The Democratic "Globalization" and "Localization" Under the Culture Diversification

TAN Rong[a]; SUN Hongwei[a],*

[a]Ph.D., Professor, Zhou Enlai School of Government, Nankai University, Tianjing, China.
[b]Ph.D., Zhou Enlai School of Government, Nankai University, Tianjing, China.
*Corresponding author.

Abstract

Political culture is a set of political attitudes, convictions, and emotions that prevail in a special period for a nationality, which influences the actions of the various political actors and the democratic process of a country. In the global era, the different nationalities and areas still maintain their own culture, exploring the suitable developing routes and having formed different democratic developing models. The political practices of such countries indicate that a stable and effective democratic government not only depends on the reasonable political systems and governmental structures, but also on the political values of the people. The world order should be more tolerant and plural, thereby supplying broader space for non-Western countries to choose suitable ways for themselves and combine the democratic globalization and localization together.

Key words: Culture diversification; Democracy; Globalization; Localization; Political culture

INTRODUCTION

For many years, it remained a contentious issue whether democracy has been a single Western definition or unique and distinct in the definition and practice with different political cultures of various countries, and whether the worldwide democratization process should all refer to the Western model or have several versions in accordance with different national political cultures. This paper attempts to explore this problem from the perspective of the relationship between political culture and democratic politics, cultural diversity with democratic *globalization* and *localization* to analyze cultural reasons of democratic mode pluralism in world development.

1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLITICAL CULTURE AND COUNTRIES POLITICAL STRUCTURE

The famous scholar of American comparative politics, Almond, believes that "political culture is a set of political attitudes, convictions, and emotions that prevails in a special period for a nationality. It is formed by the national history and the process of current social, economic, and political activities," (Almond & Powell, 2007, p.26) are the "civil cognition, feelings," and "internalized political institution," (Almond & Verba, 1989, p.15) and "influences the action of every political actor in the political system." (Almond & Powell, 2007, p.26) Another researcher of American comparative politics, Lawrence Meyer, calls political culture as temperamental characteristics, with a "subjective nature," "is individuals' internal state when they are exposed to certain stimuli and prompt them to respond in some way." "When these particularities are applied to a political object and reflected widely in the crowd to make them have the typical sense, they will become a part of political

culture." It embodied "the attitude toward authority; beliefs or notions to truth; dogmatism and pragmatism in the decision making; the sensibilities of such conducts as passion, alienation, refuse, trust or suspicion, and so on; cognition and knowledge; and some basic values." (Mayer et al., 2001, p.16) American political scientist Pye et al. (1965, p.513) consider that political culture is a set of systematic political subjective factors existing objectively in the political system (i.e., country), reflecting a social tradition and public spirit, the citizens' love and hate, popular political sentiments, leaders' activity patterns and specification; it makes personal political behavior run in a certain way, political systems have a value orientation and ensure some kind of consistency of the political system. Another American political scientist, Ronald Inglehart, proposes that political culture is a unique national historical experience and also the results of people learning continuingly at an early stage, so it is a lasting cultural factor and becomes a nation-specific and relatively stable cultural pattern. Such cultural identity is bound to bring important behavior consequences (Wang, 2000, p.171).

The political culture determines people's political orientation, the attitude toward the political institution, as well as the attitude of their own role in the political institution. When the political structure of a country adapts to its political culture, citizens of that country will have a sense of identity, and the awareness of people will tend to be distinctive. Conversely, people's thought will be on the chaos and they will feel at a loss due to the absence of direction. American sociologist Talcott Parsons, who divides a political system into two parts: political structure (mode of political behavior) and political culture (psychological orientation of political behavior), accounts for both affecting and checking each other, and ignores any one will result in a lopsided understanding to political system (Parsons & Shils, 1951, p.55). In the 19th century, Tocqueville, after investigating American society and politics, fully affirmed the rule of law in America. He considered that it has a great impact on American social happiness; meanwhile, he said: "I also have reasons to be sure this influence is less than public feelings." (Tocqueville, 1997, p.356) Meaning that the American legal system is built on the foundation of American public feelings, which is contrary to the political culture of the United States.

