



## Comparative Civilizations Review

---

Volume 75  
Number 75 Fall 2016

Article 2

---

10-21-2016

### Notes

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

(2016) "Notes," *Comparative Civilizations Review*: Vol. 75: No. 75, Article 2.  
Available at: <http://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol75/iss75/2>

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the All Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative Civilizations Review* by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [scholarsarchive@byu.edu](mailto:scholarsarchive@byu.edu).

### ***Editor's Note***

The only thing we can be sure of in life and in history is change. But how can we conceptualize change?

On the one hand, Heraclitus taught us that change is perpetual, unstoppable, and all things are flowing. "This world, which is the same for all, no one of gods or men has made; but it was ever, is now, and ever shall be an ever-living Fire, with measures kindling and measures going out." As he famously said, "you cannot step twice into the same river, for fresh waters are ever flowing in upon you...The sun is new every day." But he also pronounced that "We step and do not step into the same rivers; we are, and are not." According to Plato, Heraclitus taught that nothing ever is - everything is becoming; Aristotle summed it up as "nothing steadfastly is."

On the other hand, there can be little doubt that it is instinctual to search for that which is permanent; and this is desirable above all else, or so many have thought. Is it true that "whatever is, ought to be?" Hume looked into that proposition, and Belinsky famously converted politically when he changed the emphasis from the second to the first phrase.

I think that it may be true that you can step into the same river twice. There can be change and permanency simultaneously. At least that has to be the logical conclusion when one observes the members of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations, as each year they give up whatever they are doing, wherever in the world they might be, and flock dutifully to attend the annual meeting. There may be great change occurring in the world from the historical perspective, but you can bet on one thing: next year, like this year, there will be an annual meeting of the ISCSC, held somewhere in the world. Additionally, it will be invigorating, challenging, meaningful. Like Heraclitus's fire, it always is yet constantly changes.

So it is that we can say with certitude that the annual meeting of the ISCSC survives; simultaneously, like the river of Heraclitus, the content changes.

This year's meeting was no exception to the rule of history. It was held on the beautiful campus of Monmouth University, ably structured, compact yet explosive with ideas. Organized by the redoubtable duo of scholars and long-time organizational leaders, Mariana Tepfenhart of Monmouth University, the Conference Chair, and Laina Farhat-Holzman of California, the Program Chair, it centered on a beautiful set of sessions. From each lecture and debate one could draw much of value to take away, a great learning experience.

The river of inspiration kept on flowing, sufficient to keep those who attended thinking about great ideas and looking forward to next year's sessions.

At the meeting, the outgoing president, Dr. David Rosner from the Metropolitan College of New York, where he is a highly productive professor of values and ethics, offered his valedictory remarks. Everyone hailed the fine work he has done during the past several years and congratulated him on a successful presidency, one during which many advances were made in the structure and professionalism of the society.

It was noted by all present that he had led the organization with distinction since his election during the annual meeting held in Washington, D.C., in June 2012. One reason: Dr. Rosner is surely one of the kindest and most dedicated faculty members and comparative civilizationalists anywhere. Everyone on the Board of Directors thanks him for his dedicated, self-less, time-consuming and always thoughtful leadership of the society.

And it should be noted that Prof. Rosner's scholarship has always been superb: I would point out, from this desk, that his brilliance in analyzing the social and ethical implications of Boccaccio's *Decameron* made for one of the most penetrating articles ever carried in the journal. A distinguished graduate of Vassar, with a PhD. from Brown University, this philosopher/president has left an indelible mark of intelligence, courtesy and kindness on the society.

The gavel was handed over at Monmouth to the newly-elected president, Dr. Toby Huff, who was well received by all present. Currently Research Associate in the Department of Astronomy at Harvard University, he was formerly at the University of California, Berkeley; the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey, the National University of Singapore, the University of Malaya, and the Max Weber College in Erfurt, Germany.

