Introduction

Explorations in Political Macroanalysis

The selection of essays in this volume was initiated by John Torpey, to whom I would like to express my considerable gratitude. The essays retrace my social science itinerary spanning four decades and three continents. They are unified on the methodological/theoretical side by a skeptical rejection of two widespread reductionisms: first, the self-imposed one of disciplinary boundaries; and second, the notion that the goal of the social sciences is to identify certain generic 'laws' governing collective human activity. I am persuaded that our most valuable contributions consist of elucidating 'patterns,' that is, dynamics characteristic of certain situations under certain historical circumstances. My overall intellectual objective is to promote the understanding of sociopolitical configurations as unique, but not accidental.

The other element that unifies the essays is a concern with the management of cultural diversity in contemporary societies. This concern arose initially from the accident of my own autobiography. I was born in Brussels, capital of a country created in 1830 for the convenience of the 'Great Powers,' somewhat like Czechoslovakia in the wake of World War I. In the case of Belgium, the new state happened to straddle the long-established linguistic boundary separating the western European zones of Gallo-Roman and Gallo-Germanic languages, with the result that the population of the new state was, from the outset, divided along linguistic lines. Yet as a consequence of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century confrontations, the two language groups shared a single religion, Roman Catholicism. As detailed in Chapter 3, 'The Making of Flemings and Walloons'(originally

published in 1974), the situation was further complicated by social class, with French emerging at the time of the country's independence (1830–1831) as the preferred language of its founding bourgeoisie and hence of upward mobility. The Belgian language groups do not constitute 'ethnicities' in the sense of groups tracing distinct ancestral lineages, but are constructed entities of fairly recent vintage and shaped by specific historical circumstances.

My most formative course as an undergraduate at Columbia College from 1949 to 1953, by far, was 'Contemporary Civilization I.' I had the good fortune of being taught by Fritz Stern, who masterfully contextualized discrete historical events within macro-structures in a manner I have sought to emulate ever since. After meeting Columbia's extensive liberal arts requirements, I took mostly courses in government and sociology. Government, dominated by the nascent theory of American pluralism and the group process approach was both boring and evidently out of touch with the reality of the society's prevailing racism and social inequality. C. Wright Mills, who sought to combine the elite theorists, Mosca and Pareto, with the dialectical materialism of Marx and the rational–legal logic of Weber, provided a much more seductive alternative. However, studying 'government' enabled me to connect with the stirrings of decolonization and postcolonial nationalism that were reaching New York City by way of the United Nations. Combining journalism and government, I wrote a seminar paper (my first piece of 'research') on Morocco, based in part on interviews with members of the Moroccan Istiqlal's delegation, pleading their case against the French protectorate.

Given my nascent fascination with decolonization and emerging states, I also wanted to learn about India, but the only course offered at Columbia was one taught by Kingsley Davis, on population. This exposure to demography had a lasting impact on my work. Somehow, I ended up focusing on sub–Saharan Africa and therefore applied to Boston University, which was in the process of launching the first center of African Studies that was not primarily anthropologically oriented. After starting at Boston University, I was thoroughly disappointed with the intellectual mediocrity of the field of 'comparative government' into which I was cubbyholed by virtue of my academic interest. However, before I had an opportunity to work out the implications of this development, I was drafted into the U.S. Army, ending up in El Paso, Texas. In the course of a year and a half, my wife and I discovered features of American diversity totally unknown at the time to East Coast city-dwellers, notably the existence of an extensive Mexican American culture and the persistence of a Cajun subculture in Louisiana. We also learned first-hand about racial segregation and the potential of institutional change by witnessing the impact of desegregation on human relationships within the U.S. Army.

Upon release from the army in the Fall of 1955, and eligible for study under the GI Bill, I explored programs for doctoral study in the area of political science to which I aspired. Two recent books immediately attracted my attention: David Easton's *The Political System: A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (New York: Wiley, 1955), which promised to provide for

political scientists the comprehensive framework that Talcott Parsons had given sociologists; and David Apter's *The Gold Coast in Transition* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955), which placed decolonization and the emergence of new African states in a theoretical framework that connected the process with great historical transformations. Easton was at the University of Chicago; Apter, at Northwestern. Ultimately, I chose Chicago because of he university's higher overall reputation, even if it meant giving up studying Africa in the process. However, upon arrival at Chicago, I learned that the political science department had recruited David Apter, so I would be able to have my cake and eat it, too.