The attitudes of people from their past experiences shape a culture that affects behavior of various political actors and all kinds of activities in people's political life and, thus, becomes the foundation of political activities. Such attitudes and culture in different political systems show different "preference modes," (Almond, 1956) which then affects a country's democratization process; therefore, it is very necessary from the perspective of political culture to study the democratization trend of countries and development models, but also to investigate

"the suitability between political culture and political institution" (Gooding & Klingemann, 2006, pp.484-485) that appears in different political systems.

2. DIVERSITY OF POLITICAL CULTURE AND PLURALISM OF DEMOCRATIC MODES

Today, the world has entered the age of globalization. However, it is found from the development of various countries that each nationality still flaunts stubbornly its own cultural personality and seeks the development path suitable for itself. Thus, they form a variety of democratic political development models, known as the "East Asia Model," "South Asia Model," "India Model," "Latin America Model," "European Model," "Islam Model," "Africa Model," and so on. The new democratic localization emerging in different areas and countries demonstrates that people of different regions and ethnic groups do not have the same interpretations and preferences toward democracy in multiple cultural backgrounds.

2.1 East Asia Model

East Asia is located in the east part of the world, which contains many kinds of cultures. This area in history did not experience Western modernization and democratization process, such as the Renaissance, enlightenment movement, and the industrial revolution. Confucianism and cultural traditions pursuing a discipline order and obedience awareness and ethical principles have achieved a dominant position for a long period. So the Confucian value structure and sociocultural characteristics emphasize these factors, such as hierarchy, authority, filial piety, social customs and rituals, as well as behavioral norms. In countries with Confucian cultural traditions, the civil society is weak, the social force is frail, and the political process often runs along the interpersonal relationships track. Confucian ethics, different from the Western religious culture since the Middle Ages, are personified and requires people, through learning, to develop and perfect themselves in aspects of morals and spirit. Stressing political authority arranges for the publics interests and the responsibility of the people with the strongest moral consciousness.

For a long time, people thought that these conservative and traditional principles had hindered East Asian development and the democratization process. In such a culture, it is difficult to have powerful social forces to promote the societal democratization process. However, in the latter part of the 20th century, East Asian countries achieved great economic achievements, for example, Japan's rapid development and the emergence of the "four little dragons" stimulated people to look at Confucianism principles with a new vision and reconsider East Asian

development ethics and the institutionalized model, reexamine and reflect East Asian countries' political development goals, values, and mechanism choices, some people even commenced exploring the "Asian values." (Wiarda, 2004, p.15). It is found that the East Asian countries' economic miracle is not built on the foundation of democratic politics, the governments of these countries lead and organized native development and construction and played an active role in social and economic development. East Asian governments, both in the international system or in the relationship with their elite and social groups, have maintained a high degree of autonomy, which becomes a cultural feature.

Accompanied by East Asian countries being stronger, people have found out that, on the one hand, under the attack of globalization, East Asian countries have been steadily affluent, thus increasingly advocating pragmatism and owning a globalization mentality, and the democratic mechanisms have developed from top to bottom. On the other hand, the strength of civil society in East Asian countries is still frail, the initiative of a democratization course is grasped in the hands of elites cultivated up by the reform, and the democratic process depends on elites' attitudes and impetus. The ability of a regime is an important determinant in East Asian democratization process; the position of authority maintains a relative stability that becomes an important condition for East Asian countries toward democracy. People have noticed in the reform and development that it is just the state's capacity and role that reduces the risks brought by the democratic process of East Asian countries, the nation decides the social order, and bureaucratic groups, who are formed through the appointment and test selection, control the state trend. The nation is the dominant force in promoting the political, economic, and social development; puny civil society is difficult to request from the nation and also can't become forces independent of the nation. Such democracy and modernization courses have a strong East Asian traditional cultural character, and called "later Confucian" democratic model by some scholars (Ibid., p.98, 105).