President Huff taught sociology for thirty-four years at the University of Massachusetts Dartmouth before becoming Chancellor Professor Emeritus in 2005. Notably, he earned his PhD. at New School University (formerly, the New School for Social Research) under the guidance of the late Dr. Benjamin Nelson, first president of the ISCSC in its United States incarnation.

Prof. Huff's scholarship is respected worldwide; I have in my hands now his beautiful 2011 book, *Intellectual Curiosity and the Scientific Revolution: A Global Perspective*, published by Cambridge University Press. In this book he shows that Europe in the 1600s was alive with discovery and invention. There was a scientific revolution in Europe. An enormous flow of discoveries transformed scientific thought. Among these was the telescope. While the invention of the telescope was transmitted from Holland to China, to Mughal India, and to the Ottoman Empire in short order, those civilizations did not respond as Europeans did to the new instrument.

Thus he writes that "But it was not just the telescope's promise that was passed by: the same thing occurred with the microscope and the study of human and animal microscopy as well as electrical energy and pneumatics." While in Europe there was a great burst of

innovation in science and technology, the other civilizations were dilatory in their reaction to Europe's flowering of scientific activity. Its "discovery machine" thus failed to ignite the same spark elsewhere. The result, argues Prof. Huff, was a great divergence, one which granted to Europe 400 years of scientific and economic ascendancy.

This significant work for the comparative study of civilizations was preceded by a number of other books, including *The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China, and the West*; a co-edited volume with Wolfgang Schluchter entitled *Max Weber and Islam*; and, from 2005, *An Age of Science and Revolutions, 1600-1800*.

President Huff announced that he would be working closely in the administration of the society with two others: Lynn Rhodes of California, newly-elected Vice President, and Peter Hecht of Washington, D.C., newly-elected Executive Director.

An easy prediction: Watch for exciting new developments from this leadership team.

One reason that this is an easy prediction is that the three of them have already overseen the development of our new website: [www.iscsc.org](http://www.iscsc.org). Everyone should take a look at this colorful, information-laden site. The home page features a continuously revolving globe and links to the following sections: About Us; Newsletter; the Journal CCR; ISCSC Blog; Civilitas; Civilization Defined – References for Research and Study; Featured Articles; Book Review; Membership; Constitution; By-Laws; and Officer and Director Contact.

Here are four of the most fascinating sections:

**First:** On the front page is a statement of "Our Society's Mission and Goals." It states:

*Mission:* To provide means of cooperation among all persons interested in the advancement of the comparative study of civilizations.

*Creed:* Civilizations matter.

*Goal:* To achieve scholarly recognition by pursuing and publishing knowledge of the comparative study of civilizations.

*Strategy:* Organizing annual international conferences with scholar leaders of the comparative study of civilization and publishing *Comparative Civilization Review*, Conference Proceedings & Civilization Book Series.

Note: A somewhat similar statement appears on Page 1 in the revised By-Laws.

**Second:** Another fascinating section, in my view, is the "Civilization Defined" link. Central to this area of the website is a 21-page paper entitled "Civilization: Definitions and Recommendations." The paper contains early definitions of civilizations, contemporary definitions of civilizations, and a number of classifications of civilizations.

Among the scholars quoted in this paper are the following: Arnold Toynbee and Carroll Quigley, plus in more or less alphabetical order the following: Philip Bagby, Steve Blaha, Andrew Bosworth, Shepard Clough, Rushton Coulborn, Christopher Dawson, Laina Farhat-Holzman, Felipe Fernandez-Armesto, Dario Fernandez-Morera, Andre Gunder Frank, John K. Hord, Samuel P. Huntington, Edward Tyler, Feliks Koneczny, and Jaroslav Krejci. Also, A. L. Kroeber, Ross Maxwell, William McGaughey, Matthew Melko, David Richardson, W. M. Flinders Petrie, Lee Daniel Snyder, Pitirim A. Sorokin, Oswald Spengler, Andrew Targowski, Roger Wescott, and David Wilkinson.

Following this list of quotes is an article presenting opinions of leading members of the IS CSC in response to the following question posed by the *Comparative Civilizations Review*:

What literature do you use or recommend in teaching the comparative study of civilizations?

