and ethnographic narratives to look at modernity from a Third World position and Venezuela from the perspective of the elite. He presents a transnational cultural political approach to interpreting the role of the state in Venezuela's modernization project, identifying Venezuela as a site of subaltern modernity. He uses "a relational conception of the subaltern" to capture both the (global) unifying aspect of a shared subordination and the difference inherent in (national) particular manifestations of subjugation. Coronil explores narratives of national sovereignty and agency, thereby exposing power relations and "the place of third-world nations in the global structure of production and distribution."(Coronil 1997, 391)

He attempts to complicate the center periphery underdevelopment approach by directly incorporating culture and politics through what he calls a unifying approach that parallels Garretón et al's integrated concept of socio-political matrix. Coronil writes, "Treating the creation of value as a process that involves the formation of subjects as much as the production of valuables, I place the domains normally associated with culture, politics, and economics within a unified analytical field"(Coronil 1997, 6). Coronil's framework is marked by poststructuralism and dependency theory and his methodological goal is descriptive and analytical. This is an example of cultural politics that is not concerned with direct policy relevance yet brings useful historical and cultural insights to economic policy.

While Coronil and Escobar's works illustrate the continuing legacy of dependency theory, it did experience a serious crisis in the 80's for various reasons. As already mentioned,
dependency did not offer itself easily to operationalization. In addition, its focus on Latin America limited its ability to analyze and explain the economic development of East Asia. Also, neoliberal economic policy, Reagan and Thatcher's 'there is no alternative,' was on the rise. During the 1980's alternative theoretical directions developed, including new institutionalism and various interdisciplinary critiques of Latin American studies.

New Institutionalism

In response to the limitations of modernization and dependency, the new institutionalist turn led to a historically specific rethinking of conventional issues such as the state, institutional design, and rule of law. This turn in understanding patterns in political change focuses analysis on institutions. Comparative politics started with a focus on the state and then moved to political systems with a cultural deterministic accent. The crisis of modernity yielded the response of dependency theory. Then, to balance the economic determinist tendency of dependency theory to focus on external factors, comparative politics brought the state back in, yet enlarged its scope to include the state - society relations, the state including the people inside it. New institutionalism examines modernization's theoretically impenetrable blackbox by analyzing the internal workings of the state, its groups and coalitions. The two types of new institutionalism explored here briefly are historical, sociological and qualitative approaches and rational choice. They both fall on the state side of the state- society debate, with a focus on the role of institutions in shaping political strategies and influencing political outcomes. New institutionalism favors structural analysis over cultural analysis. Here I will develop the historical, sociological and qualitative type and then address rational choice in the subsequent section.
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Huntington's institutionalist response to the crisis in modernization and new institutionalism share several key theoretical assumptions. James G. March and Johan P. Olsen in "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life," (1984) define a unifying set of concerns. First, new institutionalism understands society and political institutions to be separate and autonomous, with the analytical focus on state institutions as central actors in politics. Theda Skocpol in *Bringing the State Back In* (1985) is concerned with state capacity and the state as an autonomous unified body. In placing the state as central to comparative social science, Skocpol explores both states as primary actors in terms of their autonomy and capacity and states influence on political and social processes. Culture is understood as a dependent variable.

New institutionalism also de-emphasizes the role of micro processes and methodological individualism in favor of studying how rules and procedures structure and shape behavior, interests and choices. The underlying argument is that political institutions can be treated as political actors, which depends on the presupposition that institutions are coherent and autonomous. This presupposition overlaps directly with Huntington's four criteria for evaluating institutional scope of support. Coherence (a measure of consensus and unification) positions institutions as decision-makers that reflect collective interest, thereby fulfilling political duties. Autonomy establishes institutions as more than just a mirror of social forces due to their independence from other social groupings. (March and Olsen 1984, 739) In evaluating the autonomy of states, Skocpol draws upon Trimberger's notion that relative autonomy can be said to exist when people who hold high civil and military posts are not recruited from the dominant classes. Furthermore, if those holding civil or military post are from the dominant classes, they should not maintain close ties to those classes. (Skocpol 1985, 10) Skocpol adds that in an
analysis of autonomy, one must take into consideration, "the international orientations of states, their domestic order-keeping functions, and the organizational possibilities for official collectivities to formulate and pursue their own policies." (Skocpol 1985, 11) In terms of state actions being "rational," Skocpol claims that this may hinge upon "the fit (or lack thereof) between the scope of an autonomous state organization's authority and the scale and depth of action appropriate for addressing a given kind of problem." (Skocpol 1985, 15) State capacity to implement policies may be uneven across policy areas, depending upon the policy instruments to which the state has access.

An aspect of conceptual continuity between Huntington's Institutionalism response to the crisis in modernization and new institutionalism is the way in which institutional thinking "emphasizes the part played by institutional structures in imposing elements of order on a potentially inchoate world. (March and Olsen 1984, 743) This aspect overlaps with the universalist, top-down and inductive orientation of developmentalism in general.

Approaches that focus on state-society relations study the state in relation to different interest groups, civil society, social movements, NGO's, etc. To fully theorize state capacity, Skocpol argues that the relations between states and "domestic and transnational nonstate actors and structures" must be considered (Skocpol 1985, 19). Skocpol requires a study of the "specification of the organization and interests of socioeconomic groups, and inquiries into the complementary as well as conflicting relationships of the state and societal actors." (Skocpol 1985, 21) These social aspects must be taken into consideration in relation to the organization and interests of the state through structural analysis while cultural analysis is sidelined.

Furthermore, Skocpol argues that states can be understood as having an influence upon political culture, group formation, collective political actions and the possibilities of raising
political issues. (Skocpol 1985, 21) While Skocpol's analysis of state and society holds society, economy and culture in relation to each other, she weighs in on the state side. The state has important regulatory, coopting, controlling and cohesive functions.

In the 1990's the state-society approach began to look at the behavior of grassroots in the political system, with attention to individuals in the political system. Ruth Lane makes the following points about individuals; they are "highly influenced by a complex structure made up of social, economic, and political institutions, within which they designed their lives, careers, and their politics as best they can, occasionally changing some institutions to adapt better to their need and desires. (Lane 1997, 100) Ruth Lane explains her microanalytic method as concerned with "individuals caught in their webs of state and society relations." (Lane 1997, 108) To break out of the conceptual limitations separating state and society, Midgal's proposes an alternative conceptualization of state and society.

A melange of organizations adjacent, competing, embedded, all influencing individuals; organizations that defined what people could do, or think, or hope for; organizations that could bestow a livelihood or take it away, could assist or impede survival. (Midgal in Lane 1997, 110)

While this conceptualization softens the distinction between state and society, the state remains the point of departure thereby relegating culture to a dependent and peripheral variable.

Two critical aspects of new institutionalism, attention to subsystems and analysis of the internal workings of the black box of political systems, differentiate it from developmentalism. Yet, new institutionalists argue that new democracies in particular must get their institutions right to have successful political development, echoing Huntington. David Levine's new institutionalist analysis in "Venezuela: The Character, Crisis and Possible Future of Democracy" (1999) defines democracy with an emphasis on stability through access and procedure, a legacy
inherited from developmentalism. This is in contrast to definitions of democracy that emphasize outcomes and equality.

Alfred Stepan (1985) applies a new institutionalist analysis in his chapter, "State Power and the Strength of Civil Society in the Southern Cone of Latin America." He writes about the shift in focus from society centered modernization theory to the central role of the state and "the analysis of actions and initiatives of groups operating within the state apparatus." (Stepan 1985, 317) Stepan takes the methodological position of balancing his focus on state and society by claiming that they have a reciprocal relationship. More specifically, he sustains that while civil society responses to the state are constrained by the contours of the state apparatus, the tensions and characteristics of civil society are critical for understanding and contextualizing state actions and institutional power. Here Stepan emphasizes the mutual relationship of state and society while maintaining a structural analysis.