The development model of East Asian countries is rooted in their histories and cultural traditions. Associated with the modernization between process and ethical spirits (such as respecting authority, stressing rank, and the concentration of power) penetrate into the political life, and it is the modern transformation of traditional political culture. States play their own ability to mobilize social political resources, at the same time they also adopt a number of Western-style democratic institutions. People's economic life in East Asian countries improved significantly, so they recognize the regime and make the regime legitimacy of states beyond actual performance of their democratic system. Based on the reality of East Asian development, some scholars propose that goals and values of political development are diverse rather than unique. In the aspects of government capacity and the role, as well as political order, different countries can and should make their own choices to fit their actuality (Chen, 2006, pp.16-17). Now, with a deepening study of the East Asian democratic political development and political cultural traditions, some scholars further explore democratic contents behind the traditional cultures, they deem that the development and utilization of such cultural resources have a great significance to promote and facilitate the East Asian democratic political development (Guo, 2010, p.15).

2.2 India Model

India is a country with ancient culture and civilization, as well as multiple religious and ethical traditions, located in South Asia, called Orient "operational democratic country" (Wiarda, 2004, p.15) by Westerners. However, India is not the Western development type. For a long time, the driving force of Indian development stemmed from two directions: One from Western liberal law, political systems, modern education as well as science and technology, and the other is from its own cultural traditions. In choosing the modern path, for one thing, it has inherited Western political liberalism; for another, it has been seeking independence to avoid being sunk into Western countries' spheres. It does not want to abandon political freedom adopted from the British; simultaneously they hope to lean on their own multiculturalism to make itself a trend for "multifaceted development." (Wiarda, 2006, p.41) The long-term history of British colonial rule makes this country mix external factors and local factors in the development: possessing multipartisan, holding regular competitive elections, but showing the instability in the political process and still staying in the ranks of underdeveloped countries in economics. Indian democracy is not like Western countries, which are the product of capitalist economic development, by contrast, a largely transplanted product, so when introducing Western liberal democracy, it will inevitably associate with the time-honored caste system and social bottom mechanism, and is bound to encounter its own unique problems in the democratic process.

In such a deep-rooted hierarchical society, its outstanding issue during the democratization process is the growth of people's political ability. The caste system makes Indian democracy form some kinds of a participation sequence, different social and economic classes can participate in politics in accordance with the sequence (Ibid., pp.108-109). In the social and economic level, India's caste and religious culture exhibits the obedience in social affairs and the freedom in religion. People allow and tolerate cultural pluralism while abiding the community consistency. When such freedom and tolerance infiltrate into its political level, it will display a sort of inestimable value. The Indian democratic process has been run through the quantity principle, periodic

elections, and the principle of one person, one vote. In the competition for political power, middle and lower castes join up to challenge the upper caste, prominently demonstrating the participation characteristics, this makes the Indian traditional caste system eroded, and Indian populace and its grassroots join the democratization process (Wiarda, 2004, p.113). On the one hand, implementing a Western parliamentary system, while on the other hand, retaining local Presbyterian of a native grassroots type. It blends the Western system with its own traditions. Nevertheless, Indians, who are deeply rooted in hierarchy and traditional social relations, still tend to authoritarian rule in politics. The society is full of factions and distrust with highlighted performances of community conflict and division. Upper castes and the forces owning land refuse to give up their dominance, but they also do not allow the lower social forces to encroach on their inherent privileges.

Different from the situation that formation of civil political capacity and civil societal development of Western countries experienced, several centuries' evolution to match their democratic political development process, the creation of the Indian political participation mechanism and the realization of adult suffrage are all earlier than the formation of the capacity of the people using these systems effectively; therefore, the Indian democratic mechanism has the traits of vulnerability, instability, and immaturity. The middle class is extremely indifferent to politics, while well-educated and having a skill and competitive in the community; however, they do not think they have any responsibility for the development of national democratic institutions. They love freedom and democracy and hate bitterly selfishness and corruption of the political class, yet they do not want to reach out to help the government improve the management nor want to have anything to do with public life (Ibid., p.119).

