
Politics, Culture & Socialization

Vol. 12-13, 2021-2022

Content

Editorial 3

Articles 2021

Elizabeth S. Smith, Sabrina S. Roof, Katherine West, Nicole Hyman

The Political Socialization of College Students:
Student Government, Diversity, and Political Power 9

Stéphanie De Munter and Sam Pinxteren

Making Sense of Political Images on Instagram:
Analysing the Online Image and Impression Management of World Leaders
versus Belgian Politicians. A Comparison of Two Case Studies 34

Solvita Denisa-Liepniece

A Longitudinal Heuristic Polito- linguistic Approach to Metaphors
in Authoritarian Regimes. The case of Aleksandr Lukashenko,
president of the Republic of Belarus 63

Book review

Bas Schueremans

Hot Contention, Cool Abstention: Positive Emotions and Protest Behavior
During the Arab Spring. By Stephanie Dornschneider (2021) 80

Articles 2022

Anna Diedkova and Christ'l De Landsheer

Political Suitability in an Authoritarian Regime: A Comparison of the Personality Profiles of Vladimir Putin and Opposition Leader Alexei Navalny 87

Carmit Fuchs-Abarbanel

The Mixed Communities as an Innovative Form of Political Organizing 107

Ingo Juchler

Sites of Democratic Awakenings in Berlin: 1848, 1918, 1968 and 1989 120

Book review

Max Runge

The Lonely Century: coming together in a world that's pulling apart.
By Noreena Hertz (2020) 146

The Political Socialization of College Students: Student Government, Diversity, and Political Power

*Elizabeth S. Smith, Sabrina S. Roof, Katherine West
and Nicole Hyman*

Furman University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Cincinnati,
University of Connecticut¹

Abstract: For over a century, institutions of higher education have had student government organizations on their campuses. We show these organizations serve as important socializing agents, providing opportunities to practice politics and exercise political voice. In this article, we present both quantitative and qualitative research conducted over the past two years on the top 50 universities and top 50 liberal arts colleges. We investigate the role of these organizations on their campuses, the level of their diversity in leadership, and the correlates of that diversity (type of school, geography, politics of the state legislature, etc.). Using surveys and in-depth interviews of student leaders, we find that student governments are influenced in many ways by the current politics of the day especially surrounding issues of diversity and inclusion, and that leadership opportunities socialize students to have the skills for and interest in future political office-holding.

Keywords: political socialization, college student government, student leadership

Introduction

“How dare you claim to care about this university but lie and cheat to get into a position of leadership?” (Vasquez, 2018, pg. 3) – A student at Texas State University to the student-body president (who later resigned) accused of taking illegal campaign donations from Turning Point USA, a 501c(3) founded in 2012 to promote, “conservative grassroots activist networks on college campuses across the country” (Turning Point USA, 2019).

“Hi Clemson fans. It’s Ivanka Trump. I am so proud of what each and every one of you are doing. Don’t forget to reach for new heights by voting for Huskey-Haley”- Ivanka Trump in a video on her webpage for students. Rena Haley is the daughter of Nikki Haley (former S.C. Governor and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations) and was running for Clemson student government vice-president on a shared ticket with Huskey in February 2019 (Foley, 2019).

“Brooks [an openly gay Texas A&M student] did not win the election. He finished second by more than 750 votes to one Mr. Robert McIntosh. However, McIntosh was disqualified by the SGA [Student

1 Email of corresponding author: liz.smith@furman.edu

Government Association] Election Commission and Judicial Court through a process that – at best – made a mockery of due process and transparency. At worst, the SGA allowed an election to be stolen outright.” – U.S. Secretary of Energy Rick Perry in an op-ed in the Houston Chronicle (March 22, 2017).