**Rational Choice**

Rational choice institutionalism (RCI) is the second of the two types of new institutionalism briefly explored here. Rational choice theory attempts to find parsimonious, single and elegant explanations for political behavior, therefore it is similar to modernization in that is it lends itself to policy application. Three basis assumptions regarding social actors form this theoretical position. According to Julia Adams, social actors utilize a means-ends rationality to decision making, they are self-interested and motivated to maximize wealth. (Adams 1999, 100) Rulers within key positions of state institutions make and enforce decisions according to rules and procedures. Rational choice is strongly influenced by economics not just in its theoretical assumptions but also its methodological frame.
Kurt Weyland (2002) critiques RCI by exploring the limitations of the political science definition of politics as a discrete sphere. Weyland argues that RCI does not account for macro factors such as cultural norms or systemic imperatives and is limited in its analysis of the dynamic, unpredictable and complex aspects of Latin American politics. Cultural politics threatens the basic principles of RCI because it explores the aspects of politics that are excess to the RCI frame. To account for this would demand a method that attends to specific contextual factors. Such a methodological step would compromise RCI's ability to be the vehicle for a unified political science. Weyland calls for a theoretically eclectic approach that stresses “complementarity and substantive particularism,” (Weyland 2002, 62) in addition to identifying “reciprocal connections between politics and economy, society and culture.” (Weyland 2002, 71) This approach takes elements that are central to cultural politics in the direction of middle range theory, increasing the potential for cultural politics policy relevance.

While both the rational choice and the historical sociological versions of new institutionalism and dependency theory respond to the limitations of society focused and cultural deterministic modernization theory, neither employ cultural analysis or pay sufficient attention to social struggles due to their institutional, economistic and/or structural focus. Furthermore new institutionalism and dependency eclipse the role and significance of social struggles both inside and outside the black box of politics. Instead of introducing a dependent variable to squeeze culture into or addressing it through a sweeping universalist approach, Steinmetz (1999) reframes the relationship between state and culture; "states are not autonomous from extrastate cultural forces, but are shot through with circuits of meaning that cut across the state-society frontier."(Steinmetz 1999, 12) Moreover, Steinmetz asserts that cultural theory is very important for unpacking the very definition of the state and moving past the sticking points within
theoretical debates regarding the state. New institutionalism is theoretically invested in the demarcation between state and society. Marxist oriented theories such as dependency understand such a demarcation to be ambiguous and illusory. Cultural analysis allows the boundary of the state to be theorized as "a variable discursive effect," not an ontological constant. (Steinmetz 1999, 25) This last assertion folds into the agenda of cultural politics, specifically to question the parameters and unbind the realm of the political.

Cultural Politics

Through critical analysis of the various comparative politics approaches, key aspects of cultural politics have been brought to light. In counterdistinction to modernization theory, cultural politics denaturalizes the West as the unquestioned referent by asserting a poststructuralist notion of culture and takes a transdisciplinary point of departure that blurs the lines between disciplinary categories. From dependency theory, cultural politics borrows from its structural historical analysis yet pays attention to the particular manifestations of global relations, adding cultural analysis. Cultural politics has a strong tendency towards qualitative methodology a legacy of dependency theory, which limits its direct policy application. From new institutionalism, cultural politics adopts the attention to subsystems which expands its analysis of multiple levels of scale, yet rejects a state - society analysis that favors the state side of the relationship. Arturo Escobar's work elaborates on the epistemological roots of these foundational precepts.

Escobar (1992), develops a cultural political lens by drawing from cultural theory and discursive analysis to critique the relationship between knowledge and power. Discourse is defined as mechanisms by which permissible modes of being and thinking are determined.
Escobar asserts that developmentalism is a historically produced organizing discourse or regime of truth that effectively links knowledge and power in a way that informs material practices. The presupposition of an irrefutable boundary between state and society sets the basis for a practical and conceptual separation between economic and social policy, for example. In response, Escobar develops a "framework for understanding Latin American social movements as economic, political and cultural struggles" by drawing from theories of everyday life, historicity, the practice of cultural innovation by social actors, the "ethno-semiotic approach" and the interface between culture and politics (Escobar, 1992, 64). This analysis resonates with Garretón et. al.'s call for a socio-political matrix of analysis that attends to the mutually informing aspects of change in Latin America.

Escobar proposes that social change can be understood as encompassing, a dual strategy that includes the struggle for material survival coupled with the struggle "for the very definition of life, economy, nature, and society." (Escobar 1995, 16) The collective action of social movements is the engine for the creation of "autonomous regimes of representation." (Escobar 1995, 17) The key cultural politics aspect of this research agenda is the inseparable relationship between discourse and materiality. Escobar underscores the invaluable contribution of social movements to forming new cultural products and meanings.

The central requirement for a more lasting transformation in the order of discourse is the breakdown of the basic organization of the discourse, that is, the appearance of new rules of formation of statements and visibilities. (Escobar 1995, 216-217)

He is especially interested in the innovative qualities of cultural hybridization as holding potential political relevance for reading meanings in new ways, thereby accelerating "the breakdown of the basic organization of the discourse." Alberto Melucci explains this
phenomena as movement's ability to name and make visible social dilemmas that fall outside the scope of the political system, thereby denaturalizing asymmetrical relations.

All of this is not to say that social movements present the universal solutions to global neoliberal oppression. If critiques of globalization and/or neoliberalism are not grounded, or substantiated by observing their coherence with local and national manifestations, then they stay at the level of theoretical reflection. Methodologically, cultural politics stays grounded through its vigilance of the dynamism of the actions of social protagonists and the meanings and ends they attribute to such actions. (Krischke 1998, 416) Paulo J. Krischke explicates the more subtle position from which these arguments emanate. First, the cultural process of social and political change is unpredictable, dynamic and multidirectional. Second, social actors are the "the subjects and interpreters responsible for the meanings and the political relevance of their actions." (Krischke 1998, 415) Mary Louise Pratt adds that the movement's alternative meanings intervene in the "shared political culture that underwrites both dominant and oppositional movements." (Pratt 1998, 434) Feminist movements in specific contribute significantly to this cultural process of social and change.

Feminist analysis is integral part of a cultural politics approach and as Georgina Waylen (1994) contends, comparative politics would benefit from increased feminist intervention. Jane S. Jaquette (1995) explores the implications of gender methodologies in the study of women in development and women's social movements. Her critique calls for an epistemological shift in the study of contemporary politics in Latin America to include a critical gender analysis. Alvarez argues that ongoing feminist interventions in public spaces have effectively challenged and continue to shift Latin American political culture.
Feminist discourses now circulate in and potentially destabilize the dominant political cultures of a wide variety of social, cultural and political actors and institutions in Latin America. (Alvarez in Alvarez et al. 1998, 304)

This feminist challenge is an integral aspect of cultural politics theoretical analysis and methodology. In unbinding the realm of the political, particularly by questioning the state-society dichotomy, this begs a further blurring of the public-private dichotomy that has so long been interrogated by feminist analysis. The drive to expose divisive modernist logic can not be separated from the efforts to expose sexist and patriarchal logic as it intersects with other vectors of oppression such as racism and heterosexism.

_Cultural Politics Analysis of the Formal Political Realm_

The second analytic thread that reads for the ways in which culture is used within the formally distinct realm of the political is further enriched by foregrounding a feminist analysis. The study of nation building is not complete without attention to the way nationalism is gendered, sexed and racialized. Since cultural politics methodological approaches account for power relations within a dynamic matrix made up of vectors of oppression, feminist analysis is one of various tools applied to interpret the social terrain in question. Cultural politics assists in the study of nationalism through its analysis of gender, race and class, offering important insights into the workings of inclusion and exclusion. By unbinding the realm of the political and employing a variety of theoretical trajectories including critical race theory and transnational feminism, cultural politics brings to lights aspects of nationalism that are obscured through a comparative politics optic.

Benedict Anderson contributes a nuanced cultural analysis of nationalism, asserting that "nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artifacts of a particular kind." (Anderson 1991,
4) He defines the nation as "an imagined community -- and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign." (Anderson 1991, 6) The term community denotes state efforts to unify across inequality and exploitation, reinforcing "deep, horizontal comradeship" even if only symbolic. (Anderson 1991, 7) He asks the following questions about nationalisms.

We need to consider carefully how they have come into historical being, in what ways their meanings have changed over time, and why, today, they command such profound emotional legitimacy. (Anderson 1991, 4)

Instead of theorizing nationalism as a political ideology, Anderson argues that nationalism must be theorized in the context of its historical and cultural systems. A gendered, classed and raced cultural politics analysis of nationalism in Latin America exposes the logic of inclusion and exclusion.

Nationalist movements in Latin America are associated with populist regimes, which represented a domestic political alternative in the post world war II period. *Populismo* refers to a style of political mobilization in which a charismatic leader focuses on "the people," using the language of self-determination and nationalist symbolism, and negotiating political compromises and coalition building, to implement economic reform policies and national integration that promote development without destabilizing the status quo.