Some short and some extensive answers, with valuable lists, were supplied by Dr. Walter Benesch of Alaska; Dr. David Wilkinson of California; the late Dr. Matthew Melko of Ohio, Dr. Laina Farhat-Holzman of California, Dr. Midori Yamanouchi of Pennsylvania, and myself.

**Third:** A revised set of By-Laws contains much that is new and attractive.

Special recognition for the formulation here must go to the scholar and government leader Dr. John A. Grayzel of New York. Former holder of the Baha'i Chair for Peace at the University of Maryland, Dr. Grayzel, who holds both a J.D. from Stanford University and a PhD. from the University of Oregon, served for many years as a top official of the United States Agency for International Development. As an attorney, he guided the society through the creation of this new set of By-Laws and their unanimous approval by the Board of Directors of the society.

Please note that the By-Laws also contain within Article IV on Page 2 a Code of Ethics, as follows.

The members of this society pledge themselves by virtue of their membership to:

- 4.1. Assume the responsibility for conduct and behavior designed to serve the cause of truth and justice
- 4.2. Maintain the highest standards of professional, moral and ethical conduct
- 4.3. Respect the inherent dignity of mankind and deal justly, fairly and objectively with each individual
- 4.4. Hold themselves apart from influences intended to benefit their political, personal or financial well-being while influencing their professional judgments
- 4.5. Actively support the mission and aims and efforts of this society

Can any other scholarly association in the United States boast of a similar statement?

**Fourth:** There is also a direct link on the front page of the website to this journal. Two clicks bring you to the very latest edition.

The most exciting news for *Comparative Civilizations Review* is that we are moving to a new electronic platform. As always, this miracle is occurring thanks to Connie Lamb, the wonderful Editor of this publication and librarian at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah. In short, what is happening is that the journal is transitioning away from the OJS platform and onto a new one, Digital Commons. Digital Commons is run by Berkeley Electronic Press of California.

As that company notes, “Digital Commons Network brings together free, full-text scholarly articles from hundreds of universities and colleges worldwide. Curated by university librarians and their supporting institutions, the Network includes a growing collection of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, working papers, conference proceedings, and other original scholarly work.”

So, to begin with, this is a great resource when you want to undertake study and research. One reason: There are over two million works from nearly 500 higher education institutions included on this platform.

In a future Editor’s Note, I will examine in greater depth the value of the Digital Commons platform to researchers and scholars within the membership of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations. The following is just a brief introduction to two of the many strengths of this electronic resource which we are now about to receive:

To see the depth of Digital Commons, go to: [network.bepress.com/explore](http://network.bepress.com/explore). I just did. I typed in the following language in the search box: comparative study of civilizations. A total of 180,177 hits were then listed.

Next, I picked one of the top-listed entries and there got the citation and the abstract. It is easy enough to follow through and obtain the key words and other vital information on this new manuscript. There on the left was a “download” button and I was able to read through the working draft of a new book on political theory.

Another interesting area (you can see them all listed on the left, in a column) is entitled “Theses and Dissertations.” A total of 29,426 dissertations and theses are listed. This is of great interest to me as I am currently a faculty member at Morgan State University in the Community College Leadership Doctoral Program and actually advise on, and edit, many doctoral dissertations.

I pressed on Theses/Dissertations and picked out one that looked interesting. There was the abstract. But in addition, I saw the date the dissertation was awarded, the degree type; the degree name (i.e., Doctor of Philosophy); the department; the four committee members; the number of pages; the number of downloads until now; key words (important for search engines); disciplines related to the topic; language; repository citation; and best of all, a “Download” button.

So, Digital Commons is a library, an institutional repository of considerable depth. It is accessible now to members of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations and to everyone else.

But more than that, it is going to enable the journal to be handled electronically in a most efficient manner. Articles will be submitted electronically and the peer review process, plus the editing process, will be carried out minus those flaws that can drive a journal wild: where is the article by so-and-so? When was it peer-reviewed? What did the reviewer say? What changes, if any, were suggested? What articles are not back from the authors? Who has edited, when and where?

