

základní argumentační linie se dá krátce shrnout: i když není pochyb o návratu k imperiálním způsobům myšlení a jednání, je třeba hledat vysvětlení v souhře okolností a událostí, ne v nějaké fatální a nepřerušené tradici. Jde o znovuoživení, *Wiederbelebung*, [Schulze Wessel: 273], ne o pouhé přežívání, a opětovný imperiální obrat je úzce spojen s rostoucím autoritářstvím na domácí frontě. Počátky obojího je třeba hledat už v ekonomickém a politickém chaosu devadesátých let, a Putinovým nástupem nebylo ještě o všem rozhodnuto.

Jako u Hildermeiera, tak u Schulze Wessela lze uvažovat o tematických perspektívách, které v knize nejsou prozkoumány, ale mohly by obohatit a zakotvit její argumenty. V tomto případě jde o problematiku národovorných procesů. Schulze Wessel na ni naráží v různých souvislostech (např. datuje první fázi ukrajinského národovorného procesu na začátek devatenáctého století); nevěnuje jí však systematickou pozornost a neodkazuje k diskusím o nich. Přitom je nabíledni, že struktura, chronologie a širší kontext národovorných procesů jsou v každém z jeho tří historických případů jiné, a že takové rozdíly ovlivňují geopolitické vztahy a procesy.

Jóhann Páll Árnason

DOI: 10.14712/23363525.2024.9

**Eubomír Dunaj – Jeremy C. A. Smith – Kurt Cihan Murat Mertel (eds.): *Civilization, Modernity, and Critique. Engaging Jóhann P. Árnason's Macro-Social Theory*. Abingdon – London: Routledge, 2023, 274 pp.**

The volume I have the opportunity to review, *Civilization, Modernity, and Critique*, is dedicated to the life's work of a major figure in historical sociology, Professor Jóhann Páll Árnason. Like Árnason's scholarship, books, articles, and lectures, this volume presents a wide range of theoretical and critical approaches focused specifically on the work of this emeritus academic. We could speak of dozens of books and studies that Professor Árnason has contributed to the research on civilizational analysis and its specificities. To name but a few *Civilizations in*

*Dispute: Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions* (2003), *The Future that Failed: Origins and Destinies of the Soviet Model* (1993) or the important Czech-language monograph *Civilizační analýza: Evropa a Asie opět na rozcestí* again from 2009. The volume *Civilization, Modernity, and Critique* takes these and other theoretical approaches into account and treats them with critical attention but with all the more respect.

Already in the introduction, Professor Árnason is introduced as one of the most important figures in civilizational analysis, and in order to make the most relevant assessment of Árnason's contribution, the editors have tried to find other prominent scholars with an interdisciplinary background for their volume. The book thus consists of five parts, beginning with a brilliant foreword by Axel Honneth and ending with a reflection on the individual contributions by Professor Árnason himself.

The first part is devoted to theoretical and methodological issues, which constitute the basis of all of Árnason's works. In the first chapter of this part, Suzi Adams reflects on political philosophy and discusses, almost metaphysically, the ontological approaches found in Árnason's theories. The basis of Suzi Adams's chapter is a comparison to another prominent sociologist, Cornelius Castoriadis, who focused on the mode of being and on whom Árnason often relies in his writings. Adams shows that "Árnason himself has suggested a rethinking of the creativity of action as one of the tasks of articulating the being of the political, but it is worth noting that, over the course of his intellectual trajectory, the question of action/praxis has, at least since his hermeneutic turn in the 1980s, clearly been subsidiary to the problematic of history" (p. 20).

In this part of the proceedings, Jiří Šubrt deals with long-term developmental processes that may manifest themselves as an unintended consequence of actions. In his contribution, the author relies on Norbert Elias and his theory of unplanned and mainly unintended processes that affect human lives. Author describes the historical development of society and points to these unintended consequences that have manifested themselves in various forms, be it

religion, economics or war conflicts. Jiří Šubrt is a long-time colleague of Professor Árnason, with whom he founded the historical sociology programme at the Faculty of Humanities, Charles University in Prague.

The chapter by Saïd Amir Arjomand is based on the question of world religion and on Arnason's contribution to science by breaking away from the classical conception of Western modernity as "the universal goal of undifferentiated traditional societies" (p. 48), but using comparative and historical sociology to focus on "the analysis of the dynamics of non-Western civilizations" (p. 48).

The second part of the volume is devoted to civilizational analysis and civilizational specifics, which is the main contribution of Árnason's work. Peter Wagner, in his chapter *Ways Out of the Modern Labyrinth. Normative Expectations and Subsequent Social Change* refers in its title and content to Árnason's book *Labyrinth of Modernity* (2020), which brought together current debates on approaches to modernity and which charted the new workings of the formation of modernity on a global scale. With regard to modernity, Wagner raises the question of whether it should be viewed normatively or neutrally, which is also one of the dilemmas raised by Árnason. "Johann Árnason has rejected all these options – and that far this author is in agreement. Alternatively, as quoted at the outset, Árnason sees the normative expectations of modernity as creating a field of action – maybe in loose Bourdieuan terms? – within which normative claims are made and struggled about" (p. 64).