Manuel Antonio Garretón et al in *Latin America in the 21st Century* present the ideal type of statist-national-popular social political matrix as a framework for analyzing this prevailing socio-political configuration in Latin American during the mid 20th century. The state is central to this model, both as unifying institution and symbol. (Garretón et al. 2003, 8) The ideological component of the statist-national-popular matrix is nationalism that offered the social cohesion necessary for nation building. A popular collective orientation and common identity "foster allegiance to the governing system, and secure compliance with the dictates of authority" across a heterogeneous population. (Garretón et al 2003, 13) This nation-building ideological
project was implemented through the educational system, economic nationalism, and political rhetoric to produce cultural homogeneity.

The symbolic importance affiliated with *el pueblo* (the people) responds to aspirations for global change in addition to immediate demands. "Seeking to close the gap between the rich and the poor internationally and domestically at the same time, Latin American *populistas* had both a nationalist and class orientation." (Drake 1982, 233) Middle class cultural values informed the emphasis placed on education as a vehicle for upward social mobility and industrialization to insure employment.

Yet, Kenneth Paul Erikson (1977) argues that populism and corporatism in Brazil maintained weak working class organizations through controlled vertical relations, which in turn crippled workers ability to resist to the 1964 military coup. The outcome was a decline in real wages and concentration of wealth to the upper class. Erikson is careful to point out that populism failed to address social inequality and to implement redistribution, thereby undermining worker autonomy. Spalding (1977) in his comparative study of the relationship between labor and two periods of Populism in Brazil (Vargas, Goulart) and Argentina (Perón) agrees with Erikson's assessment that Populism does not challenge the social structure. The new industrial working class formed the base of Populist regimes, while political elites maintained both the social hierarchy and their lions share of economic and political benefits. Horowitz (1999) underscores the dual and contradictory nature of Populism in that it opens politics to traditionally excluded populations yet does not fundamentally challenge or restructure the social order.

In addition to the issue of class, the making of the Populist "nation" is also entangled with gender and race. Sarah Radcliffe and Sallie Westwood and Norma Alarcón, Karen Caplan and
Minoo Moallem construct the theoretical scaffolding for this analysis of nationalism and sociopolitical inclusion and exclusion, providing a poststructural feminist and critical race entry point. Cultural politics analysis uses a textured methodology to explore the following questions with attention to structures of oppression and asymmetrical social relations. How nationalism is constructed? Who is included and excluded and how? What are the social struggles involved in the shaping of nationalism? How does culture and symbolism get instrumentalized through nation building?

Radcliffe and Westwood in "Imagining the Nation" (1996) ask questions about the heterogeneity of national identities. How is the imagined community generated, sustained and fractured in one state? They take transnational concerns seriously, such as new claims to national identities due to multi-ethnic diasporic relations that create pluri-nations and ethnicized identities. This approach brings attention to the violence of defining a homogeneous nation through ideology. Norma Alarcón, Caren Kaplan and Minoo Moallem (1997) would add that modernity, which informs the political philosophy of Enlightenment and liberalism, plus or minus Marxism or capitalism, are the ingredients for nation state formation. "Furthermore, they argue that "the crisis in modernity is its simultaneous denial and universalization of difference, which underpins state practices." (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 2) Therefore, efforts to unify the state produce privileged subjects and eccentric subjects marked as different by sexuality, gender, race, ethnicity, and class. What is the cost to unity and who is left out?

Alarcón, Caplan and Moallem identify a situated space between women and nation that disrupts the pedagogy of the nation; the nation-state's efforts to produce citizen subjects who mirror the nation-state's political desire. (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 7)
Women are both of and not of the nation. Between women and nation is, perhaps, the space or zone where we can deconstruct these monoliths and render them more historically nuanced and accountable to politics. (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 12)

This method of analysis is to question both woman for nation (global feminism naturalizes nation-states and essentializes woman) and nation for woman in (national discourse uses the icon of women to justify the nation-state). (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 14) Both terms woman and nation are historical and contingent, yet are constantly getting regulated through economies of time, space, body politics and heterosexual and kinship metaphors. (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 15) Furthermore, the meaning of women's roles are constantly being re-interpreted by both hegemonic discourses and counter-discursive resistance.

Navarro's (1982) exploration of Weberian charisma in relation to the Populist leadership of Juan and Evita Perón in Argentina illustrates what Alarcón, Caplan and Moallem call the discourse of woman for nation. Juan Perón's populist regime in Argentina is described as inclusionary corporatist and Eva Perón played a key role in its success. Evita herself possessed charisma and her contribution to the Perón administration was to prolong the life and strength of its political charisma. Eva was interpellated as the icon of woman to justify and strengthen the logic supporting the nation-state and Perón's regime in specific. In her speeches and actions, she always highlighted the fact that she was “only a humble woman” who wanted to bring love into the political arena (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 60). She is unique in that her charisma was dependent on that of Juan Perón: she was his complement and they created a “dual leadership” fueled by popular support (Alarcón, Kaplan and Moallem 1997, 64). Evita Perón's political identity was completely subsumed to fortify the logic of Perón's populist regime.

William Rowe and Vivian Schelling (1991) also present a critical analysis of Populism in Argentina and Brazil. They assert that focusing on the negative influence of external international factors, only obscures the inequalities within internal social structures and power
differentials. They foreground the importance of examining gaps and contradictions between populist nationalism as an ideology and actual cultural processes in the society. For example Brazil's populist nationalism claimed itself a racial democracy while it never came to terms with slavery on a social level. The key critique of populism in Brazil and Argentina is that it does not challenge or transform vertical social hierarchies.

In *Making Race and Nation* (1998) Anthony Marx develops an analysis of race in Brazilian state-building, arguing that Brazil effectively produced an “unofficial” policy of racial discrimination and social order through the “official” discourse of conciliation and preservation of the nation-state. Emancipation in Brazil was accomplished through conciliation and preservation of authority rather than bloody conflict. The centrality and ordering of Brazilian society made it unnecessary for the state to enforce a social or racial dichotomy. While this process of nation building “achieved emancipation without civil strife” (Marx 1998, 160), according to Marx, blacks labored as they did before emancipation, but for low wages. Economic changes during the late 1890s through the 1920s included a demand for low wage or free labor and the state solution was to import white labor, simultaneously whitening the nation by “diluting” blacks through a regime of lightening.

Marx illustrates and problematizes the myths and stereotypes of racial democracy in Brazil. He explains that state practices of “ignoring” race was part of a system of power relations produced by the state in an effort to keep an unwritten social order. Marx claims that these state practices neutralized race-based resistance to state sanctioned ethnic and cultural inequalities. Military rule further enforced social order and continued to produce the state through the eyes of Brazilian elites. Marx concludes that although African culture was practiced and celebrated within and by the state, “the political and economic rights did not follow.” (Marx
This exploration of race and nation building in Brazil reinforces Rowe and Schelling's assertion that Populism did not challenge or transform vertical social hierarchies.

Nationalism defines membership to a political community and serves to create social solidarity, by preserving traditional identities and creating a new set of attributes. This section offers an alternative route to thinking about nationalism and the underlying questions of inclusion and exclusion that also vex democratization processes. Elaborating on Benedict Anderson's analysis of nationalism in *Imagined Communities* (1983), Linz and Stepan ask the following questions in *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation* (1996), how are national identities constructed and how do they condition the prospects for democracy? Using alternative methodologies, cultural politics sheds light on the aspects of nationalism that provide reflections on exclusionary policy and directions for inclusive democratic theorizing within the formal political realm. Studying the gendered, raced and classed aspects of nationalism exposes the issue of inclusion and exclusion in Latin America which is an underlying problematic for democratic consolidation in Latin America. As mentioned earlier, the concepts of democracy and democratization hold different meanings depending on the theoretical approach. One of cultural politics main concerns is with inclusive participation in decision making processes. In the next section, I will examine the central tension between the comparative politics reviewed and a cultural politics approach; how to define the political in the study of democracy and democratization.

*Democracy*

Melucci explicates the critical centrality of debates on democracy. The theme of democracy from a cultural politics perspective --
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highlights the democratization of politics and the guaranteeing of rights as the crucial condition of the nonsubordinate inclusion of Latin America in ongoing global processes, and in the symbolic sense because it signals that analysis of the forms assumed by democracy must necessarily address the cultural dimension of social conflicts and movements. (Melucci 1998, 422)

Yet, Melucci thinks this concentration of attention on democracy is problematic because it may narrow the optic through which new forms of domination and exploitation are analyzed. Since I agree with Melucci's concern, I will condense the following rehearsal of contemporary and relevant points of debate and their underlying assumptions about the political realm. By placing four texts, Samuel Huntington's *The Third Wave* (1991), Laurence Whitehead's *Democratization Theory and Experience* (2002), Leonardo Avritzer's *Democracy and the Public Sphere in Latin America* (2002) and Evelina Dagnino's "Culture, Citizenship, and Democracy" (1998) in relation to each other, this exercise will elucidate how the definition of the political in each study determines the varied delineations of the social terrain they theorize and the issues they consider.