In the 2012 report, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future*, commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education, scholars note the increasing threat of civic disengagement, low political trust, incivility, and hyper-partisanship to our democracy (The National Task Force, 2012). The report highlights the need for institutions of higher education to provide young people the foundational knowledge and skills needed to support and maintain a thriving democracy: “As a democracy, the United States depends on a knowledgeable, public-spirited, and engaged population. Education plays a fundamental role in building civic vitality, and in the twenty-first century, higher education has a distinctive role to play in the renewal of U.S. democracy” (pg. 2). An increasingly diverse population and a more globally intertwined world pose challenges to democratic nations. In order to be prepared for democratic citizenship, students must learn skills such as how to navigate different cultural values, how to engage with people of diverse opinions, and how to solve complex problems while at the same time understanding and respecting their own and others' rights and obligations.

One of the most effective ways for students to be socialized into democratic norms is by providing them the opportunity to actively engage with others and with politics. As the *Crucible Moment* report states, “full civic literacies cannot be garnered only by studying books; democratic knowledge and capabilities also are honed through hands-on, face-to-face, active engagement in the midst of differing perspectives about how to address common problems that affect the well-being of the nation and the world” (pg. 3). We propose that college student government associations (SGAs) are important socializing agents because they give students the opportunity on college campuses to practice self-government. Like the democratic institutions of the U.S. government, college student governments provide students a variety of opportunities to practice politics including: running for or holding public office, writing and getting support for legislation, lobbying on behalf of one's interests, managing and distributing scarce resources, working on political campaigns, learning about political candidates, voting in student elections and, especially, learning to communicate and work with diverse individuals. SGAs at institutions of higher education are important potential mechanisms for providing students with what Dewey would call “learning by doing” (Dewey, 1916). Student governments in their structure and design theoretically mirror the real political world college students are beginning to enter. Student governments can give students practice in the art of governing and being governed. As Bok (2017) recently argues, “student government offers valuable opportunities for students to learn the skills of politics and community leadership.” Ideally, students would learn through these student organizations what democracy in a diverse society entails.

Much like high school students, most university students are generally given limited say over the structure and decisions made at universities. The institutions themselves, for example, with their Boards of Trustees and what some have called their “imperial faculty,” fail to model democratic processes in their own structure and organization (Lagemann and Lewis, 2012). Prominent thinkers like Horace Mann (1855) and John Dewey (1916) among others have argued that schools should model democratic practices at best and at the least provide students the opportunities to exercise the skills of citizenship to prepare them for the life of a democracy. But, do college student governments provide an access point for influence and participation in decision-making in college? Who gets these opportunities and to what effect? How does the type of institution (university or liberal arts) and its context (political geography, religious affiliation) affect access to leadership positions among diverse students?

Making Sense of Political Images on Instagram: Analysing the Online Image and Impression Management of World Leaders versus Belgian Politicians. A Comparison of Two Case Studies

Stéphanie De Munter and Sam Pinxteren

University of Antwerp¹

Abstract: For the past decade, informality seems to be playing an increasing role in the branding strategies of politicians around the world. Ongoing individualization and privatization have encouraged candidates to share personal pictures of themselves on social media platforms, highlighting the human side behind the leader. Although visuals are omnipresent in digital media, little is known about how people interact and engage with the presented content. Perception politics and impression management techniques can help to create a favourable public persona (Diedkova, De Landtsheer & De Vries, 2019) – in this case through an Instagram post. Drawing on the perception politics management framework, which postulates that a more serious and formal presentation of a political candidate leads to higher support and an elevated perception of political suitability for candidates, it is assumed that the presence of formal attributes on a post has a positive effect on engagement. In order to explore voter’s perception of political suitability, a comprehensive visual analysis was repeated within two different geographical contexts: 1) Belgian politicians and parties and 2) world leaders. Data was collected via a real-time object detection program called ‘You Only Look Once’ in the programming language Python. The results indicate that – though one might expect that political communication should adhere to the informal character of social media to garner more voter engagement – the image that resonates best with the voter is a formal one – similar to the pre-social media age.