What follows is a chapter that has its antecedents in another of Árnason's modernising concepts, the social imaginary. The chapter in the anthology entitled *Politics and the Social Imaginary. The Problem of the State – and the Problem of Modernity* was written by Wolfgang Knöbl. This chapter is already based on Árnason's conviction that there is "no [normative] project of modernity, no clearly defined core structure, and no basic principles that would explain and enable changes of institutional patterns [of modernity]" (p. 77). Thanks to the professor's insights, Knöbl moves his conception

of the modern state in an even more "historicist direction" and relies on the bureaucratic structures of Western powers.

The second part concludes with Kurt MerTEL's paper on civilizational analyses in Left-Heideggerianism, in which he offers an alternative within a social paradigm system that combines the perspective of both early and late Heidegger. The result is "to open the methodological and conceptual space for accommodating Árnason's civilizational analysis within the social paradigm" (p. 98).

The third part of the proceedings focuses on modernity and the debate on the Axial Age, which opens with Hans Schelkshorn's contribution according to which the theory of the Axial Age is part of the theory of modernity. Schelkshorn's findings are based on Jaspers' theory of the Axial Age, which acknowledges cultural diversity in global modernity. Therefore, Schelkshorn's analysis also focuses on the relationship between the Axial Age and the modern world. The approach is reminiscent of another contribution to the corpus, namely by Suzi Adams, as Hans Schelkshorn approaches the analysis of modernity from an existential and philosophical perspective. Schelkshorn's approaches to modern science and technology are brilliant, as his conclusions polemicizing Jaspers provide new insights: "The dominance of modern science and technology promotes not only a homogeneous world civilization but also a nihilism that grips not just the Western world, but devalues various canonical sources of spiritual and moral life, the teachings of the great figures of the Axial Age like Socrates, the prophets of ancient Israel, Buddha, Zarathustra, Confucius, or Lao-tzu" (p. 120). These conclusions build on and systematically complement Árnason's analysis of civilization.

Hans-Herbert Kögler's contribution analyzing the discourse theories of the Axial Age complements Hans Schelkshorn by focusing on the questioning and rejection of tradition and, in contrast to Jaspers, on the objectification of the world. Kögler concludes that authoritative traditions do not prevent authoritarianism, dogmatism, or uncritical accommodation. However, "the reconstruction of hermeneutic premises of

understanding can show the required value-orientations are implied in the interpretive appropriative process" (p. 135). It follows that diverse historical and cultural conditions share certain cognitively significant features. Yet these conditions retain their uniqueness.

In the following chapter, authors Christoph Kleine and Monika Wohlrab-Sahr apply civilizational analysis to the historical development of conceptual distinctions and institutional differentiations in Japan. The paper relies on models of order that are based on contrasts and connections between transcendental foundations and secular lifeworlds. The authors apply Árnason's method to the search for cultural differences in Japan, but also take into account Buddhist and Confucian approaches, since "Buddhism cannot be reduced to its other-worldly aspects" (p. 173). Taking into account the civilizational specificities of the area under study, this approach is a welcome contribution, as it breaks free from Western analytical thinking.

The fourth part of the book is more politically oriented, as evidenced by the very first contribution in this section by Armando Salvatore and Kieko Obus, who discuss the religious-civilizational imaginary in the context of the cultural distinction between East and West. Right at the beginning of their paper, they argue that despite the growing links between East and West, the social theory of the East is mainly evaluated by Western views. Thus, the paper points out the differences between religion and civilization, and that it is necessary to understand them separately and both Western religion and Islam. The authors' paper is very lengthy and so often skims the surface. The authors also refer to a number of other authors, which sometimes comes across as chaotic, but it is a useful factual analysis of civilization.

Yulia Prozorova, who also deals with religio-political issues in her contribution, has written on similar themes. The focus of her civilizational analysis in this case is Russia. Prozorova works with Eisenstadt's Axial Age theory and artfully places it in the political context brought about by the legacy of Axial Age civilizations. The author also works, like other contributors to the volume, with Árnason's civilizational analysis

and concludes that the dramatic transformation of the world order "instigated by the Axial 'breakthrough' and the rise of monotheism, which demarcated a crucial rupture with the cosmological vision of homology of religious and political reality represented by the king-god. A related line of inquiry traces the effects of monotheism on the religio-political processes and distinct articulations and forms of power it gave rise to" (p. 200). Indeed, Professor Árnason makes similar assumptions in his theories of theocracy.

Jeremy C. A. Smith, for a change, in the last chapter of this section, presents a paper entitled *Regionality and Civilizations in the Americas*, which aims to complement the concept of regionality, which is one aspect of Professor Árnason's civilizational framework, i.e., the relationship of regional constellations to civilizations and civilizational structures. Smith works with a dual concept of region and regionalism, which he uses as internal to territorial states and as a reference for national regions. In relation to this, he comes up with the claim that socio-historical institutions exhibit regionality of a dual kind. "Geographical zones in which intercivilizational engagement is pronounced generate especially conspicuous substate and transnational regions. Each case is historically and geopolitically specific yet shows this core characteristic of intercivilizational engagement. The chapter suggests civilizational analysis as a paradigm offering potential for richer understanding of the geographical institution of place in America's multiple modernities" (p. 226).