Huntington's *The Third Wave* (1991) explores democratization in the 1970's and 1980's and is geared to both a social scientist and practitioner audience. He categorizes his book as explanatory and takes on the role of political consultant, including sections entitled "Guidelines for Democratizers" for "people who wish to democratize their societies." (Huntington 1991, xv) The definition of the political not only adheres to norm of political science, it sets the reference for political science. Huntington does not stray from reinforcing the superior role of the U.S.

The United States is the premier democratic country of the modern world, and its identity as a nation is inseparable from its commitment to liberal and democratic values. (Huntington 1991, 30)

He utilizes a minimalist definition of democracy, consisting of elections. Huntington offers an equally simplistic definition of the process of democratization, which includes "the end of a non-democratic regime, the inauguration of the democratic regime, and then the consolidation of the
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democratic system." (Huntington 1991, 9) The two factors, economic development and political leadership, are key to Huntington's formula for political stability and democratization. This book illustrates an approach to democratic theory that sits at the center of political science and bounded realm of the political.

In *Democratization Theory and Practice* (2002), Whitehead also maintains his study within the formally recognized parameters of the political. Yet, his definitions of democracy and democratization are attentive to temporal and contextual specificity and his methodology is more consequential. Whitehead argues against the idea that Huntington's third wave has taken its cycle and proposes a different interpretation, "the global upsurge of democracy has not yet exhausted its capacity to surprise, and emerging scholarship remains vulnerable to the further unfolding of its object of study." (Whitehead 2002, 2) In defining the term democracy, Whitehead does a full review of nine procedural minimum conditions and while he qualifies the conditions as partial, he asserts that they provide "a rather coherent and broad-based exposition of the predominant view." (Whitehead 2002, 26) He chooses to use this as the baseline for his book, squarely placing him in the bounded realm of the political. Democratization is "long-term, complex, dynamic, and partially open-ended" (Whitehead 2002, 187) leading to more rule-based, consensual and participatory politics. (Whitehead 2002, 27) Yet, he makes clear that democratization is not a stable or predetermined process.

In terms of methodology, Whitehead is clear about the complexities involved in studying democratization, such as the proliferation and diversity of cases and "a shared vocabulary, but with multiple shades of meaning and little terminological closure." (Whitehead 2002, 5) He proposes an "interpretivist" approach to the study of democratization to "draw attention to the normative, transformative, and persuasive components of democratization and to its reflexive
and self-directed characteristics." (Whitehead 2002, 35) He applies the interpretivist method to cross-regional and paired comparisons. In his conclusion Whitehead is careful to mention that his methodological approach does not produce confident predictive theories and testable hypothesis. In contrast to Huntington, the strength of Whitehead's approach is that it does not force a unified portrayal of democratization. Whitehead is more interested in studying diversity, adaptability and deliberation as contingent yet useful concepts in the study of democratization. While Whitehead stays safely within the bounded realm of the political, his methodology is careful not to overestimate its capacity to predict democratic processes.

In *Democracy and the Public Sphere in Latin America* (2002) Avritzer takes issue with the application of democratic elitism in Latin America. He rejects Huntington's formula that institutionalization responds to sociopolitical mobilization in the context of democratization in third wave countries in Latin America. Avritzer points to the poverty of democratic practices as the main threat to democratization. Therefore, he underscores the need to redefine institutionalization as "the connection between new collective forms of occupation of the public space with new institutional designs." (Avritzer 2002, 165) Democratic collective action plays a critical role in Latin America and is under-theorized by democratic elitism, which dominates democracy theory. Democratic elitism disassociates political society (elite control of democratic governance) from the potential of participatory publics (mass participation in public political space). Therefore, Avritzer presents an alternative approach to the study of democracy in Latin America based on Habermas' notion of public space that accounts for democratic collective action. "The public sphere lies between the market and the state and involves individual communications and deliberations through face-to-face interaction." (Avritzer 2002, 5) The key to participatory publics is "their capacity to act as a problem-solving public addressing specific
drawbacks of the local culture through innovative designs."(Avritzer 2002, 168) The political
process most valued by Avritzer is deliberation and this can be transferred into political
institutions through participatory publics, offering political renovation. Avritzer argues that this
is necessary "to bridge the gap between democratic societal practices and a hybrid political
society that resists its full democratization."(Avritzer 2002, 9)

Avritzer expands the frame of democracy theory within political science yet maintains his
work within the bounds of the political as defined by political science. Avritzer claims that "the
definition of what is political is always contested and that contemporary societies utilize their
public spheres precisely to broaden its definition." (Avritzer 2002, 45) He goes about doing this
in his work by drawing from 1) social movement theory to understand the actors within the
public space and 2) interest aggregation (voting) as parallel to interest transformation
(argumentation through deliberative democratic process). (Avritzer 2002, 47) I argue that
neither of these sources that Avritzer introduces take him out of the bounded realm of the
political a la political science. While his definition of political culture is borrowed from
Alvarez, Escobar and Dagnino (1998), unbinding the realm of the political, it is reworked into
his Habermasian proposal of participatory publics, thereby re-inscribing it into the formal realm
of the political.

Conversely, Dagnino would fully agree with Avritzer's following assertion: "As long as
the democratic impulses in Latin America remain insulated at the societal level, democratization
strategies are bound to fail." (Avritzer 2002, 170) The difference between Avritzer and Dagnino
is that Avritzer sees social movements as political when they can be drawn into the formal realm
while Dagnino understands social movements to be political in themselves. Avritzer's goal is to
intervene in democratic theory as applied to Latin America while Dagnino's priority is to be in
conversation with social movement actors and theorists. Dagnino redefines the realm of the political through a Gramscian lens, reconfiguring and infusing the relationship between culture and politics with insights from social movements. Gramsci's understanding of "civil society as a terrain of political struggle" expands the understanding of the realm of the political and establishes "new parameters for reflecting on the relations between culture and politics." (Dagnino 1998, 38)

Dagnino calls the false divisions within the political analysis of democratization a "schizophrenia," dividing "institutional from non-institutional, civil society from state, political from cultural." (Dagnino 1998, 57) She calls for a more integrated and extended theoretical framework for the study of social movements as protagonists.

In politicizing what is not conceived of as political, in presenting as public and collective what is conceived of as private and individual, they challenge the political arena to enlarge its own boundaries and broaden its agenda. It is my contention that the cultural effects of such efforts upon this dispute and upon the social imaginary must be recognized as political, beyond the assessment of other successes or failures that may result from them. (Dagnino 1998, 57)

Social movements have a proactive role in raising questions and in "generating new directions for theoretical-political analysis" (Dagnino 1998, 35) and cultural politics defines "a common ethical-political field" in which theory and practice are blurred in relation to social movements (Dagnino 1998, 46).

As Dagnino's theorizing elucidates, a cultural politics approach expands the concept of democracy beyond the limits of formal political science as exemplified by Huntington and Whitehead. Melucci points out how a cultural politics study of democracy must not reproduce the shortcomings of liberal conceptions of democracy and to do this, he suggests a guiding question: "what forms of power are more visible and therefore more negotiable than others?"
(Melucci 1998, 428) Movements make visible patterns of inequality even as the patterns shift and reproduce themselves in adapted form.