Keywords: Instagram; visual analysis; impression management; political communication; political marketing

Introduction

For the past decade, the technological innovation of social media has radically changed political communication. With the introduction of new communication technologies, (political) communication is being transformed. De Landtsheer (2004) argues that political communication underwent a transformation when television was introduced: political messages became shorter, superficial, and increasingly visualized. Suddenly, ratings dominated in an ongoing marketized media environment and defined mass media, turning political leaders into actors performing a

¹ E-mail: stephdemunter@gmail.com

show on stage and entertaining the masses. With the arrival of social media, candidates have gained unforeseen control over the creation and distribution of their published images, and they are no longer dependent on journalists (Kruikemeier et al., 2013). Additionally, there has been a steep decline in voters' interest and turnout since the 1990's (Solijonov, 2016). Consequently, a growing need for politainment has arisen – a combination of entertainment and politics – in order to gain attention from possible voters.

An obvious way to attract the audience's attention is by posting an image (photo or video) of oneself – and social media is a convenient distribution channel for these images. Subsequently, for the past couple of years, social media platforms have increasingly been shifting away from text in favour of pictures (Muñoz & Towner, 2017). This explains the growing popularity of visual-centric platforms such as TikTok, YouTube, and Instagram. Pictures are so appealing to both the sender and receiver because they can overcome language barriers; they are easy to understand and accept. An image is a way to express oneself that goes beyond the written or spoken word, beyond what can be said. Therefore, it is obvious that pictures are thriving on social media and are able to seize the attention of big audiences. Hence, pictures on social media are an ideal communication tool for politicians to construct an ideal persona (Lilleker, 2019). They allow the construction of an appealing candidate image, one that garners voters' support, by highlighting specific aspects that make them look more authentic, powerful, or competent for the job (Lilleker, 2019). There appears to be an intuitive acceptance of images. Often, however, the creation and selection process that lies ahead of the distribution remains unnoticed by the observer. Subsequently, the power of images cannot be underestimated. The saying 'A picture never lies' suggests that imagery speaks directly to our unconscious and so, this saying might be considered as a dangerous assumption (Lilleker, 2019).

Drawing on the impression management framework, it has been postulated that perceived political suitability benefits from a formal, conservative, and professional self-presentation style. Yet, it has been observed that politicians are increasingly turning to social media platforms such as Instagram to post *private* images, picturing the candidate's loved ones, their upbringing, or their hobbies. This informal self-presentation strategy has been adopted by many well-known world leaders, including former US President Barack Obama and current Prime Minister of Canada Justin Trudeau. It seeks to highlight the human dimension of the leader, suggesting a certain authentic communication between the politician and the follower (Hinsliff, 2019; Jung et al., 2017, Poulakidakos & Giannouli, 2019; Russmann, Svensson & Larsson, 2019). A possible motivation to share these 'behind the scenes' pictures could be to evoke a level of intimacy, which in turn, can create a feeling of connectedness and closeness between the candidate and their followers (Kruikemeier, 2013; Liebhart & Bernhardt, 2017).

In their almost two decades of existence, social media platforms have matured and gained authority, including Instagram. In Belgium and the United States, 42% of adults use social media as a primary news source; in countries such as Kenya, the Philippines, and Malaysia, it is close to 80% (We are social and Hootsuite, 2022). The dominant presence of social media imagery might affect the perception of political suitability and so the question arises: What image resonates best with the voter? Therefore, the main research question of this thesis is: Does a less formal and casual appearance add to perceived political suitability and receive more voter engagement than a formal appearance on Instagram?

The experiment in this article will be repeated for two entirely different datasets in terms of geography and type of candidates: namely Belgian low-profile leaders vs. well-known world leaders. This was chosen to research whether the findings are similar across borders and to analyse voters' evaluations of different types of politicians. For instance, voters might have pre-existing views regarding high-profile leaders. So, it is interesting to research whether there is a universal voter response. Consequently, it makes sense to compare voters' responses to high-

A Longitudinal Heuristic Polito-linguistic Approach to Metaphors in Authoritarian Regimes. The case of Aleksandr Lukashenko, president of the Republic of Belarus

Solvita Denisa-Liepniece

Vidzeme University of Applied Sciences, Valmiera¹

Abstract: Despite the recent tendency to evaluate the power of facts and fact-checking, the power of emotions continues to attract researchers. While fact-checking is now actively addressed in public discourse, recent decades have witnessed a growing interest in understanding communication related factors that influence audiences. This article presents a new approach, entitled the Polito- linguistic Metaphor Approach, which is designed for the longitudinal study of metaphors, specifically those metaphors used in authoritarian regimes. This approach can contribute to detecting crises encountered by the regime. The approach integrates two self-sufficient research methods for analyzing metaphors and one approach for studying political discourse in political rhetoric. Both quantitative and qualitative research methods are incorporated in this new method for studying metaphors in authoritarian political discourse. The research methodology of the Polito- linguistic analysis for the metaphors of an authoritarian leader is applied in this article to the (2004-2011) ritualistic political rhetoric by Aleksandr Lukashenko, president of Belarus.