Indian practices proclaim that only having the electoral system and multiparty competition does not mean a realization of truly democratic politics. The representative politics having no public responsibility is difficult to be called true democracy. The construction of democratic politics must be accompanied by the growth of civil society and the enhancement of people's political ability. Therefore, it is an important task for the current Indian democratic road to carry forward excellent native culture, develop education, carry out a moral calling to society, and cultivate a social class with responsibility and political awareness.

2.3 Latin America Model

Latin America is located in the West, a geographical area adjacent to the United States. Despite this, the people of Latin America are distinct from Americans in both psychology and politics. Latin America was once a Spanish and Portuguese colony; its ideological and political traditions are closely linked with Medieval Western European premodern traditions. In modern times, Latin American countries were constantly subjected to the edification of modern Western cultures, but it inherited traditions of authoritarianism, hierarchy, elitism, etc. from Medieval Western Europe, making it bog down and fall far behind when its neighbor America marched toward modern democracy.

According to the Anglo-Saxon cultural tradition, Catholicism is a religion rejecting democracy because: Democracy requires an independent mind, yet the Catholics requires obedience; Democracy holds that everyone is equal, yet Catholics recognize social hierarchy; Democracy allows explanation of statutory law, yet Catholics tightly controls interpretation of sacred text. In the Western view, the Protestant system closely linked with democracy is the only acceptable version, but they ignore that democracy may have a Catholic edition. The fact is: In Latin American countries, since the beginning of 20th century, the doctrine and beliefs of Catholics have always owned a lasting influence and played an important role in the social integration process of Latin American countries. The Catholic democratic version emphasizes internal consistency, organic combination, and interdependence, which are placed above the equality and personality. Different from institutional arrangements of governments internal constraints under Protestant liberal tradition, institutional arrangements under the Catholic version emphasize external constraints on the nation and government. It pursues a corporate organic model, and groups or corporation institutions have certain restrictions on power and tyranny, although such restrictions shall be advanced under the unified leadership of political leaders from top to bottom. Under such cultural traditions, the authority has an unassailable position, but that does not mean it need not be restricted. Instead, the philosophy of such systems is: authority is supremacy only in the secular realm, and it must be restricted by divine law and natural law in a greater range. Under such Iberian traditions, in the absence of a more rational and effective internal restriction mechanism, institutional arrangements pay more attention and emphasize the moral strength and the conscience guidance.

Latin American countries have been calling for reforms, trying to carry out a controlled change, namely "through organic, strictly managed, centralized, and integrated political model to integrate various social forces into the track and the political process controlled by country, then adapt to change under the support and control by the elites." (Wiarda, 2006, p.66) Western liberal culture exerts a gradual long-term influence on people of this region. They greatly treasure freedom and democracy and often hope to transform themselves with the aid of the Western liberal democracy. However, in the mid and late 20th century, the course that Latin America countries pursued was plural political democracy that enunciates that a region with a lack of realistic

underpinning and historical roots searches a democratic model not suitable for their own circumstances is doomed to fail. Latin American countries untimely implemented a wrong democratic model leading to the countries' political turmoil and economic crisis. The practice of Latin American development declares that "When authoritarianism is no longer accepted by people, liberalism in Latin America context is also repeatedly frustrated." (Ibid., p.64) The reality is that the marketization, small government, and liberal democratic road in North America are difficult to be the best choices for Latin America countries in the contemporary period.