Avritzer attempts to bridge cultural politics insights with democratic theory elaborating upon the Habermasian concept of public space. While cultural politics' reconfiguration of the realm of the political is the vehicle for its expanded concept of democracy, its engagement with a varied swath of social terrain implies the use of methodologies that limit its direct policy relevance and its proclivity to be operationalized. What would a "Guide to Democratizers" section of Dagnino's text look like? While Huntington's audience includes policy makers and mainstream political science theorists looking for policy suggestions, Dagnino is oriented towards social movement actors and other actors on the Left in a mutually informative relationship crossing theoretical-political analysis and action. As Escobar clarifies, the goal of such research is to contribute to transforming the politics of representation and social life itself (Escobar 1995, 225) through documenting and participating in "the formulation of visions and concrete proposals in the context of existing constraints." (Escobar 1995, 226) Indeed, Pratt describes a commitment to localism as purposely anti-prescriptive. (Pratt 1998, 432)

In the next section, I will use the concept of political culture to further examine the underlying assumptions regarding culture and social forces in the study of state-society relations. Following Dagnino's reflections on the relationship of culture and politics, at the end of the next section I will review four books to illustrate several theoretical and methodological approaches that extend the understanding of the political in the study of political culture and the relationship between state and society.
Political culture is a key concept in the developmentalist lexicon, which can be seen as a brush with anthropology in that it brings attention to political orientations and behavior at the intersection of state and society. The term culture refers to belief systems and codes that inform social relations on a trajectory from traditional to civilized. In this context, culture is closely related to modernization's concept of civilization, founded upon the Enlightenment assumption of social development. Through a psychocultural approach to the study of political phenomena, Almond and Verba understand political culture as "consisting of the system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols, and values, which define the situation in which political action takes place." (Verba 1965, 513). Political culture links structure, macro political systems and institutions, to culture, the micro politics of individual political attitudes and motivations. Since political attitudes inform the types and degrees of political action or inaction, political culture "is an important determinant of how well the political system functions." (Wilson 1996, 24) Verba asserts that political culture is the tool to study the state - society relationship systematically to shed light on the problem of political stability and change. His institutionalist thesis is that the political culture of moderation, civil culture, transmitted through political socialization will create a stable pattern of democratic institutions.

Cultural politics finds its most salient and direct conceptual engagement with political culture. Alvarez et al. define political culture as "the particular social construction in every society of what counts as "political." (Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar in Alvarez et al. 1998, 8) This definition functions on two mutually informative levels, that of action and practice and that of theory and discourse. On the theoretical and discursive level, this approach denaturalizes the "political" in order to analyze how it gets constructed, by whom, and to the benefit of whom. By
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demystifying this process, the possibility to intervene and resignify meanings is opened to non-elites. Therefore, examining and contesting the bounds of the political occurs at the intersection of theory and practice. Social movements in particular are the driving force for this interpretive struggle that has the potential to foster alternative political cultures and extend and deepen democracy in Latin America. (Alvarez et al 1998, 12)

In this section, I will develop a cultural politics critique of political culture, first focusing on institutionalism and path dependency and then shifting to a critique of the conflation of neoliberalism and democracy. Last, I will review four texts, Poor People's Politics (2000) by Javier Auyero, Weavers of Revolution (1986) by Peter Winn, Decentering the Regime (19970 by Jeffrey Rubin and Marketing Democracy (2001) by Julia Paley. These texts offer alternative methods to approach the state - society relationship in the context of democratization.

Institutionalism

In studying the U.S., Britain, Germany, Italy and Mexico, Almond and Verba in The Civic Culture (1963) construct a model of democratic culture that they call the civic culture. For Almond and Verba civic culture seems particularly appropriate for democratic political systems because it sustains a balance between governmental power and responsiveness, between consensus and cleavage, between citizen influence and citizen passivity. As the following quote illustrates, modernization's ethnocentrism and cultural determinism is markedly present in the concept of political culture.

While the non-Western world is far from having successfully developed an industrial technology and an efficient bureaucracy, there can be little question that it wants these institutions and has some understanding of them.(Verba 1963, 4)
New nations have significant difficulties in learning appropriate belief systems, codes of personal relations, attitudes and feelings for establishing participatory political culture. (Verba 1963, 5) A blatant sense of superiority and patronizing tone is clearly expressed through the concept of civic culture. As the great gift of the West, civic culture is the preferred mix of modern and traditional. "A pluralist culture based on communication and persuasion, a culture of consensus and diversity, a culture that permitted change but moderated it,"(Verba 1963, 8) purportedly unlocking the key to a balance between political culture and structure.

Kamrava, (1996) reaffirms the modernization concept of culture, while struggling to define the parameters between state and society. Social institutions are vaguely defined as "intangible phenomena that provide for means of collective identity" (Kamrava 1996, 71) and they give meaning to social symbols and values. Political culture is used as a conceptual blanket to cover the interactions and processes that occur between state and society, the "transcendental link." I will argue that the use of political culture to explain state - society relations is a case of theoretical stretching "the larger set of insights associated with the concept may not illuminate the case." (Collier 1995, 150)

Kamrava (2000) elaborates upon his analysis of political culture specifically regarding the developing world. He contends that political sentiments are often expressed through political symbolism embedded in cultural, folkloric and artistic expression since open political expression is commonly limited due to repression. Interestingly, this observation opens his analysis to the possibilities of a cultural politics approach. Yet, he asserts that "the whole affair of using cultural forms as mediums of political discourse, as links between ideological protagonists and the larger society, is a decidedly elitist affair" (Kamrava 2000, 132), falling back upon the principles of democratic elitism. A cultural politics approach assumes that the masses are also
protagonists in the use of "cultural forms as mediums of political discourse" in addition to identifying political symbolism within nation state building efforts, political rhetoric and economic, social and cultural policy.

Furthermore, Kamrava contends that developing states have the task of transforming and rebuilding political culture because their political systems suffer from fragmented political cultures due to legacies of political distrust, cultural anomie and social paranoia. Rapid changes and social heterogeneity cause discontinuity in socialization and psychological confusion and instability. Fragmented political cultures have a tendency to produce political instability and are related to weak links between state and society and a sharp dichotomy between elite and mass political cultures. (Kamrava 2000, 124) Kamrava's work builds from Verba's thesis that the political culture of moderation, civil culture, transmitted through political socialization will create a stable pattern of democratic institutions. This formula maintains elite power and is attained by a process of fusing political cultures. The blending of contradictory political attitudes is an elite-led process that can be understood as "balanced disparities" (Verba 1963, 476) or "limited polarization" of society. This blending process explains the mixed demands on citizens to be both active and passive and states to be responsive to societal demands while maintaining power and control.

The tension between state and society is echoed by Diamond, Linz and Lipset's (1989) analysis of Latin America, yet they frame the tension in terms of extreme inequality and (or) class polarization on the one hand and stable democracy on the other. (Diamond et al 1989, 39) This tension is also discussed in terms of statism and democracy, which critiques state intervention in the economy. The problematic slippage between political development and neoliberalism will be discussed later with reference to Francis Fukuyama. Interestingly, in the
1999 edition, Diamond, Linz and Lipset express the tension in new language; between participation and empowerment on the one hand and efficient and authoritative institutions on the other. (Diamond et al 1999, 6)

A second assumption shared by Verba, Kamrava and Diamond and Linz is democratic elitism. "Where the elite made room gradually for autonomous institutional expression of new popular interests, democracy developed." (Diamond et al 1998, 9) While Diamond, Linz and Lipset share an analysis of the tension between culture and structure and elite led democratization with Almond and Verba and Kamrava, they reject cultural determinism. Wiarda, who argues that Latin America has overarching corporatist, authoritarian traditions held over from Spanish colonialism, typifies modernization's cultural determinism. In contrast, Diamond and Linz argue that the colonial legacy in Latin America is not uniform as related to political culture. They emphasize social structure primarily and socioeconomic change secondarily in relation to political culture, thereby drawing a methodological affiliation with new institutionalism. Linz and Diamond address state - society relations.

Just as democracy requires an effective but limited state, so it needs a pluralistic, autonomously organized civil society to check the power of the state and give expression democratically to popular interests. (Diamond et al 1998, 35)

This formulation has a fundamentally top down approach, institutions are instruments for democratic socialization and civil society legitimates substantive policies. While March and Olsen do not address political culture directly, they sustain a similar argument with regard to political preferences; they are molded by political institutions and political experiences that are informed through political leadership, education and indoctrination. (March and Olsen 1984, 739) Although Diamond, Linz and Lipset offset the more offensive cultural deterministic aspect of modernization analysis, they leave the concept of culture in relation to politics unexplored.
Path Dependency

Diamond Linz and Lipset's institutionalist tendency is interwoven with another theoretical approach to the study of democratization, path dependency. In the introduction of the 1999 edition, they state that their main challenge is to balance attention to historical detail necessary to understand path dependency with attention to recent political developments necessary for assessing democratization. (Diamond et al 1999, 2) Path dependency is exemplified by Ruth Berins Collier. In *Paths Towards Democracy* (1999), Collier studies democratic reform by drawing comparisons across patterns during different time periods. Using an historical approach, she examines the strategies of labor within prior regime contexts. (Collier 1999, 22) While another significant contemporary application of path dependency can be explored in Robert Putnam's *Making Democracy Work* (1993), this approach can be traced through Robert Dahl's *Polyarchy* (1971) and Barrington Moore's *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* (1966). Here I will briefly review path dependency in its complimentary role to institutionalism with attention to the way culture is framed.