Keywords: Belarus, Lukashenko, metaphor analysis, critical discourse analysis

Introduction

The persuasiveness of metaphors is nothing new. Influence as one of the main elements of political communication is achieved by appealing to emotions, and metaphors have emotional power. Implemented in a written form or orally, metaphors influence the audience at an emotional level. This explains why politicians so often employ metaphors when they communicate to their audiences, especially in times of crisis.

This article introduces a new approach, the Polito- linguistic Metaphor analysis, which offers the opportunity to measure changes in the rhetoric of authoritarian leaders. At the theoretical level this method is based on the politico-linguistic approach by Reisigl (2008) and his methods to studying metaphor, including the Corpus Approach to Critical Metaphor Analysis, and the politico-semantic approach by De Landtsheer (2015).

¹ E-mail: solvita.denisa@va.lv

There are two types of indicators that can demonstrate power decline in authoritarian regimes, i.e. action in crisis (or even making the crisis) and change in values (Gilley, 2008). The latter can be viewed as a kind of crisis of legitimacy, which Habermas linked to an “identity crisis” (1975, p. 46). The most important goal of any authoritarian regimes is to survive (Ambrosio, 2009; Linz & Stepan, 1996; Linz, 2000; Levitsky & Way, 2010).

A personalistic authoritarian regime aims at getting public support and it is crucial for this type of regime to control the public opinion – a source of legitimacy. To illustrate the new approach, we are using in this article some excerpts dealing with the case of the Republic of Belarus and political rhetoric of its president Lukashenko

This research demonstrates the usefulness of this approach for different purposes, including with regard to societal resilience and other strategic political communication issues.

Theoretical background

Language is not only a tool for actions for a politician, but it is political by itself. J. Walter and J. Helmig (2008, p. 121) argued that producing and receiving metaphors is essential for the identity of society and for social identity. These authors repeated the statement that language constructs social and political reality. By studying political language, therefore, it is possible to identify inclusion and exclusion.

At the same time, metaphor can be analyzed only by considering the context. One must grasp the sense in which the metaphor was used and study information about the moment in which it was used, such as the relationship between the sender and receiver among other important details (Walter & Helmig, 2008, p. 124). Metaphors serve both as a filter and as a focus of information. There is a social and cultural frame around the metaphor. For metaphor use (and understanding) a common base is essential, as only with a common base a metaphor can be implemented and circulated. The context has to be common, though some scholars, such as Bauman, do not agree that this is a necessary requirement, and the audience has to know the context, as Walter and Helmig (2008) argue. Cognitive analysis of metaphor lies outside the classic treatment of metaphor as a part of rhetoric, which requires analysis of metaphor using a linguistic framework. However, the cognitive approach is widely criticized because a number of its studies completely ignore discourse. What is important for the new approach, is the argument by Walter and Helmig (2008, p. 124) that metaphor is the main element of discourse.

C. De Landtsheer and I. De Vrij (2004) stressed that metaphor is the primary rhetorical tool for provoking emotions. They argue that emotions are the key for reaching the cognitive side. During an analysis, cognitive and emotional facets can be separated, but in real life it is difficult to draw this line. De Landtsheer and E. Koch (2005, p. 430) used an eloquent metaphor of glasses to describe how metaphor works. Some metaphors clarify, as glasses sharpen one’s vision; others blur and mystify the world when seen “through such glasses”.