Over many years, it becomes a vexing issue that Latinos have been plagued by their development path. American scholar Howard J. Wiarda (2005, p.141) said: "In fact, cultural sites are the filters of development and factors blocking the invasion of some Western thought as well as letting the others enter." Latin America cultural hybridization often becomes a problem when you "mix American, European, local and Spanish traditions in a chaotic way; is frequently unpredictable and bewildered; and shows a strange blend of democracy and authority in its democratic process." (Wiarda, 2004, p.173) The development course in Latin America indicates that no matter how the world situation changes and regardless of how Latinos swing in the moving road, there is one point undoubted, that is: At any time, the recognition of local people for cultures and values is a key factor in this regional development and plays a decisive role for Latin America countries in choosing a development path.

2.4 European Model

Not just the development path of developed Western countries and non-Western developing countries differs, even between Europe and America, due to distinct historical traditions, the connotation of liberalism and democracy are not alike. Europeans said liberalism has more connotations of economic philosophy rather than political philosophy. Europeans stressed democracy as having more emphasis on social democracy and the welfare state rather than just political democracy advocated by Americans. The history of European development makes people give priority to the attention of social rights. Europeans generally believe that social problems are affairs the country must be concerned about and rarely like the United States entrusted a large number of social issues to the market. As early as the beginning of the 20th century, when German politics began to move toward democracy, the prestigious Weimar Constitution held high the banner of social and economic democracy, and called for social and economic equality, reflecting a European democratic concept.

The long-term feudal autocracy and the history of nation-state development make European democracy a strong conservative color, its specific performance is the integration tradition into the political process, and emphasizing social solidarity and communalism rather than pursuing American individualism. The country occupies an important position in the political, social, and economic operation and maintains a relative separation with society. In the design of political system structures, European countries are reflected more as a representative system from this to fuse social left-wing, right-wing, and multiple forces rather than Americans rigorously pursuing the principle of separation of powers with checks and balances in the government system. For a long time, social movements of continental Europe showed a strong social reformism color, social policy has become an important national political issue, unlike Americans drastically implementing managerialism and market-oriented reforms.

2.5 Islam Model

Some scholars, when studying the Muslim world, put forward whether Islam and democracy are compatible. They believe the Koran requires that Muslims resolve the collective affairs by "Shura" consulting each other. Shura means equal participants discuss with each other, not just by the rulers, to get advice from vassals or colleagues. Leaders may determine the way of consultation according to the needs, and people achieve the goal through the elected representative assembly and have the right to participate in government decision making. Fazlur Rahman considers that refusing to recognize Muslim community with the right to practice a democratic system makes the Islam system to become empty and useless (Ibid., p.98, 146). Prophet Muhammad never explained how to choose his successor, and medieval Muslim jurists did not address the right of choosing governors by people, but they tried to solve the problems of rulers' responsibility and political obligation, which means what Muslims should do when facing an evil ruler. In the Muslim world, until now they retained the tradition that the Prophet handed down, namely, "when you see the evil man, kill them with your own hands; if not, use words to expel them; or despise them in the heart, which is the bottom line of trust." (Syed, 1982, p.16). So far, the Muslim mass still maintains the state of using the soul to despise tyrants. In their views, "the community can withdraw allegiance to an evil ruler," because "if the behavior of the rulers violates Sharia law, the obligation of people obeying the dominators will terminate." (Wiarda, 2004, p.98, 144-145)

Some Western scholars researching Islam found that Islam and their historical traditions contain favorable factors for democracy, so reinterpretation of Islam and its historical traditions may make Muslims have both Islam traditions and democracy. Today, along with the increasingly convenient communication and more developed education, Islam and Muslim local traditions are undergoing some kind of change, to a greater or lesser degree, deriving some content from Western culture, meanwhile, exploring their own democratic development path.