Robert Putnam, in *Making Democracy Work; Civil Traditions in Modern Italy* (1993), explores the relationship between civic community, patterns of civil involvement and social solidarity, and the quality of democratic governance. Continuing in the institutionalist vein, Putnam studies how institutions shape politics. In addition, he also draws upon path dependence to examine how institutions are shaped by history. Lastly, to balance out his approach to state-society relations, he adds a third analytical thread, how institutions, institutional performance in particular, are shaped by social context. While Putnam does not utilize the term political culture, he makes the same argument as Verba in that "civic associations contribute to the effectiveness
and stability of democratic government." (Putnam 1993, 89) Interestingly, Putnam rejects economic determinism, arguing that while civics predicts economics, economics does not predict civics. (Putnam 1993, 157) Using path dependence to sideline the culture - structure debate, he forwards a veiled cultural deterministic argument that Northern Italy is more civic than Southern Italy due to the way "history smoothes some paths and closes others off." (Putnam 1993, 181) Yet underlying this gesture of attention to historical particularity, the optic has not shifted away from culturally determined norms of behavior and their interaction with institutional rules. This parallels Diamond, Linz and Lipset's historical reference of political and social patterns rather than explicit discussion of culture. (Diamond et al 1999, 2) Yet, Diamond, Linz and Lipset are influenced to a lesser degree by cultural determinism than Putnam. In Making Democracy Work, happiness is associated with living in a civic community, while uncivic communities are characterized by the "interlocking vicious circles" of hierarchy, political alienation, limited citizenship, self-interest, corruption, and exploitation. (Putnam 1993, 115) Uncivic communities lack needed social capital to produce trust, norms and reciprocity networks to strengthen democracy. (Putnam 1993, 167)

Dahl presents a systematic path dependent approach to the study of democratization. He describes three paths to polyarchy, or relatively democratized regimes in which opportunities for public contestation are available to the great bulk of the population. (Dahl 1971, 202) These paths, 1) liberalization precedes inclusiveness, 2) inclusiveness precedes liberalization and 3) abrupt transformation, are determined by evaluating seven historically observed preconditions. (Dahl 1971, 34) Dahl's central concern is participation and inclusiveness yet he theorizes the relationship between state and society from an institutionalist position focusing on rules and procedures in addition to the assumption of elite-led democratization processes. According to
Chalmers et al, this approach maintains a theoretical gap between institutional design and political practice, which does not control for the problematic combination of seemingly democratic institutions and authoritarian behavior. This point also applies to Huntington as explicated earlier in the approaches section. Dahl's understanding of political culture as a culture of competitive politics characterized by tolerance and mutual security does not facilitate further exploration of the conditions that increase chances for polyarchy. (Dahl 1971, 37)

Dahl is forthright with the limitations of his path dependent approach for the study of democratization. He points out the complexities of development and rejects a unidirectional development model. Moreover, Dahl underscores the complexity of "the processes by which the politically influential acquire their beliefs and gain power." (Dahl 1971, 188) He identifies the lack of an explanatory theory that can account for "the beliefs of political activists and leaders" and asserts the need to treat this factor as "a major independent variable" in the comparative study of regimes. (Dahl 1971, 188) Dahl attempts to stretch his institutionalist path dependent approach to make sense of social forces, yet his methodological framework constrains his ability to theorize the complexities of the intersection of state and society.

Barrington Moore presents a prior example of the study of historical political patterns. In *Social Origins*(1966), Moore delineates five preconditions and indicators for "routes to the modern world;"(Moore 1966, 413) the bourgeois revolution, the conservative revolution and the peasant revolution. A bourgeois class and bourgeois attitudes are necessary for democracy and democracy's unquestioned referent is located in the *West*; France, England and the U.S. Putnam echoes Moore's rejection of cultural explanations in favor of an assessment of political considerations and economic opportunities.

The main question Moore poses can be understood in terms of political culture.
Our problem becomes one therefore of trying to identify those situations in the relationship between the landed upper classes and the town dwellers that have contributed to the development of a relatively free society in modern times. (Moore 1966, 423)

This relationship between landed upper classes and town dwellers constitutes the "basic framework and environment of political action, forming the series of opportunities, temptations, and impossibilities within which political leaders have had to act"(Moore 1966, 423). Moore's formulation that bourgeois attitudes facilitate democratization falls in line with elite led democratization typical of institutionalism. Path dependency, the study of historical patterns to determine preconditions and indicators for democratization processes, falls short of a full analysis of social factors due to its institutionalist orientation and underlying cultural deterministic tendencies.

The main developmentalist critique of political culture, which is valid on all counts when applied to this assessment, is that it is difficult to develop a sound methodological approach to measure the relationship between political culture and political stability. This critique is most clearly stated by Dahl. Indeed, Verba's Civil Culture is a typologizing description to be applied deductively rather than an inductive exploration of the meanings and relationship between culture and politics. Path dependency provides indicators for this deductive analysis, such as Putnam's measurements of civic-ness, through the vibrancy of associational life, mass media, voting patterns and referendum turn out. (Putnam 1993, 98)

From a culturalist perspective, George Steinmetz in State/Culture (1999) critiques the concept of political culture on three fronts. First, the concept of culture is defined through its collective sharing of beliefs and behaviors, which contradicts the validity of measurements taken at the level of the individual, a salient critique for Verba and Putnam. Second, political culture suffers from the characteristic ethnocentrism and narrow categorization of modernization theory.
While political culture does not always assume homogeneity within cultures as, Diamond, Linz and Lipset evidence, it does assume a bounded sphere of the political that limits exploration of other areas that might have significant impact on political development.

To further elaborate on this second critique, feminist analysis highlights the lack of attention to spaces designated as private, such as family. Verba mentions the social agencies related to political socialization which include family, work place, and voluntary associations, emphasizing the changing channels of socialization. (Verba 1963, 502) While the issue of family is mentioned, no analysis is developed to address the close relationship of state institutions to families through regulation such as marriage, family law and social policy. Jane S. Jaquette and Sharon L. Wolchick in Women and Democracy (1998) underscore the need for a political analysis of the central role of the family in economic transactions, nation building, and political socialization.

Another aspect of feminist analysis that neither Almond and Verba nor Putnam acknowledge is women's key roles in social movements and civil society activities, which are central to the associative life they wish to study. In fact, the lack of attention to women's roles does nothing to counter the practical problem of social gender bias, which causes low intensity citizen participation (Jaquette 1998, 44). Therefore, the framework in which political culture is understood must be broadened and shifted from its "institutional boundaries towards a concept of political viability that is social at its core."(Jaquette 1998, 18) The concept of collective action as theorized by Chalmers, Vilas, Hite, Martin, Piester and Segarra in The New Politics of Inequality in Latin America (1997) achieves this by questioning the underlying division between public and private dimensions. "In fact, the very differentiation between public and private spheres is
subject to question, in that public participation of some actors is conditioned by relations of
power and divisions of labor in the private sphere."(Chalmers et al 1997, 4)

Another variation of this last critique of political culture is that it does not attend to the
dialectic relationship between culture and structure. Gestures are made from a structural or
institutionalist positioning, yet the actual connecting link is never deconstructed and explored.
(Steinmetz 1999, 20) Cultural politics steps in to the gap that Steinmetz identifies by
reconceptualizing culture and its relationship to politics through a poststructural and postcolonial
lens. Before fully shifting gears to explore cultural politics responses to these limitations, I will
develop an analysis of how political culture and democracy are theorized in relation to
neoliberalism, which will subsequently be united with this cultural critique.

The conflation of democracy and neoliberalism

Political culture is also employed by developmentalists who are eager to theorize the
correlation between neoliberal economic development and democratization in order to capture
the way cultural changes can provide the link between the two. "The impact of economic
development in democracy works through its tendency to reshape the goals and behavior of
wrote a critique of Schumpeter's 1942 analysis of capitalism. With the end of the Cold War and
the subsequent eulogies for socialism, Lipset reflects upon the celebratory capitalist fervor of the
time. The logic, best typified by Fukuyama, is as follows, "capitalism is a more efficient engine
of economic growth than socialism, and thus is more likely to generate the rapid socioeconomic
change that favors the emergence of stable democracy."(Lipset 1996, 126) Yet, Lipset asserts a
sobering commentary in that the struggle between the left for greater equality and the right for
the status quo will continue to produce profound political conflict.