This transition is a tremendous advance for the journal, a major step forward. Thank you so much, Editor Connie Lamb.

Joseph Drew  
Washington, D.C.

### Commentary from the President

With regard to the 21 pages of definitions of “civilizations” mentioned above, I suggest a different perspective. The fascination with definitions needs to be balanced by a stress on *civilizational analysis* and a *pluralist* conception of civilizations (rather than civilization, singular) focused on actual comparative studies that reveal *how* such studies can be carried out and *what new insights/discoveries* they produce.

What we need to focus on is *exemplars of civilizational analysis*, works that pioneered the comparative study of civilizations that show us *how* comparative civilizational analysis can be undertaken, and what innovative things they found out.

Whatever orientation current members of the ISCSC may have, it might be useful to recall the original vision of a “*new science of civilizational analysis*” that Benjamin Nelson articulated in the early days of the ISCSC in the US. He believed that this new progressive orientation to civilizational study:

will one day—before too long—be found to constitute a ‘new science’ of civilizational analysis [based on anticipations by outstanding scholars of the past such as Emile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss, Max Weber, Henry Sumner Maine, etc.]...Already the evidence is overwhelming that many of the main challenges confronting sociology in our days cannot be met without recourse to civilizational and inter-civilizational perspectives...With others, I have been striving to carry out detailed studies in the comparative historical, differential sociology of civilizational patterns and inter-civilizational encounters.

With these frames as my reference points, I have sought to throw light on the differences in the passages to—and from—modernity in ‘East’ and ‘West’ in the spheres of law, conscience, consciousness, science and in the images people have regarding state, society, community, authority, individual, future, freedom, and so on.

(This statement comes from the “Introduction” written for the German edition of Nelson’s collected papers, *Der Ursprung der Moderne: Vergleichende Studien zum Zivilisationsprozess* (Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 1977), and which I reprinted in *On the Roads to Modernity: Conscience, Science, and Civilizations* [Roman and Littlefield, 1981], pp. 13-14.)

Surely this framework is broad and open-ended enough to encompass the broad major themes that members of the ISCSC continue to explore.

### Brief Note by Dr. John Grayzel

ISCSC board member Dr. Grayzel adds the following comment:

Heraclitus' philosophy was an important theoretic hook for my dissertation on ethnic identity among the Fulbe, an African pastoral people. The problem is that most "quotes" from Heraclitus are really quotes from people saying what they think he said.

The seemingly most accurate statement using his words is:

*"potamoisi toisin autoisin embainousin hetera kai hetera hudata epirrei."*

*"On those stepping into rivers staying the same other and other waters flow."*

Apparently, the most accurate interpretation of this enigmatic insight is found at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/heraclitus/>:

*"...not that all things are changing so that we cannot encounter them twice, but something much more subtle and profound. It is that some things stay the same only by changing. One kind of long-lasting material reality exists by virtue of constant turnover in its constituent matter. Here constancy and change are not opposed but inextricably connected. A human body could be understood in precisely the same way, as living and continuing by virtue of constant metabolism – as Aristotle, for instance, later understood it. On this reading, Heraclitus believes in flux, but not as destructive of constancy; rather it is, paradoxically, a necessary condition of constancy, at least in some cases (and arguably in all)."*

## *Civilizational Analysis and Some Paths Not Taken, Part I*

Toby E. Huff  
Harvard University

These are some preliminary remarks from my Plenary Address to the 46<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the ISCSC held at Monmouth University in June 2016. The paper analyzes three civilizational encounters between “East” and “West” in the fields of law and science but which are too complex to be treated adequately in a short paper.

When I began my preparations for this presentation, I thought I would reflect on the early founders of the ISCSC, especially Pitirim Sorokin and Arnold Toynbee, above all, given the comments on the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Society published by Michael Palencia-Roth but also Joseph Drew’s tabulations of the themes of the Conference.<sup>1</sup> As I looked into the issues, however, it became increasingly clear that neither Sorokin nor Toynbee left us with a viable platform for carrying on *comparative* civilizational analysis and no one articulated a revised vision.

