

National Research University Higher School of Economics
Ghent University

As a manuscript

Ivan Kislenko

**The Idea of Global Sociology in the International Sociological Agenda: Unity and Diversity
of interpretations**

PhD Thesis summary for the purpose of obtaining academic degree PhD in Sociology

Academic Supervisors:

Dr. Sc. Soc., professor,
Alexander Filippov (HSE University)

PhD in Sociology, professor,
Raf Vanderstraeten (Ghent University)

Moscow – Ghent, 2022

Introduction. What is (un)known about global sociology?¹

In the recent past, “global sociology” was the topic of a number of international conferences and events such as the World Congresses of the International Sociological Association (ISA) in 2010 and in 2014 as well as the interim ISA Forum of Sociology in 2016. The journals of the ISA, viz. *Current Sociology*, *International Sociology* and *Global Dialogue*, have also provided much space to the debates. The International Institute for Sociology (IIS) devoted its 40th World Congress in 2012 to the topic of “After Western Hegemony: Social Science and its Publics”. For these institutions and associations, the idea of a new global sociology clearly seems (or seemed) able to provide both a program and a *raison d'être*.

The current president of the ISA, the Syrian-Palestinian sociologist Hanafi underwrites the “critical” directions in which global sociology is developing (Hanafi 2020). Editors of the ISA journals also intend to further the development of a “genuinely global sociology” (e.g. Li 2019). A new momentum seems to have emerged, although, of course, it might well be that the COVID-19 pandemic will divert attention to other types of research. Under the label of global sociology, epistemological diversity is now widely endorsed (Pleyers, 2020). The unity of the discipline seems to rely on ideas about social justice and on coordinated actions in striving for a better world.

Pleas for taking “internationalization” in sociology seriously abound. Some energy has been invested in introducing various local, “indigenous” traditions to the “international” sociological community (e.g. Alatas, 2006; Burawoy, 2011; Patel, 2010). The elaboration of a global southern perspective – directed at providing sociology for the whole world – has been proposed to address inequalities within sociology itself (esp. Connell, 2007).

The rise of the idea of global sociology seems to constitute a reaction to perceived social and scientific crises (Szelenyi, 2015), but the notion itself is used for a variety of geographical imaginaries and a variety of perspectives on sociology (Sorokin 2016, 2018). For

¹ Part of this introduction is published in: Kislenko, I. Debates on global sociology: “unity and diversity” of interpretations // *The American Sociologist*.

some researchers, the “dream” of global sociology is a late response to the inequalities in the world system. It is then linked with theoretical visions such as dependency and postcolonial theory (Bhambra, 2014; Alatas SF, 2006). At times, it is also linked with calls for “equal access” for all, to the main publication outlets in the discipline (Albrow, 1987). For others, the debate has been dominated by ideological, not by scientific arguments (e.g. Sztompka, 2011). Most participants in the debates probably agree that “global sociology” does not (yet) exist, but they clearly disagree about the direction into which sociology has to develop and the ways in which the discipline has to deal with its own intellectual past and heritage. While empirical tests of the globalization of different aspect of publishing formats in sociology have seen the light of day (Beigel, 2014; Collyer 2018; Koch & Vanderstraeten, 2019; Koch et al, 2020; Vanderstraeten and Eykens 2018), hitherto systematic sociological-historical reflections on the particulars of the debates on global sociology do not exist and a critical reflection on how the debates have taken place in these institutional contexts is lacking.

One of the first mentions of the global sociology notion could be found in 1966 in an article presented by a student of Parsons, Moore. He started from the observation that sociology as a discipline had been spreading rapidly to many different parts of the world, but also noticed that society remained “operationally” defined in terms of national units or cultures, if only because social data were mostly taken and aggregated at the national level (Moore 1966: 479-480). Instead, Moore suggested considering the world as a single system that could be analyzed as a global order (see also Parsons 1971). Global sociology thus had to focus on the “super-systems” that structured human life on the globe (Moore 1966: 482)². A more “critical” perspective soon started to dominate, however. Conflicts and inequalities became the point of departure of many discussions on global sociology. The scientific and historical context only contributed to the development of such an idea. Sociology as a scientific discipline is inevitably connected with the spirit of the time, where its main practices are implemented. The second half

² Other examples of early uses of the idea can be added (Hallen & Prasad 1970; Motwani 1971).

of the 20th century was a period of significant political, economic and social changes. All these factors are related to the researched topic. At this time, the process of obtaining independence by a large number of colonial countries, huge geopolitical changes and economic turmoil took place.