There are three main research approaches to study metaphor: 1) introspective (related to philosophy); 2) corpus linguistics (related to linguistics); 3) psycholinguistic (related to cognitive psychology). Metaphor has been widely studied from a linguistic and a cognitive perspective. As we will explain in the following paragraphs, Critical Metaphor Analysis and Metaphor Power Model can be integrated with Critical Discourse Analysis. It is known that Critical Metaphor Analysis derives from Critical Discourse Analysis, and the Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis as an approach for analyzing metaphor. Both approaches have the same aim – to look at the language used by those in power to provide information about ideology.

Political Suitability in an Authoritarian Regime: A Comparison of the Personality Profiles of Vladimir Putin and Opposition Leader Alexei Navalny

Anna Diedkova and Christ'l De Landtsheer

University of Antwerp¹

Abstract: Studies in political psychology have linked the personality characteristics of leaders to political success, specifically regarding electoral results and leadership effectiveness in democracies. This article expands this literature by exploring the relationship between personality and political career in an electoral authoritarian regime. This research focuses on the psychological profiles of the Russian president Vladimir Putin and Alexei Navalny—one of his most prominent critics. We compare the personalities of two political rivals with unequal access to the political arena, employing at-a-distance assessment. Why is then the case that Putin seems to fear the rise of Navalny more than the communist party contestants, after all? The results indicate that if not for the regime restrictions, Navalny's personality profile and leadership style would be instrumental for his political career. The findings emphasize the need to differentiate between distinctive environment attributes (context of marginalized opposition and ruling elite) within the general context of an authoritarian regime when studying the value of certain personality patterns for leadership emergence.

Keywords: elites, elections, personality assessment at a distance, Russia, Putin, Navalny

Since the 1980s, political psychology has shown a growing interest in the personality traits of politicians (Hermann 1980; Post 1979; Winter 2013). Studies have established that personality assessment of political leaders contributes to the analysis of political decision-making (De Landtsheer and De Sutter 2011; Schafer 2000), and partially explains election outcomes (Joly, Soroka, and Loewen 2018; Wyatt and Silvester 2018). Nevertheless, comprehensive clinical evaluation of leaders' personalities often remains overlooked in the field (Immelman 2005), especially in regimes that demonstrate solidifying authoritarian features (Baturu and Elkink 2016; Sakwa, Hale and White, 2019; Sperling 2018).

This article addresses these limitations through *psychodiagnostic meta-analysis* (Immelman 1998, 2005), an at-a-distance assessment method aligned with clinical procedures and informed by the conceptual perspective of Theodore Millon (1994). This study employs a novel dataset of psychodiagnostics materials on two political leaders within the authoritarian regime of the Russian Federation, which was, until Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022, often described as a "hybrid" regime or a "regime in transition" (Ekman, 2009; Sakwa, 2010). The aim is to eval-

¹ Corresponding author: Anna.Diedkova@uantwerpen.be and christl.delandtsheer@uantwerpen.be

uate the incumbent president, Vladimir Putin, and the persecuted opposition leader, Alexei Navalny,² based on relevant personality patterns indicative of political success. The study broadens the scope of personality and political suitability research, including comparative studies of incumbents and opposition leaders, by applying it to an alternative, authoritarian political landscape. Moreover, Putin's long-term incumbency provides a unique opportunity for analysis. In addition, against the background of Russia's invasion in Ukraine (Hookway and Trofimov, 2022) this research might help international practitioners and academics to make sense of internal political processes in Russia, from the political psychology perspective.

The first section of the article contains an introduction to the study of leadership trait analysis in politics. We then discuss the Russian political setting and present the approaches to personality assessment, after which we review the personality characteristics related to political success. We pay attention to how different perspectives on personality research relate to each other and review our methodological choices. Thereafter, we discuss the results – the personality profiles of Putin and Navalny and their implications for political suitability.