In the meantime, the most sophisticated and ambitious articulation of a new approach to civilizational analysis, drawing on the work of Weber, Durkheim and Mauss (among others), was put forth by Benjamin Nelson in a paper titled, “Civilizational Analysis and Intercivilizational Encounters.”<sup>2</sup> Nelson, who had been collaborating with Vytautas Kavolis, brought in historical “structures of consciousness” usually, but not always, defined by religious commitments, along with legal, logical, and scientific modes of thought. Nelson had translated and published the important “Note of the Notion of Civilization” by Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss.<sup>3</sup>

This foundational conception, according to which *civilizations* are composed of at least two or more *societies* sharing fundamental religious, legal, and symbolic expressions, has

---

<sup>1</sup> Michael Palencia-Roth, “‘On Giants’ Shoulders: The 1961 Salzburg Meeting of the ISCSC,” *Comparative Civilizations Review* #62 (2010): 142-158; *ibid*, “The 1961 Conference of the ISCSC: Notes and Summaries,” *CCR* #66 (2012): 106-142; Joseph Drew, “The 1961 Salzburg Conference and Contemporary Reflections of Its Overarching Themes and Participants,” *CCR* #65 (2011): 105-114.

<sup>2</sup> Benjamin Nelson, “Civilizational Analysis and Intercivilizational Encounters,” *Sociological Analysis* 34 #2 (1973): 79-105 and reprinted in Nelson, *On the Roads to Modernity: Conscience, Science, and Civilizations*, edited by Toby E. Huff (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 1981, reprinted by Lexington books, 201, with a new introduction by Toby Huff.

<sup>3</sup> Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss “Note on the Notion of Civilization,” *Social Research* vol. 38, no. 4 (1971): 809-813; translated by Benjamin Nelson.

belatedly caught on in some circles,<sup>4</sup> though within the ISCSC mainly by Nelson's former students such as myself<sup>5</sup> and Donald Nielsen.<sup>6</sup>

Moreover, some members of this Society will recall that the march was stolen with regard to long-term historical-sociological analysis with the appearance of Immanuel Wallerstein's book, *The Modern World-System*.<sup>7</sup> This happened just when the revived ISCSC was reconstituted in the United States. Consequently, then President Benjamin Nelson (and other members) saw the challenge of the world-system perspective and invited Wallerstein and/or his supporters to make presentations at the ISCSC Annual Conferences in order to challenge the model. It has to be conceded that the world-system approach did attract a large number of highly competent social scientists who pushed the model forward and some of whom attended meetings of the ISCSC.<sup>8</sup> It now appears, however, that the world-system approach has played out.

In that context it is germane to note that Wallerstein's system had no place for *culture*, for such apparently friable human institutions as religion or law. Consequently, neither China nor the Islamic world played any part in the world-system, being relegated at best to the silent "periphery," whereas in fact, first, "the Four Little Tigers" (Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and South Korea) and then China itself were poised to "take off," in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century, despite the overburdening world-system postulated by Wallerstein and followers.<sup>9</sup>

Because of this lacuna in Wallerstein's worldview, his analysis was inherently incapable of recognizing the impact that religion and law had on the making of the West, and plausibly, the retardation of both China and Islamic civilization for very long periods of time (that I shall spell out in part 2 of this paper). Whether or not he thinks modern science, the international legal system, the idea of universal human rights are just "rhetoric" is an interesting question.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Among his many publications, see Johann P. Arnason, *Civilizations in Dispute. Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); idem, "Civilizational Analysis: A Paradigm in the Making," *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems* (2007 [no pagination available]); idem, "Understanding Intercivilizational Encounters," *Thesis Eleven* #86 (2006): 39-53; Said Amir Arjomand and Edward Tiryakian, *Rethinking Civilizational Analysis* (Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> Huff, "Europe as a Civilization: The Revolution of the Middle Ages and the Rise of the Universities," *CCR* #69 (2013); 65-86.