3. GLOBALIZATION AND LOCALIZATION OF DEMOCRACY

A Western modernization theory puts forward: "the modern cultural structure and a basic system pattern developed by modern Europe will be eventually all accepted by all modernizing and modern society; with the expansion of modernity, they will be popular around the world." (Guo, 2010, p.14) Japanese-American scholar Francis Fukuyama in his book *The End of History and the Last Man,* proposed the view of "the end of history," deemed that liberal democracy practiced by Western countries is "the end of human ideology development" or "the last dominant form of humanity." (Fukuyama, 2003, p.57) However, the reality that the development of various countries, especially non-Western countries, states clearly political and economic reforms implemented by Western modernization theory does not necessarily bring development, prosperity, freedom, and democracy to the vast number of developing countries. Instead, many countries got caught in a vicious cycle of political instability, economic crisis, social development disorders, cultural distortions, and so on. Political practices of various countries manifest that only the democracy established on the basis of their historical culture and traditions can truly be stable and lasting. A stable and effective democratic government not only relies on the rational political system and government structure, but also depends on people's political values. Unless people's political values support the established political system, or such system, cannot be successful (Almond & Verba, 1989, p.546). Countries ignoring their own conditions and blindly copying the Western democracy model often appear not to be acclimatizing problems.

Since the late 20th century, non-Western countries and developing countries gradually have become aware of their own cultural values in practices and introspections. They "have found the reason to keep the dignity and individuality of their cultural values," "got comfort from these," (Perroux, 1987, p.127, 160) begun to emphasize endogenous development, and advocated finding the development types and ways based on their own cultural identity, thoughts, and action structures. They pose, "there are how many societies, and it should be how many layouts and development modes. The same and unified development model suitable for all does not exist." (UNESCO, 1988, p.19) Stressing the importance of historical cultural traditions and accounting for the culture of a nation is its inherent spirit power for development. This not only determines the basic direction of development, but also determines the type and mode of development. When American scholar Robert D. Putnam, studying Italian government reform and civic cultural traditions, put forward that in the past one thousand years Italy experienced a huge economic, social, political, and demographic change; "however, some things don't change," "civic traditions have amazing resilience," which "proves that the history has power." (Putnam, 2001, p.189). Famous East Asian politics expert Lucian W. Pye also advances the analysis of political culture in East Asia that political culture has significant persistence, the divergences of political culture has a decisive significance in determining the political development process (Pye, 1985, p.viii, 20).

Since the late 20th century, the evolution of democratization is in leaps and bounds around the world. In the wave of globalization, Western political civilization has continuously expanded. Such expansion, however, continues to encounter resistance, the globalization of Western democracies face difficulties. In this course, some Westerners found democracy in non-Western countries is not their familiar liberal democracy (Huntington, 2003, p.41). Practices have proved that Westerners can output their cultural elements, but they can't suppress and eliminate the core elements of non-Western countries' own culture. The facts testify that cultural output of a country is not an easy thing and such output may be "experiencing substantial changes" in the process (Almond & Verba, 1989, p.15).

Nowadays, the world has entered the period of globalization, which is a growing degree of interconnection between various countries and regions, all countries in the world are facing more and more problems in common, but also the increasing need for mutual cooperation. However, the cooperation and globalization to solve common problems do not mean achieving Western-dominated world harmony and integration. As the famous British scholar David Held said, "The globalization process does not necessarily lead to the development of global integration," "The globalization process does not necessarily lead to the world order manifested, the mark of unified social and political constant developments." Globalization "is neither a single condition, nor a linear course," but rather "a multidimensional phenomenon of different activities and interaction scopes involving economy, politics, technology, military, legal, culture, environment, and so on. Each area could include different relationship and activity patterns." Each nation-state "brings into the regional and global trend in different ways." (Held, 2004, p.425. 427).