Theory

Leadership personality traits and political success

Huddy, Sears and Levy (2013, 8) refer to *personality* as “relatively persistent individual differences that transcend specific situations and contribute to the observed stability of attitudes and behavior.” Despite the attention to political leaders' personalities, there is no consensus on the impact of personality on political success (Bittner 2008; Wyatt and Silvester 2018). Studies of political success refer to two concepts – leadership emergence (getting elected or appointed) and leader effectiveness (performance in office) (Antonakis 2011; Wyatt and Silvester 2018). Wyatt and Silvester (2018) indicate the disconnect between the characteristics that help politicians to get elected and those helping them to be effective leaders. The characteristics ascribed by voters have turned out to be better at predicting leadership emergence than at predicting leadership effectiveness (Wyatt and Silvester 2018). In addition, context can restrict the expression or visibility of particular characteristics and modify the impact of personality on political outcomes (Mehl, Robbins, and Holleran 2012; Winter 2013). Most politicians function within the range of actions afforded by their leadership role and are surrounded by the political elite, that can alter the outcomes of decision-making (Renshon 2003; Schafer 2000). According to Greenstein (1967), the more regulated the situation, the greater the chance that dissimilar personalities will behave similarly, according to the situational requirements. In contrast, the more ambiguous the situation, the greater the impact of personality, due to the absence of restrictions (Byman and Pollack 2001).

Political regime in Russia

Among the terms that occur in the literature to describe the political regime in Russia are competitive authoritarianism (Levitsky and Way 2002), and electoral authoritarianism (Gill 2015;

2 Alexei Navalny is an oppositional politician who has repeatedly declared his ambition to run for the Russian presidency (BBC 2021). Navalny is a founder of a nonprofit, investigating corruption at state-controlled corporations in Russia. Since 2010s, Navalny has been involved in several court cases, making him ineligible to run for president, followed by his subsequent prison sentence in 2021 (BBC 2021; Gel'man 2015).

The Mixed Communities as an Innovative Form of Political Organizing

Carmit Fuchs-Abarbanel

Center for Education, Beit Berl College¹

Abstract: The research examined Jewish communities with a new sociopolitical pattern: secular, religious, and traditional members. Researchers generally view Israeli society as composed of divides and groups educational systems and political parties, with a predominant secular-religious divide in Jewish society. Mixed communities counter separatism and segregation. Their development has implications for future national social processes. Their political pattern encourages social discourse promoting community-ness, handles social challenges dynamically, confronting social and political dilemmas. An inclusive educational system exemplifies this (secular, religious, and traditional students attending the same school. The new discourse offers a model for a fresh Israeli sociopolitical ideal. The communities explore questions impacting individuals and wider society. These innovations originated in ties between individuals and between population groups: unprecedented in Israeli society, they are gaining momentum and success.

Keywords: mixed communities, social challenges, Jewish communities, integration of different identities, modes of discourse.

This research sought to examine the phenomenon of communities with a mixed population of religious, traditional, and secular members. They are Jewish communities in Israeli society, displaying an innovative sociopolitical pattern.

The religious-secular divide as an engine for developing mixed communities

Mixed communities are an innovative model in Israeli society, known for its various divisions: one of the most prominent of those is the secular-religious divide.

In structural terms, Israel is characterized as multicultural. One characteristic of that reality is reflected in a diverse continuum of Jewish identities in everything pertaining to attitudes to Jewish religious tradition, its contents, authorities and so on. The degree to which mitzvot are upheld, the various ways in which they are upheld, their status and importance in the individual and community way of life, alongside the place of religion in public life and other topics, all split Israeli society into different groups and attest to the broad range of opinions (Azoulai and Wurzburg 2008; Ben-Yossef 2003; the Social Survey 2009; Liebman 1990:187; Leshem 2004). The Democracy Index shows that the Jewish population views the tension between secular and

¹ Address for correspondence: carmit68@gmail.com

religious citizens as second in severity after the left-right tension on political-security issues. In 2019 the issue of religionization was frequently the focus of public discourse (Herman et al. 2019).