In my first year, while awaiting Apter's arrival, I studied with David Easton and Myron Wiener (who taught on India). For Weiner's course, I undertook my first major graduate paper, a study of the enactment of the Hindu Code Bill, which taught me much about the management of diversity. When Apter arrived in 1956, he became my principal adviser. We quickly agreed that, given my fluency in French, I should undertake as my doctoral project a study of a French colony, comparable to his own study of Ghana. I applied for and obtained a Ford Foundation Area Training Fellowship to study the Ivory Coast. Unbeknownst to me, I was following in the footsteps of Immanuel Wallerstein, who had undertaken a comparison of the Ivory Coast and Ghana for his own doctoral dissertation in sociology at Columbia, and was in the field at the time. The only other scholar doing political research in French-speaking West Africa was another American, the late Ruth Schachter (subsequently Morgenthau), writing her dissertation at Oxford under Thomas Hodgkin. Schachter generously made her draft dissertation available for my examination in New York City over the Summer of 1958.

My wife Vera and I set off for Africa in September by way of Paris, where Charles de Gaulle had recently seized power. At the time, the main concern with regard to French-speaking Africa was the outcome of the referendum organized by de Gaulle, to be held on September 30. In the event, Ahmed Sékou Touré's Guinea alone managed to have its vote recorded as a majority 'no,' whereas Félix Houphouët-Boigny managed to have his Ivory Coast recorded as France's most faithful follower. Given the ensuing political tensions, we faced an uphill task in persuading the French authorities to allow me to do political research on their turf. As there was no interest whatsoever in Africa among the faculty of Sciences Po, who controlled political studies in Paris, I gravitated toward the sociologist Georges Balandier, at the graduate school of the University of Paris. Balandier, who had worked mostly in Equatorial Africa, was most welcoming, and became in effect my French mentor.

Vera and I landed in the Ivory Coast in December 1958, just in time to observe a bout of 'ethnic cleansing' that targeted petty traders from Dahomey (now Benin) and Togo. The pogrom was launched by members of western coastal ethnic groups (principally the Bété), who constituted the major opposition to Houphouët-Boigny and his PDCI, based largely on his own Baoulé people. The prominence of ethnic dynamics in the Ivory Coast's political life,

now taken for granted as the central feature of African politics more generally, came as a complete revelation because it did not fit into any of the emerging theoretical frameworks, which were Weberian or Marxist, or the themes emphasized by observers such as Thomas Hodgkin, nationalism, and the ideological orientation of party leaders.

Although I was quickly persuaded of ethnicity's centrality in the political dynamics of my case study, I quite literally had no idea what to make of it: Fortunately, Balandier encouraged me to essay a framework focused on the concept 'integration.' This was published as my first professional article in the journal he was launching, and set forth what was to become the central argument of my dissertation.

While David Apter's project of comparing Ghana and Ivory Coast eventually saw light in a volume co-edited by me and Philip Foster, my own concerns led me to choose Mali as a second fieldwork site. Although the choice arose initially from the ruling parties' contrasting ideological orientations (as of the mid-1960s, Houphouet-Boigny's relatively affluent Ivory Coast was the epitome of postcolonial French-client capitalism, whereas Modibo Keita's poor Mali embraced a quasi-Maoist version of socialism), my new fieldwork led me to view the two societies' contrasting ethnic configurations as more fundamental and lasting features. Presented in Chapter 1, ('Patterns of National Integration') and originally published in *The Journal of Modern African Studies* in 1967. I believe this essay—which owes a great deal to the inspiration of Clifford Geertz within the University of Chicago's Committee for the Comparative Study of New Nations, and constitutes my unique addition to Torpey's original selection—captures a fundamental feature of African regimes that transcend the variables that evoked the area specialists' attention at the time. I have included it in the present selection as the sole representative of my nearly two decades of Africanist work.

By the late 1960s, I had fully mined the empirical materials and theoretical concerns resulting from my sub–Saharan field work. Moreover, conditions throughout the region were so disheartening that I decided time had come to reorient my professional career before I grew too old and tired to do so. Dissatisfied with the overwhelming 'presentism' of comparative politics, which exaggerated the contrast between 'developed' and 'developing' countries, I enthusiastically responded to an invitation to participate in a Social Science Research Council's project seeking to identify 'crises and stages of political development' in Europe and the United States. I invested heavily in historical study to contribute a chapter on Belgium to the resulting work edited by Raymond Grew as *Crises of Political Development in Europe and the United States* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1978). Quite unexpectedly, however, I concluded that the 'crisis' scheme was overly simplistic and failed to do justice to historical realities. Determined to work henceforth in an historical vein, given my established interest in patterns of cultural diversity, I designed a project that might enable me to explore the distinct impact of linguistic and religious diversity: I would compare the

Netherlands—marked by religious diversity, but overwhelmingly Dutch-speaking,—with Belgium—Overwhelmingly Roman Catholic due to the Inquisition (albeit divided since the late eighteenth century into clerical and anticlerical camps, much like France), but split almost evenly into French- and Flemish (Dutch)-speaking language groups.