The last section is written by Jóhann Páll Árnason himself and is a response to the suggestions and criticisms attributed to Árnason in the collection. The word criticism is, however, very much overstated in the case of this anthology, since all the contributions use the professor's methodology or are built on his theories, especially civilizational analysis. In his section, Árnason positively evaluates the individual contributions, which could have set an imaginary mirror to him. At the same time, he concretizes his statements and answers the questions that have been raised in the proceedings. Mostly, these are semantics of deepening the opinions that appeared in the proceedings.

The style in which the proceedings are written and organized is very interesting, but above all useful. There is no doubt that Jóhann Páll Árnason is one of the most important figures in the field of historical sociology and his theories on civilizational analysis are ground-breaking. For this reason it serves to the benefit of the cause that such a volume has been compiled. The summaries, explanations, questions, additional thoughts and opinions on the Professor's work that are subsequently answered by Professor Árnason are very useful and reflect developments in historical-social thought. Such reflection is indeed to the benefit of the cause, and the form and clarity that this book presents is of a very high standard.

Markéta Minářová

DOI: 10.14712/23363525.2024.10

**Dilbar Alieva (ed): *Anatómia revolúcie: Historické poučenia a sociologické analýzy*. Bratislava: Sociologický ústav SAV, 2022, 159 s.**

Recenzovaná kniha s názvem *Anatómia revolúcie*, která si vypůjčuje svůj název od Cranea Brintona, se prostřednictvím šesti příspěvků věnuje revolucím a zejména teoretickým otázkám, které se týkají revolučních změn. Jednotlivé části reflektují širokou škálu přístupů a autorů od nejstarších teoretiků-praktiků revolucí až po současné revoluce a teoretické přístupy.

Dušan Kováč (s. 11–19) vedle sebe staví na pozadí historického dění tři teorie světové revoluce. Velmi známou teorií socialistické revoluce, kterou očekával K. Marx. O něco méně známou teorií V. I. Lenina, který navazuje na Marxe a teorii světové revoluce T. G. Masaryka. Kováč vhodně popisuje odklon Lenina od ortodoxního přejímání Marxe a důsledky pro následný světový vývoj. Popisuje také Masarykovo očekávání demokratické a humanistické revoluce popsáné ve stejnojmenné knize, (v angličtině výstižněji nazvané *The Making of the State*). Z pohledu současných teorií revoluce text představuje spíše proto-teorie revolucí, které byly zároveň všechny neúspěšné. Otázkou je, jestli by nebylo vhodné zmínit Leninovu teorii jako mnohem

méně intelektuálně zdatnou a odlišit tak úroveň představených teorií.

V druhém příspěvku nahlíží Marek Němec-ký (s. 30–54) dlouhou iránskou revolucí optikou vybraných přístupů teorie revoluce. Autor dobře připomíná, že iránská revoluce je pro teorii důležitá také díky tomu, že ukazuje, že je nutné zkoumat i „negativní“ revoluce, a že po revoluci nemusí vždy následovat pozitivní vývoj či určitá vyšší nebo lepší formace. Autor z přibližně osmi základních přístupů k analýzám revolucí volí přístupy, které nazývá strukturální a ideační. Vhodnější a přesnější kategorií (vzhledem k orientaci textu), kterou nabízí obecné teorie revoluce, by pro strukturální přístup byl státocentrický přístup (state-centered). Pro to, co autor myslí ideačním přístupem, využívá obecná teorie revoluce kategorií kulturní přístup (Cultural). Také tvrzení o menším zastoupení kulturního přístupu při studiu revolucí již není platné, naopak většina současných autorů se orientuje právě přístup orientující se na kulturu. Autor naopak precizně popisuje události revolucí, kdy se soustředí na vývoj Íránu ve 20. století, právě s důrazem na období revolucí, přičemž se pohybuje zejména na úrovni státu a mezinárodního dění týkající se Íránu.

Autor vysvětluje konstituční revoluci v Íránu za využití primárně státocentrického přístupu. Soustředí na to, jak jsou různé systémy, režimy a typy států náchylné k revolucím. Konstituční revoluci nahlíží také optikou kulturního přístupu k revolucím, do kterého spadá i ideologie jako faktor ovlivňující podobu a směr revoluce. Ideologie je zde na rozdíl od marxistického přístupu viděna jako procesuální, vznikající během revoluce. Zajímavá je také zmínka o roli historické náhody. Tomuto významnému faktoru většiny revolucí se věnuje jeden z nejnovějších přístupů, který se soustředí na nahodilosti (Contingency) jako prvek či princip revolucí.

Stejně jako v případě konstituční revoluce vedle sebe staví M. Němec-ký dva pohledy na islámskou revoluci. Strukturální (státocentrický) pohled zde vysvětluje primárně příčiny islámské revoluce, zatímco ideační (kulturní) pohled zohledňuje také průběh a výsledky revoluce. U zvoleného kulturního přístupu v případě Arojomanda by se dalo diskutovat o tom, zda