Since the late 20th century, under the conflict between cultural universalism and relativism in the epoch of globalization, some people have been trying to seek "a thinking frame about world politics." (Huntington, 2002, p.1). However, the reality is: with the growth of power and self-confidence, non-Western societies increasingly assert their own cultural values and reject those cultural values imposed by the West. American Harvard University professor Samuel Huntington believes: "In the post-Cold War world, the most important difference among the people is not ideological, political or economic,

but cultural." He deems that "in the coming years, the world will not emerge as a single universal culture, but there will be many different cultures and civilizations coexist." Global politics will "become a multipolar and multicultural for the first time in history." (Ibid., pp.5-6)

Since the 1980s and 1990s, the localization of democracy has been growing into the development agenda of the non-Western world. Various countries are going through such a process, that is, the introduction of a foreign culture and making them localization by copying and purification. In this process, the non-Western countries pose that "we will be modern, but we will not be yours." (Ibid., p.101) Non-Western countries recognize clearly in practice that they must go their own ways rather than take the western road, and they must achieve their own modernization on the rudiments of their own traditions, institutions, and values in order to achieve modernization.

The actuality of world development makes it clear that the present globalization world order should be more tolerant and pluralistic, thus providing a broader space for non-Western countries going their suitable way and linking democratic globalization and localization, rather than attempting to reconstruct other countries culture with might. The future world must be one full of multiculture and harmonious utopia, which can tolerantly accept cultural diversity and pluralism of the democratic development paths.

REFERENCES

Almond, G. A., & Powell, G. B. Jr. (2007). *Comparative politics: System, process, and policy* (p.26). Beijing: The Eastern Publishing Co. Ltd.

Almond, G. A., & Verba, S. (1989). *The civic culture: Political attitudes and democracy in five nations* (D. J. Ma et al., Trans.). Hangzhou, China: Zhejiang People's Publishing House.

Almond, G. A. (1956). Comparative political systems. *The Journal of Politics*, *3,* 396.

Chen, Y. (2006). *Democratization of the neo-authoritarian regimes* (pp.16-17). Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.

Fukuyama, F. (2003). *The end of history and the last man.* (S. Q. Hua & M. Xu, Trans., p.57). Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.

Gooding, R., & Klingemann, H.-D. (2006). *New handbook of political science* (K. B. Zhong et al., Trans., pp.484-485). Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company.

Guo, D. P. (2010). East Asian confucian culture and democratic transition: A theoretical analysis framework. In D. P. Guo (Ed.), *Culture and democracy* (p.15). Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe.

Held, D. (2004). *Models of democracy* (J. R. Yan et al., Trans., p.425, 427). Beijing: Central Compilation & Translation Press.

Huntington, S. P., & Li, J. Q. (Trans. and Ed.). (2003). The clash of civilizations again. *Marxism & Reality,* (1), 39-44.

Huntington, S. P. (2002). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. Hong Kong: Xinhua Publishing House.

Mayer, L. C., et al. (2001). *Comparative politics: Nations and theories in a changing world* (p.16). Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House.

Parsons, T., & Shils, E. (Eds.). (1951). *Toward a general theory of action* (p.55). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Perroux, F. (1987). *A new concept of development* (N. Zhang & Z. Y. Feng, Trans., p.127, 160). Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House.

Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy* (L. Wang & H. R. Lai, Trans., p.189). Jiangxi, China: Jiangxi People's Publishing House.

Pye, L. W., & Verba, S. (1965). *Political culture and political development* (p.513). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pye, L. W. (1985). *Asian power and politics: The cultural dimensions of authority* (p.viii, 20). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Syed, A. H. (1982). *Pakistan: Islam, politics, and national solidarity* (p.16). New York: Praeger.

Tocqueville. (1997). *Democracy in America*. (G. L. Dong, Trans., p.356). The Commercial Press.

UNESCO. (Ed.). (1988). *Strategies for endogenous development* (X. H. Lu et al., Trans., p.19). Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press.

Wang, Y. L. (Trans.). (2000). *Introduction to political culture* (p.171). Beijing: China Renmin University Press.

Wiarda, H. J. (2004). *Comparative democracy and democratization* (Y. Rong Trans.). Beijing: Peking University Press.

Wiarda, H. J. (2006). *Non-western theories of development: Regional norms versus global trends* (p.41). Beijing: Peking University Press.

Wiarda, H. J. (2005). *Introduction to comparative politics: Concepts and processes* (p.141). Beijing: Peking University Press.