<sup>6</sup> Donald Nielsen, "Rationalization, Transformations of Consciousness and Intercivilizational Encounters," in Arjomand and Tiryakian, *ibid*, pp. 119-131.

<sup>7</sup> Immanuel Wallerstein's *The Modern World-System. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the Modern World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).

<sup>8</sup> For example, Christopher Chase-Dunn, "Comparing World Systems: Toward a Theory of Semiperipheral Development" *CCR* #19 (1989): 29-66, and many other followers.

<sup>9</sup> Ezra Vogel, *The Four Little Dragons. The Spread of Industrialization in East Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993); *ibid*, *One Step Ahead in China: Guangdong under Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), among many others.

<sup>10</sup> Wallerstein, *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power* (New York: The New Press, 2006).

But there is still another theoretical initiative that threatened to undermine the very notion that the *histories of civilizations matter*. This is the “global” or “globalization” thrust that smacks of utopianism.<sup>11</sup> Not coincidentally, it joins forces with the same unworkable Toynbean conception of “civilization,” that is, according to Toynbee, *civilization* “might be defined as an endeavor to create a state of society [sic] in which the whole of mankind will be able to live together in harmony.”<sup>12</sup> A follower of Toynbee took this claim further: “Today there exists on earth only one civilization.”<sup>13</sup> In the first two decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, this conception seems to be out of touch with geo-political realities.

At the same time, Robertson and associates argued that increasingly people perceive “our world as a single space.”<sup>14</sup> As a former president of the ISCS, Vytautas Kavolis understood that position, postulates “an inevitable convergence, sooner or later, toward a universal value hierarchy in which the idea of humanity as a whole subsumes these locally differentiated responses” of subgroups around the world.<sup>15</sup> Here again this vision collides with current geo-political and civilizational realities.

Apart from this challenging background, as I looked into the voluminous writings of Sorokin and Toynbee, I discovered that both writers (as did Wallerstein) deliberately avoided learning from the insights of Max Weber, the great German scholar who has been cited as the most important sociologist of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Sorokin in particular railed against Weber when his most gifted student, Robert Merton, took up a foundational question that resulted in a classic and unsurpassed study called, *Science, Technology and Society in 17th Century England*, published in 1938.<sup>16</sup> Sorokin characterized Weber’s procedure of taking one factor and looking for its effects on another factor, “childish,” and thus relegated the whole enterprise of studying the effects of religion, or law for that matter, on other social conditions, to “pseudo-scientism.”<sup>17</sup> And, thus, Sorokin himself veered off in the direction that we can see was counterproductive,<sup>18</sup> while Weber’s (and Merton’s)

---

<sup>11</sup> There are too many works in this genre to mention here and I only mention one of the main architects of this persuasion and who published in the *CCR*: Roland Robertson, “Globalization Theory and Civilization Analysis,” *CCR* #17: 20-30. But also see *The Globalization Reader, 5<sup>th</sup> edition*, edited by Frank Lechner and John Boli (Wiley-Blackwell, 2014); and now *The Encyclopedia of Globalization*, edited by R. Robertson and Jan Aart Scholte (London: Routledge: 2007) 4 vols.

<sup>12</sup> Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History* (New York: Oxford, 1964), 12: 279.

<sup>13</sup> David Richardson, “Central Civilization,” *CCR* #17 (1987): 31.

<sup>14</sup> Roland Robertson, “Globalization Theory and Civilization Analysis,” *CCR* #17 (1987): 20-30, p. 24.

<sup>15</sup> Vytautas Kavolis, “History of Consciousness and Civilization Analysis,” *CCR* #17 (1987), p. 10.

<sup>16</sup> Robert K. Merton, *Science, Technology and Society in 17th Century England, Osiris*, 4 (1938) Part 2; reprinted by Harper Torch, 1970, with a *New Introduction by the Author*. For a useful overview of this legacy, see I. B. Cohen, *Puritanism and the Rise of Modern Science: The Merton Thesis*, Edited and with an Introduction by I. B. Cohen with the Assistance of K. E. Duffin. Afterword by Robert K. Merton (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990).