Israel's defined Jewish identities are: (1) the haredi identity, a group typified by differentiation from general society, even from religious society; (2) the religious-nationalist identity (Zionist) characterized by a rich variety of societal traits and different degrees of openness to the modern. Its adherents are divided into different groups according to their proximity to the haredi stream, or to the traditional stream; (3) the traditional (Masorti) identity, characterizing people who have not undergone the processes of modernization and secularization. Traditional Israelis report their belief that they "live in the spirit of Judaism's values" (Yadgar 2008:11); and (4) the secular identity, which is not a unified entity. Researchers have defined various approaches to that identity: Yadgar (2012) describes them negatively – as people who are non-religious; Malkin (2006) contends that this group conducts itself in a rational-secular-humanist manner, and science the sole tool they use for understanding events and phenomena; Almog (2009) divides that group into three social groups with similar values in terms of education, family, and religious orientation. In comparison, Brand (2012) presents the halachic definition – those who are "sinners, converts, and apostates," while Sagi (1999) sees them as individuals who cherry-pick from Jewish traditions what suits them best, and to award them modern interpretations. Here, the most prominent point is the negation of halachic aspects of the Orthodox tradition.

Accordingly, with the increase in the number of problems and debates, and the decrease of the common denominator, dialogue between the camps grows more difficult, with less willingness for concessions and compromises. Major groups in Israel maintain that two issues – the future of the Occupied Territories (Judaea and Samaria), and the status of religion in the state – are substantive themes in shaping the collective identity (Cohen and Zisser 2003:87). Beyond relying on principled ideological disagreements, that divide is reflected in tangible disagreements on specific topics, such as the public character of the Sabbath (this includes several sub-topics – public transport, and opening commercial and leisure sites), the status of the non-orthodox streams in general, and the question of conversion to Judaism particularly, the laws governing Shabbat, some issues related to personal status, religious services, among many others (Cohen 2005:375; Tabori, 1992).

Research conducted in the 1980's and 1990's defined Israel as the arena of an intensifying "cultural war" between religious and secular Israelis (Goodman and Yona 2004:373). Concerns are frequently raised over social separation and division (Tzameret 2001:86), linked to the argument that, in a gradual process, the extremes in Israeli society are strengthening (Perlov 20 January 2009). In 2009 over half the respondents in the Social Survey (55%) believed that relationships between religious and nonreligious people in Israel were "not so good" or "not good at all" (Arian and Kaiser-Sugarman 2011:14).

The depth of the divide is noticeable in high-level institutionalization, which in turn is reflected in separate education systems, in political parties founded by various religious streams, in residential areas designated for different groups and so on. Attempts to settle the disagreements leading to that separation are made by means of the Status Quo agreement and other techniques employed in accordance with the consociationalism political model), typical of divided societies. This model avoids clear-cut decisions in the conflicted sphere, refrains from applying the principle of the majority and its power to decide, and prefers large-scale coalitions that encompass the groups engaged in cultural conflict, reciprocal recognition of the existence of red lines, and the reciprocal veto right held by the various streams. One example is the autonomy awarded to different streams in education, preference for the relative method in elections and the creation of government coalitions (Don-Yehia 1996:18-19; 2008; Lijphart 1975,

Sites of Democratic Awakenings in Berlin: 1848, 1918, 1968 and 1989

Ingo Juchler

University of Potsdam¹

Abstract: Like no other city in Germany, Berlin's urban landscape offers a boasts a myriad of historical sites of memory in the form of commemorative plaques, memorial and documentation sites, such as the Topography of Terror, Stolpersteine, the history mile on Wilhelmstraße or remnants of the Berlin Wall. Yet in Germany's dealing with its own past, there is also widespread evidence of historical amnesia. This loss of historical-political memory of democratic achievements is particularly obvious in articulations of authoritarian, and often times anti-democratic, positions in the political arena. To be sure, the historical forgetting of democratic traditions has adverse effects on current political discourse.

Sites of memory not only make it possible to visualize previous democratic processes, but also offer an opportunity to critically reflect on one's own political experiences. Learning can take place in the actual, physical places where people took a stand for freedom and democracy. Furthermore, through a shift in perspective the various motives of the historical actors can be perceived and evaluated in a new way.

The democratic upheavals of 1848, 1918, 1968, and 1989 are among the historical events that have decisively shaped democracy in Germany today. Indeed, they also occurred in a European context, and in the case of 1968, a global one. Across Berlin's urban landscape there are places that mark these key historical moments. This article examines these historical upheavals as constitutive lines of a democratic tradition and presents the places of remembrance still visible in Berlin and presents the places where they took place.