Although I obtained an Social Science Research Council (SSRC) fellowship to carry out the research in the two countries, the appearance of Arend Lijphart's *The Politics of Accommodation: Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968) persuaded me that my Dutch research would be redundant, and I should therefore concentrate on Belgium. However, in the Fall of 1967, having obtained leave from the University of Chicago, where I was teaching at the time, I thought it would be more interesting for my family to spend the year in Paris than in Brussels, to which I would commute as necessary for archival research. Consequently, we were living on the Left Bank in Spring, 1968, and experienced the 'events of May' firsthand. Vera and I published a jointly written essay on the subject, 'The Events of May' in a new Chicago journal edited by the late Morris Philipson. I then followed this up with a more personal historical meditation, 'Moments of Madness' (*Politics and Society*, Winter 1972), which evoked lasting attention and is reprinted here as Chapter 2.

As I pursued my historical re-education, I became increasingly aware of the often-determinative impact of war on the shaping of political development, and its occasional contribution to 'shoving a country's path of development off course.' Hence, while deeply sympathizing with the overall thrust of Immanuel Wallerstein's project to restore the social sciences to their initial macro-historical orientation, I sharply disagreed with his exclusively 'political economy' approach. My most pointed critical essay, tantamount to the statement of an alternative theoretical stance of my own, is reprinted here as well as Chapter 5 ('Origins of the Modern World System: A Missing Link' (originally published in *World Politics* 23, no. 2, 1981). At about the same time (mid-1970s), I was invited to participate in a conference on international migration planned by my senior history colleague at the University of Chicago, William McNeill, and the late Ruth Adams, editor of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*. In keeping with my developing interest and competence, I undertook to explore the relationship between international migration and the formation of the Wallersteinian 'World System.' The resulting essay, 'International Migration Policies in a Changing World System,' originally published in McNeill, William and Adams, Ruth (eds.), *Human Migrations* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978, 241–286) is included here as Chapter 4 because it adumbrates the macro-historical perspective that has come to be recognized as my innovative contribution to the study of international migration.

As it turned out, the theoretical hunches and substantive ideas adumbrated in that essay provided a research agenda for the next three decades, whose results are represented here by four essays: Chapter 6 'The Formation of New States as a Refugee-Generating Process,' (originally published in

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 463 [May 1983]: 24–38) connects my insights into the management of cultural diversity, state-formation, and the impact of international conflicts on international migrations; Chapter 8, 'The Great Wall Against China: Responses to the First Immigration Crisis, 1885–1925,' (originally published in Lucassen, Jan and Lucassen, Leo [eds.] *Migration, Migration History, History: Old Paradigms and New Perspectives* [Berlin: Peter Lang AG, 1997]: 291–316) is an examination of the trans-Atlantic crisis provoked by the onset of a new immigration wave induced by the incorporation of East Asia into the western-dominant world trading system; Chapter 9, 'Matters of State: Theorizing Immigration Policy,' (originally published in Hirschman, Charles, Kasinitz, Philip, and DeWind, Josh [eds.] *The Handbook of International Migration* [New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1999, 71–93]) is the statement of a theoretical framework that highlights the complex interactions of economic and cultural imperatives in shaping immigration policy in contemporary societies; and (co-authored with Long Litt Woon), Chapter 10, 'Why Islam is Like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States' (originally published in 1999) is a theoretical follow-up on 'The Great Wall.' Inspired by the work of the political theorist Rainer Bauböck, this essay analyzes crises arising from new immigration waves as challenges to a society's identity-defining cultural boundaries. Research on immigration also provided me with the opportunity of extending my comparative range to include the United States, even on subjects that are not immigration-related. I am therefore pleased to include 'How Many Exceptinalisms?' (originally published in Katznelson, Ira and Zolberg, Aristide, *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth Century Patterns in Western Europe and North America*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), from which I have borrowed the present title. This was the concluding essay in a comparative study of class-formation that answers Werner Sombart's question, 'Why is there no Socialism in America?' by arguing that Sombart's question was misguidedly based on his assumption of the German case as the norm. My own conclusion is that, at the level of macro-social configurations, there are as many exceptionalisms as there are cases under consideration. That is why I have borrowed the essay's title for the present book as a whole. The other U.S. essay, Chapter 11, 'International Engagement and American Democracy: A Comparative Perspective,' originally published in Katznelson, Ira, and Shefter, Martin (eds). *Shaped by War and Trade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002) questions another widely heralded pillar of American exceptionalism, namely that in distinction from European states, U.S. political development was not affected by the dynamics of international strategic interactions. Such unauthorized intrusions unto the most closely guarded turf of the American political science profession regarded by some colleagues as tantamount to illegal immigration, which highlight uniqueness while demonstrating the benefits of comparative analysis, constitute a fitting summation of the message of my work to date.