<sup>17</sup> Robert K. Merton, “The Sorokin-Merton Correspondence on “Puritanism, Pietism, and Science, 1933-34,” *Science in Context* 3 #1 (1989): 291-98, at p. 291. However, earlier in his career, Sorokin was happy to introduce American students to Weber’s work more broadly.

<sup>18</sup> There have been many appreciative and critical assessments of Sorokin’s work, the most extensive is *Pitirim A. Sorokin in Review*, edited by Philip A. Allen (Durham: Duke University Press, 1963). The same

approach became an inexhaustible source of new studies and insights. I shall say more about this below.

Arnold Toynbee, on the other hand, was not polemical. Nevertheless, many of his critics pointed out to him the importance of Max Weber's insights but Toynbee continued to ignore them. In short, whereas Max Weber centered his attention on the great *religions* of the world and wrote his famous studies of *The Religion of India*, the *Religion of China*, *Ancient Judaism*, as well as Islam, Toynbee failed to produce a time-tested set of reflections on the world religions. Unlike Weber, he did not see the possibilities inherent in assuming that the great world religions constitute an important starting point for understanding *civilizational configurations*, just as Sorokin dismissed the whole idea of studying religious effects. In a word, this would be the first of the *many paths not taken*.

For as it turns out Max Weber did indeed lay out a serious agenda for *civilizational analysis* back in 1919. That agenda is found Weber's classic Introduction to his *Collected Essays in the Sociology of Religion* but which most people have read as the "Introduction" that Talcott Parsons prefaced to the *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. But this *Prefatory Note* is not at all about the Reformation and its significant impact on economic development. It is rather a very broad assessment of Western and world history in *civilizational* terms that he came to in the last year of his life. It is not about this or that "society," but about *transnational, trans-societal civilization-based developments*. In that essay, Weber raised the really big question of historical and sociological analysis, *namely, how did the Western world get to be as it is?* But neither Sorokin nor Toynbee took up the challenge. At the same time, this is the same window for finding out why the *non-Western world* went in quite different directions.

So let me recall some critical themes from Max Weber's extraordinary assessment of the West and its divergence from other parts of the world that he wrote in the last year of his life. Of course, we must bear in mind that many of the terms of reference used by Weber have now been superseded. The fact is that Weber came up with his assessment of these comparative civilizational differences before the discipline called History of Science was even invented, before anyone had coined the phrase, "the scientific revolution," usually located in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>19</sup> Likewise, Weber was doing comparative sociology of law before there was anything like comparative legal studies in the law schools or in history departments. Here is the way Weber begins:

A product of modern European civilization, studying any problem of universal history, is bound to ask himself to what combination of circumstances the fact should be attributed that in Western civilization, and in Western civilization only,

---

volume contains Robert Merton's most detailed critique, written with Bernard Barber: "Sorokin's Formulations in the Sociology of Science," pp. 332-368.

<sup>19</sup> This is usually attributed to Alexandre Koyré in the 1940s. See Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Revolution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), p. 1.

cultural phenomena have appeared which (as we like to think) lie in a line having *universal* significance and value.<sup>20</sup>

He then goes on to mention a number of specific areas in which the Western world developed uniquely, distinguishing itself from others. The first of these that he mentions is *science*, which had reached a stage of development far beyond that of any other part of the world. While all sorts of religious and philosophical reflections on the world have existed in other parts of the world, Weber noted the uniqueness of systematic theology that European medievals developed into what they called “the queen of the sciences.”

He then attempts to sketch some developmental paths on the roads to *modern* science. He mentions that Babylonian *astronomy* lacked certain mathematical foundations that were later added by the Greeks. He notes that Indian geometry (to the extent that it existed), lacked a method of proof, which was also true of Chinese mathematics, though Weber did not mention that.

He mentions a wide difference between Greek and Chinese approaches to historical scholarship.<sup>21</sup> Likewise, he was aware that Aristotle was the first to develop the modes of logical argument that continue to be recognized to this day.