Keywords: democracy, sites of memory, Berlin: 1848, 1918, 1968 and 1989

The 1848 Revolution

After the Congress of Vienna in 1814/15, the ruling monarchies and principalities in Central Europe pursued a politics of restoration aimed to reinstate the power of the monarchs and restrict essential rights of freedom. Articulations of opposition soon emerged, such as the Hambacher Festival in 1832. There, 30,000 people gathered under the black-red-gold tricolor to demand liberal reforms. During the "pre-March" (*Vormärz*) period, the liberal opposition was concerned with the rule of law and the national unity of Germany. There were also demands for social justice. In the 1840s, the social grievances led to more uprisings and revolts, such as the Silesian weavers' revolt in June 1844 or the food riots in Berlin, the so-called potato revolution, in April 1847 in response to poor harvests.

¹ Contact: ingo.juchler@uni-potsdam.de

Liberal and social demands were also increasingly heard in Berlin inspired by the 1848 February Revolution in France, during which the citizen-king Louis-Philippe was deposed, as well as by the uprisings in Vienna, as a result of which Klemens von Metternich, the symbolic figure of the restoration, resigned and fled to London. In the process, *In den Zelten* in the Tiergarten, not far from today's Chancellery, became a key venue for revolutionary development: the restaurants located there were not affected by the ban on assembly in the city and, thus, provided a public space for popular assemblies and political debates. The main political demands included: freedom of the press, freedom of speech and assembly, an amnesty for political prisoners and democratic representation in government. Even after the barricade fighting on March 18-19, *In den Zelten* remained an important place of assembly for various revolutionary groups until, in the course of the restoration of the *ancien régime* at the end of April 1848, freedom of assembly was once again significantly restricted. But the leisure grounds in the Tiergarten remained in the tradition of free speech. More than a hundred years later, the Berlin Congress Hall (now the House of World Cultures) was built on the grounds of *In den Zelten* as part of the American contribution to the International Building Exhibition held in Berlin in 1957.

Eleanor Dulles was the driving force behind the American project. Architect Hugh Stubbins was chosen to design the Congress Hall. The building was meant to embody western values in the "frontier city" and architecturally provide an answer to the *Stalinallee* in East Berlin, which was built under the principles of socialist classicism. Its function as a congress hall underscored the political intention of the building as a place where the right of free speech could be practiced. It thus continued in the tradition of the popular assemblies during the 1848 March Revolution.

After the barricade fighting on March 18, 1848, the Prussian King Frederick William IV initially made political concessions. But in the course of the year he was able to regain his original position of power. The monarch refused the imperial crown offered to him by the Frankfurt National Assembly. His younger brother William, Prince of Prussia, as commander-in-chief, quelled the revolution in the Palatinate and Baden in 1849. After the Franco-Prussian War in 1870/71, he was crowned German Emperor William I in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles. Many of the defeated revolutionaries subsequently went into exile. In the USA, many of the so-called "Forty-Eighters" continued to be politically active and took over important positions. For example, they spoke out against slavery and supported Abraham Lincoln. Former revolutionaries such as Friedrich Hecker, Franz Sigel, Ludwig Blenker, Gustav Struve and Peter Joseph Osterhaus held high positions in the Union army, and Carl Schurz became Secretary of the Interior of the USA. Today, plans for a memorial to the "Forty-Eighters" is underway. It is to be erected in the immediate vicinity of the American Embassy and the Platz des 18. März (18th of March Square).

Platz des 18. März (18th of March Square)

"We will also be victorious if we only dare to fight"

The square in front of the Brandenburg Gate in the direction of the Tiergarten (city park) commemorates the barricade fighting on March 18, 1848 as well as the first (and last) free election to the East German People's Chamber on March 18, 1990. In the run-up to the 1848 revolution, thousands of people marched through the then city gate into the Tiergarten to the *In den Zelten* restaurants to discuss their ideas of political and social reforms. These revolutionary ideals found a voice across the German-speaking lands and Europe, from the social and democratic demands of Friedrich Hecker and Gustav Struve in September 1847 in Offenburg in Baden, to