In the 1970s and 1980s, sociologists from South America, Africa, Australia, Oceania and partially Asia started to acquire broader, international visibility, i.e. they began to publish more in English and attracted a lot of attention to local academic traditions. They also criticized the Western centrism of academic sociology and the growing dominance of the Anglo-Saxon communication media and advocated for equal access to publication outlets and sociological organizations (Akiwowo, 1988; Amin, 1989; Said, 1978). Many of the ensuing discussions focused on the question of whether the knowledge produced within sociology is universal. Two positions emerged. While adherents of universalism argued that sociology as a scientific discipline exists in a single world and that its fundamental principles are applicable globally, they could also mark the opponents of this position (explicitly or implicitly) as supporters of “particularism” (Archer, 1987, 1991; Sztompka, 1988, 1991). They argued that local contexts play an important role in research, allow for the creation of a non-Western agenda, and provide for an alternative point of view on both social and sociological issues (e.g. Akiwowo 1986, 1988). By stressing the importance of local contexts, they also questioned whether sociology had to position itself within one world or within many worlds.

Issues related to postcolonialism also became entwined with discussions about sociology and sociological knowledge (Oommen, 1991; 1995). Sociologists around the world at that time, most often, were radical students with conservative professors: “the discipline was finding its way out of structural-functionalism’s dead-end street, blossoming instead into a Mecca for radical – and very smart – students” (Szelenyi, 2015). It is not surprising that a new generation of sociologists was involved in the discussion of the new ideas proposed by the global South, which were absent in the public space of sociological discipline for a long time.

International sociological associations, and especially the ISA, began to put forward a new *raison d'être* and program in the course of the 1980s. Members of the ISA no longer understood their purpose in terms of stimulating the development of sociology in all parts of the world, but actively started to discuss the validity of different traditions and various kinds of knowledge. Its new *raison d'être* led, among other things, to the organization of the first international congress of sociology outside the Western world (ISA World Congress 1982 in Mexico City). The pleas for an indigenization of sociology, which were made in this context and period, remained questionable in the eyes of defenders of the universalist version of sociology. The aforementioned international sociological organizations became a platform for discussions about global sociology and associated sociological research programs. The IIS was created in 1893 (by Worms in Paris) and the ISA founded in 1949 under the auspices of UNESCO. However, it is only in the late 1970s and 1980s that they began to stimulate and organize wider debates on the topics of internationalization and globalization. The discussion was rapidly developed, and by the beginning of the 1990s has taken a significant place in the discourse of social sciences. Throughout the final two decades of the 20th century, the opposition between universalist and particularist conceptions continued to define the terms of the debates on global sociology.

The terms of the discussion changed rapidly around the turn of the century. Critical in this regard has been the figure of Burawoy. As president of the ASA and later of the ISA, he was able to canalize ongoing discussions and give momentum to the debate on global sociology. The focus thereby shifted towards global inequalities and hegemonic relations between the global North and global South. Sociologists from all over the world have, in recent years, both criticized the universalist hegemony of the North and argued for the articulation of alternative, counter-hegemonic forms of sociology in the global South.

During the time the set of ideas, which are associated with the field of global sociology expanded rapidly. Nowadays, it is possible to outline notions, which are the part the researched

umbrella term. On the one hand, in this dissertation it will be called international face of global sociology: southern theory, indigenous and national sociologies, epistemologies of the South, academic dependency and issues related to global production of knowledge (Martin & Beittel, 1998; Kislenco, 2021). On the other hand, public face of global sociology, which could be considered as a struggle for resources. There are also those theories, which use the main idea of these faces and exist in the state of global sociology of the middle range. It could be typical sociological topics such as race, education, care, human rights etc.

All these theories come to sociology from different parts of the world at that period of time, when the idea of global present emerged. The desire to globalize sociology appeared in minds of scholars, but the problem arose. Such an idea was produced in old Eurocentric centers of sociological power. It became clear that the places where they wanted to expand sociology have different opinion on this issue. The necessity to find new centers of power and to re-define the whole space of global production of knowledge in sociology became clear (see section 1.2.).