In the realm of law, he points out that though other legal systems developed in China and the Middle East, none created a *formal and rational jurisprudence* such as was developed through the combination of Roman Civil Law and the canon law advanced by medieval Christian scholars. He recognized the uniqueness of European *universities*, the specialized education of bureaucratic servants and their function in a rational-legal state apparatus.

Weber goes on to note the differences in artistic sensibilities, in architecture and music. And finally he accents the unique creation of modern capitalism based on formally free labor and production for the market.<sup>22</sup>

In short, Weber summarized an extraordinary set of scientific, economic, cultural, legal and artistic differences between “East” and “West” long before such comparative studies were recognized as vital to our understanding of how the world got to be the way it is. Of course, each of these claims needs to be carefully checked in the light of more recent research.

---

<sup>20</sup> Max Weber, “Introduction” in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribners and Sons, 1958). This essay was written in 1904/05 but Weber’s “Introduction” to the volume inserted by Parsons comes from Weber’s 1920 Introduction to his *Collected Essays of the Sociology of Religion*.

<sup>21</sup> This has recently been revisited by G. E. R. Lloyd, *Disciplines in the Making: Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Elites, Learning, and Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). For my review of it, see Huff, “The Cognitive Disunity of Mankind,” in *Metascience* 20.1 (2011): 191-193.

<sup>22</sup> Weber, *General Theory of Economic History*, translated by Frank H Knight (New York: Collier Books, 1961).

So, let me restate just two of Weber's crucial insights using modern terminology in order that we can see the relevance of Weber's insights for civilizational comparisons.

In the first instance, Weber was correct, that though one can find earlier forms of scientific inquiry around the world -- in the Muslim world, in China and India -- *modern science* uniquely arose in the West. It was Weber who flagged this question as a major source of inquiry, yet it was only the biochemist-turned-historian, the late Joseph Needham, who took up the great question in his monumental study, *Science and Civilization in China*.<sup>23</sup> Needham's profound work produced what Benjamin Nelson called "Needham's challenge," which was to go beyond both Needham and Weber to understand why modern science did not emerge in China (or elsewhere) but only in the West.

Weber described the second great contrast between "East" and "West" as the very different legal system that emerged only in Western Europe. Of course there were other legal systems in other parts of the world, but as I shall illustrate, Europe alone produced a legal revolution in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that in fact laid the foundations for modern legal development, and even the foundations for *globalization*. This political-legal transformation was so broad-ranging and deeply ensconced in European culture that even scholars who have studied the European Middle Ages recently have failed to grasp the scope of this enduring transformation.

In broad outline, the European legal revolution of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries laid the foundations for what we now recognize as *modern political institutions*.<sup>24</sup> These include due process of law, the notion of elective representation in all forms of corporate bodies, the *very idea of legally autonomous organizations*, and not least of all, legally autonomous professional associations (of doctors and lawyers), charitable organizations, universities, as well as cities and towns. All of these innovations, including the rise of *parliamentary* governance, arose out of medieval canon law and contributed to the stability of economic enterprises and made local self-government possible. Each of these developments was part of the emergence of constitutionalism as understood in the Western world.<sup>25</sup> But this is to get ahead of the narrative that will follow in part 2.

---

<sup>23</sup> Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, 7 vols. In 22 parts. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959-2006).

<sup>24</sup> Huff, "Europe as a Civilization: The Revolution of the Middle Ages and the Rise of the Universities," *CCR* #69 (2013); 65-86.

<sup>25</sup> A crucial dimension of this development is the idea of treating *collective actors* as a whole body--a *corporation*, or corporate entity. This is the fundamental basis for all forms of legal autonomy, both local and national -- that is, the legal autonomy of civil organizations, business enterprises, professional associations and the sovereignty of nation states.

Given these institutional landmarks, I shall sketch out the results of three intercivilizational encounters that reveal how deeply rooted the axial institutions of civilizations are in their contrasting histories, cultures, and metaphysical assumptions. It is to be accented that this kind of analysis is only possible and generally useful if we maintain adequate *civilizational frames of reference*; otherwise it devolves into quaint historical findings.