The most blatant and honest of the proponents of democracy at the service of
neoliberalism is Francis Fukuyama. He defines culture as the lowest level in relation to ideology,
institutions and civil society. Culture is "a a-rational, ethical habit passed on through tradition;
although it is malleable and can be affected by developments in the three upper levels, it tends to
change the most slowly of all."(Fukuyama 1996, 321) Problems vexing modern democracies
come out of "social and cultural pathologies" that are difficult to address at the level of
institutions. (Fukuyama 1996, 322)

The problems of culture threaten to undermine the global ideological trend of the last two
decades that favors democracy and markets. These assertions rest on four presuppositions that
have striking coherence with the principles of modernization theory. First, the ideal of liberal
democracy and its underlying principles and institutions can not be improved upon. This first
presupposition is further justified through the second, the logic of universal directional History,
which supports the linear trajectory from tradition to civilization. These two basic principles are
united with neoliberalism through the third and fourth presuppositions. Third, Liberalism
forwards the desire for recognition and individualism, which can be exercised through the fourth
assumption that free markets and material prosperity are fostered by a universal consumer
culture. Diamond, Linz and Lipset in the 1989 edition also present a pro-neoliberalism and anti-
dependency theory argument (Diamond et al 1989, 47-48), yet in the 1999 edition, they
recognize the negative impact of neoliberalism over the ten years between 1989 and 1999
(Diamond et al 1999, 17).
Guillermo O'Donnell critiques the celebratory tone used to promote global neoliberalism and the subordination of politics to economics through market democracy. He points out that the critical issues countries are grappling with are immediate and need short term solutions, which the long term goals of democracy and free market do not address sufficiently or with enough attention to the particular. Moreover, O'Donnell states that "equitable growth, has remained outside the scope of what these economists would consider a serious discussion." (O'Donnell 1996, 338) Issues of social inequity and exclusion are not addressed sufficiently.

Whitehead also argues in "International Aspects of Democratization" (1986) that it is not helpful to measure democratization through economic development and political culture. O'Donnell calls for the study of democratization as a political process. (O'Donnell 1996, 340) This is exactly what Chalmers et al, attempt to do in The New Politics of Inequality in Latin America by studying the "disjunctures between new actors and old organizations "(Chamlers et al 1997, 3) and demanding a more robust definition of democracy that includes rule of law, government accountability for its actions, balance between executive, legislative, and judicial branches, and military subordination to civil rule in addition to elections. (Chamlers et al 1997, 9) The minimalist definition of democracy that Fukuyama celebrates actually can have a quite suitable fit with authoritarian behavior, "reactionary despotism."(Chamlers et al 1997, 11) The pitfalls of utilizing a minimalist definition of democracy are shared with path dependency and modernization approaches reviewed earlier, therefore it is important to work with a maximalist definition of democracy.

While Verba is concerned with the political culture that will most strongly support political stability, cultural politics concerns itself with democratic process, aligning with O'Donnell's question regarding equitable growth. Cultural politics explores the challenges to
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deepening, relevance and quality of democracy in the neoliberal context, in addition to examining the role of social democratization as related to political democratization. (Garretón et al 2003, 56)

Deepening refers to the extension of democratic procedures and ethical principles to other spheres of social life. Relevance refers to the extent to which major societal issues are channeled through and resolved by the democratic regime and its procedures rather than by de facto powers within the state, such as the military, within civil society. The quality of democracy is related to expanding the scope of citizenship through participation, representation, and popular involvement in decision making at the local, regional and national levels. (Garretón et al 2003, 56)

Social democratization looks at inclusion and exclusion in terms of social cohesion, expansion of citizenship and participation.

Chalmers et al supports a cultural politics optic and furthers O'Donnell's critique of the proponents of market democracy and their methodological approach, which promotes generalized institutional prescriptions. Chalmers et al. define an institution as "a patterned social practice enforced by law." (Chalmers et al 1997, 10) They explore the dialectic relationship between state and society taking into consideration the malleable and constructed nature of institutions informed by power laden social and cultural values and norms. This study of democratization processes is informed by overlapping spheres of economics, politics, society, and culture, "linking the analysis of political participation to the manner in which the state has been constituted and is recreated by distinct actors and their interaction."(Chalmers et al 1997, 13) This poststructural turn moves beyond the limits of institutionalism and path dependency approaches to theorizing the state - society relationship.

Furthermore, Chalmers et al. address the political culture discussion explored herein, underscoring that neoliberalism compounds social fragmentation, deepening the "disjuncture between formal institutions and social practices and, once again, between legality and
legitimacy, and between politics and culture." (Chalmers et al 1997, 17) Latin America experiences a paradoxical combination of economic growth, democracy and increased inequality. Moreover, what Verba and Kamrava understand as fragmented political culture, Chalmers et al explain as institutional inability to process social movement demands, and provide for social participation. This institutional incapacity weakens democracy and reinforces social exclusion of women, indigenous, poor, young, etc. Chalmers et al explain the factors of political instability and social fragmentation through structural heterogeneity and social discrimination. Overall, the approach employed by Chalmers et al lends itself to cultural politics because it is attentive to the society side of the state society relationship in addition to the functions of power and the interaction between politics, economics, society and culture.

Besides developing an analysis of social exclusion, Chalmers et al also look at the alternative responses of social actors to the shifting social, economic and political terrain due to neoliberalism. Chalmers et al. define political participation as "participation in processes and institutions in which relevant decisions are taken about life, about welfare, about what people consider important." (Chalmers et al 1997, 20) One of the consequences of neoliberalism has been a closure of spaces for political participation, thereby denying popular access to political processes and institutions. Chalmers calls this the reclusion of policy from public control, (Chalmers et al 1997, 20) which goes hand in hand with income polarization and an increase in social inequality.

Arguably, the structural violence associated with neoliberalism has become an intense and salient political issue that threatens political stability. Garretón's assessment goes hand in hand with Chalmers et al.

The end result is to make the economic sphere increasingly more independent of the political sphere, even though the transition is a process controlled by political actors.
the market becomes the single paradigm, *pensamiento unico*, defining the characteristics of a desirable society. (Garretón et al 2003, 46)

Chalmers et al. describe society as self managed, "*a bellum omnia contra omnes*, an 'everyone for herself or himself,' and relations between the state and the popular classes are processed primarily through the coercive apparatus of the state."(Chalmers et al 1997, 24) As a consequence, community survival networks are forced to address the needs that have previously been the responsibility of the state.

Expanded citizen responsibility and retraction of the state tests Verba's formulation of a balanced tension between consensus and cleavage. "If politics becomes intense, and if it remains intense because of some salient issue, the inconsistency between attitude and behavior will become unstable."(Verba 1966, 483) As the tension between consensus and cleavage strains, Chalmers et al highlight the role of associative networks, as structures of representation through interpersonal, media and or inter-organizational ties. These are scattered nodal points of decision-making in which new actors make claims and mediating entities communicate claims to authoritative decision making centers. (Chalmers et al 1997, 564) In comparison to Verba, Chalmers et al offer analytical tools that enter into further examination of the state and society relationship. Associative networks are social ties informed by personal relationships and shared commitments to ideas that tend to come out of "acts of association."(Chalmers et al 1997, 567) There are different types of associative networks and Chalmers et al approximate Avritzer's participative publics through their focus on horizontally structured groups interested in shaping public policy, thereby connecting civil society to the state.

While both modernization theory and cultural politics are interested in forms of government, citizenship and how institutional channels respond to social demands and conflict, they utilize very different methodologies. As an analytical tool, political culture tends to
typologize and categorize in order to identify a general set of preconditions or indicators for a minimalist definition of democracy subordinated to the market. Cultural politics on the other hand explores the internal workings of institutions and communities through ethnographic, historical, and sociological methods in relation to more expanded definitions of democracy and the political realm.

*Cultural Politics Alternatives*


Javier Auyero in *Poor People's Politics* (2000) responds to the institutionalist notion of political culture through a study of survival networks in Villa Paradiso, a poor neighborhood in the urban periphery of Buenos Aires straining under the exigencies of neoliberalism. Auyero examines "the political culture(s) of the urban poor, one revealing and cutting edge of which is the problem-solving networks and the representation and practices embedded in them."(Auyero 2000, 28) He studies the inner workings of clientalism, informal networks as related to political networks, cultural representations, politics in everyday practice, and women's participation in dominant networks of political clientalism (Auyero 2000, 26).
Auyero's ethnography of clientist networks, draws from network analysis and urban sociology. His contribution to this discussion of political culture is that he starts where people are, legitimating and valuing their reference points. Auyero does not focus on the policy or direct political implications of the survival networks and their meanings. While some aspects of Chalmers et al's analysis fits well with Auyero's approach, Chalmer et al. maintain a central focus on the political implications of associative networks, which limits the scope of their work from touching upon the community based micropolitical issues Auyero explores. While both authors agree on the importance of studying associative networks, Chalmers et al. focuses on mediation with the state while Auyero focuses on the relationship between political networks and informal webs of reciprocal help. (Auyero 2000, 26) Another difference is that Chalmers et al. highlight the inherent theoretical possibilities of associative networks (Chalmers et al 1997, 581-582) based on an assumption of non-hierarchical relations while Auyero explores how participation in the clientist network of Villa Paradiso reproduces a web of political domination.

According to Verba, Clientalism is associated with vertical social relations and can be categorized as subject political cultures. Auyero questions the top down approach to analyzing clientalist relationships in contemporary Argentina and argues that this approach obscures more than clarifies. Instead, Auyero looks at political cultures, geographic and social setting, strategies for dealing with subsistence problems (networks), and the role of brokers in these networks (information hoarding and resource control). The broker's practices are seen as performances, symbolic labor and representational remembering of the relationship under Peronism.

While Auyero employees an eclectic methodological blending of ethnography, network analysis and urban sociology to study the micropolitical aspects of political culture, Peter Winn's *Weavers of Revolution* (1986) applies historical methods to explore the political culture within
Allende's vision of revolution and democratic socialism in Chile. Winn takes the case of Yarur textile workers strike to study the revolution from below, which offers an intervention into the traditional way the Chilean revolution is studied.

Winn's method combines "the microhistory of the factory study with the insights of oral history, integrating them with the national perspectives and written sources."(Winn 1986, 8) His unwavering focus on "the history of work, the formation of consciousness and the divisions within the working class reflecting differences in character, worldview and politics"(Winn 1986, 8) comes through smoothly. This study is framed within the triangle of labor, capital and the state. Winn's story shows how Allende's regime was unable to negotiate the "balance of power" between labor and capital (since it sided with labor). Winn's study analyzes the inner workings of the tension between state and society or as Diamond, Linz and Lipset explain, class polarization and stable democracy offering textured insights into social struggles and their implications on party politics and political stability. Winn describes the Ex-Yarur workers' revolutionary drive as, "creating their own dream of democratic socialism,"(Winn 1986, 6) that accelerated Allende's timeline, radicalized their strategy and eventually provoked class polarization and the fragmentation of the Popular Unity coalition that formed the base of Allende's regime.

Similar to Auyero and Winn, Jeffrey Rubin also studies politics from the bottom up and in *Decentering the Regime* (1997) moves beyond institutionalist approaches. He offers a poststructuralist intervention in traditional political science analysis of regime and regime change in Mexico. Rubin challenges the idea of a monolithic unified Mexican state by focusing on gender, ethnicity and social movements. Drawing from Antonio Gramsci, Raymond Williams and Michel Foucault, Rubin constructs his critique of a singular understanding of hegemony. He
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rejects a state-centered approach to the study of Mexican politics and favors a "scattered
hegemonies" lens that locates fluid and dynamic power in multiple arenas.

Hegemony has taken shape differently in different locations and thus changed or
unraveled differently as well, with cultural practices of ethnicity, language, gender,
religion, and civic identity playing key roles in its dynamics. (Rubin 1997, 13)

Rubin claims that a "decentered approach to power"(Rubin 1997, 9) allow insights into Juchitán's
regional democratization in addition to the politics of domination and resistance on a national
level. This holistic mezo level approach brings "towns, regions, economies and cultures" into
focus to study the relationships "between regime, region, culture, and daily life.(Rubin 1997, 23)

Rubin highlights how social forces create political change by balancing "contrasting practices
and representations" rather than embodying "a homogeneous class or ethnic consciousness."
(Rubin 1997, 5)

The prism of cultural politics facilitates an exploration of the connections between daily
life and politics, thereby apprehending Juchiteco radical political mobilization. The Zapotec
political movement's, the Coalition of Workers Peasants and Students of the Isthmus (COCEI),
activities and vision can be understood as "embedded in complex, nonlinear political and cultural
experiences."(Rubin 1997, 7) Rubin's reading of the subtlety and complexity of COCEI's
internal and external dynamics, with attention to the way it manipulates "the multiple forms of
culture and power in regional politics,"(Rubin 1997, 14) furthers the conceptual innovation of
 cultural politics analysis. Again, we see alternative methodologies offering greater insight "a
different imagining of the processes and outcomes of democratization." (Rubin 1997, 265)

Julia Paley's book *Marketing Democracy* builds on the same theme of democratization
with a strong critique of the paradox of participation. Paley illustrates how the neoliberal cultural
project of creating citizen subjects that participate in the project of democracy functions to
demobilize dissent and mold a quiescent civil society, facilitating furthering neoliberal economic
pursuits. The mechanism of constructing public opinion absorbs the respondents into the
neoliberal logic, making them "complicit in the outcome, thereby tempering mobilization
because they imparted the sense that people were themselves participating in the system." (Paley
2001, 138) Dis-empowerment on an individual level produces the sense that impotence is one's
nature, thereby insuring a "tamed" civil society. Paley argues that participation can be
understood as a form of governmentality, a form of power within the context of democracy,(Paley
2001, 181) the only option to authoritarianism and saturated in the logic of the "free
market." Within this logic, resistance consists of "a refusal of meaning and a refusal of the
word," or, alternatively, "the hyperconformist simulation of the very mechanisms of the system,
which is a form of refusal and of non-reception." (Paley 2001, 137)

Similar to Dagnino, Paley explains another variant of resistance that breaks out of this
master frame by engaging in a discursive battle over the term democracy. Social resistance
efforts find the fissures in the hegemonic definition of democracy to insert their competing
narratives. Paley describes the contribution of this type of social resistance to democratic
consolidation.

The attribution of multiple meanings to the concept of democracy at the moment
preceding the plebiscite generated resources that after the transition to democracy could
be used strategically by a range of actors to variety of ends. (Paley 2001, 125)

Overall, Paley furthers the analysis of state - society relations under neoliberal democracy and
illustrates how cultural struggles over meaning influence, albeit indirectly, the expansion of
democracy.

Taken together, Auyero, Winn, Rubin and Paley elucidate key aspects of cultural politics
analyses. These texts blur the division between state and society, compensating for the
limitations of the concept of cultural politics as conceived by institutionalist approaches. While Winn's 1986 analysis is not influenced by poststructuralism, Winn is still attentive to power asymmetries through his class-based analysis. Auyero, Rubin and Paley weave gender and/or race into their investigation, further refining an analysis of structural inequalities and the dynamic functions of power. Moreover, these four texts share an analytical focus on social struggle that fills out the society side of the state - society relationship.

CONCLUSION

Cultural politics broadens the social terrain and issues theorized by comparative politics. In the first section I survey approaches to comparative politics, highlighting both relevant interventions and critiques cultural politics offers in addition to commonalities it shares with other approaches. Cultural politics is critical of modernization theory, specifically its cultural determinism, colonialist ethnocentrism, obsession with stability, acceptance of a minimalist definition of democracy, and typologizing and categorizing tendencies. By asserting a poststructuralist notion of culture and taking a transdisciplinary point of departure that blurs the lines between disciplinary categories, cultural politics denaturalizes the notions of Western and non-Western. Dependency theory's structural and historical analysis of global interdependence influences cultural politics. While dependency is criticized for its economic determinism and focus on external factors to the nation-state, cultural politics adopts its attention to inequality adding both a cultural analysis and attention to the local. From new institutionalism, cultural politics shares the attention to subsystems, which expands its analysis to multiple levels of scale, yet focuses on the society side of the state - society relationship.
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One way in which cultural politics expands the topics and social terrain theorized by comparative politics is by applying a gendered, raced and classed lens to the formal political realm. Cultural politics offers analytical tools to explore the formal political realm, specifically nationalism providing insights on inclusion and exclusion relevant to theorizing beyond democratic elitism.

By way of extending the issues and social arena of comparative politics, cultural politics proposes an inclusive and participatory definition of democracy. This orientation trespasses the parameters of the political as defined by political science. The role of social struggle in democratization processes is a central to cultural politics and in this field statement, I explore this subject through an critical examination of political culture. Cultural politics understands political culture to be the social construction of what counts as political. By intervening in the process of social construction and resignify meanings, social actors and theorists engage in a cultural struggle of interpretation that has implications for material struggles and can change social, political and economic practices.
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