Relevance of the research

The main statement that needs to be kept in mind from the very beginning is that the theoretical field of global sociology is diverse and has not been demarcated yet. It creates confusion not only in the reader's perception of the idea, but also provokes misunderstanding on the history of the concept. Since this notion refers to a wide range of ideas, the historical ups and downs in the fate of the concept are described in different ways, sometimes significantly differently from each other. Nevertheless, it is still possible to identify the broadest definition of the researched idea: “global sociology implies an active, open, mutually beneficial and equal interaction between sociologists from different locations, countries and cultures, in their joint efforts to understand, explain and improve the social world” (Sorokin, 2016: 43).

Currently, the fate of the idea from its appearance to the current state of affairs has not been traced. There is no articulated history of the concept, no periodization, and there is no division in the historical stages. Now global sociology is a set of different ideas and research

practices that differ in various publications. In order to distinguish existing interpretations and to implement a historical and analytical reconstruction of the fate of such an idea, this work was written.

The notion of global sociology is used to describe diverse phenomena and it is difficult to identify this idea with one concrete direction of research (Connell, 2007; Turner, 1989; Akiwowo, 1999). Indeed, this idea has different perspectives and could be considered in the context of different disciplinary practices (Sorokin, 2016; 2018). Sometimes everything that is somehow connected with the words: “globalization”, “globalism”, “globality” is identified with this notion. Nevertheless, “global sociology” has its own specific intellectual history, followers, and institutional basis. There is no exact clarity of what can be considered as “global sociology”.

Almost 40 years have passed since the crucial for the international sociology ISA World Congresses in 1982 and 1986, a little less – since the speech of Archer in Madrid as well as from the foundation of *International Sociology*: basically, the starting point in the fate of such ideas (Archer, 1991). The time period, which has already passed, allows us to look at the issue from the retrospective point of view and to describe and distinguish the existing “unity and diversity” in sociology.

More than 50 years have passed since the first appearance of the idea in publications. Sociology has undergone significant changes during this time. It has passed at least one major general sociological crisis, several fundamental changes and the absence of a large project over a long period of time, although attempts have been made to change this state of affairs several times. There are many diverse areas of research, both theoretical and empirical. Similar events accompanied the development of global sociology. Over the years, discussions have been held on the internationalization of the sociological discipline. Earlier, historical and sociological research in the field of global sociology could not be implemented due to the fact that a short period of time passed, and it was not possible to analyze this phenomenon in a historical context. In order to implement such a task and to focus on concrete issues, it is necessary to suggest an

adequate time period for the analysis. The starting point is the 1982 ISA World Congress in Mexico City, which was the first such event in a country of the global South. Since this time, the discussion on global sociology started to expand its influence. Therefore, this work concentrates on the relevant ideas presented in the international agenda for the last 40 years. Nevertheless, all necessary references to earlier events and works were also made in order to provide appropriate context for better understanding of the idea.

Where might this debate lead? Some “outside” observers have been struck by the ways in which the debate has been conducted – both in the late 20th and the early 21st century. Positions in the debate are often presented as political, if not ideological choices. Participants do not just claim to present better arguments than their opponents, but rather claim to defend the only possible legitimate or “just” stance. The opponents are at the same time blamed for their political partisanship and ideological myopia. At various moments, epistemological arguments (whether in the universalist or the counter-hegemonic version of global sociology) have been subordinate to ideological arguments. The question is whether and how we can capitalize on the momentum and use the interest in global sociology to reflect upon the nature of sociology itself, upon the social infrastructure of the discipline and its intellectual programs.

Recently, sociologists from all over the world have felt urged to take a stance in the debate on global sociology. Of course, the distinction marked by global sociology leads to only one among many possible subdivisions in sociology (others include: gender, religion, language, and race). As this dissertation will demonstrate, however, the history of the debate on global sociology allows us to obtain a good understanding of the challenges with which sociology is currently confronted. It provides us with a reflective prism that we can use to see what has been and what still needs to be accomplished. The “dream” of global sociology might continue to generate heated discussions, but it is also important to understand how the terms of the debate have changed over the past decades and how sociology itself might change for the better.

For all the reasons stated above, it seems important to clearly distinguish and classify the main approaches to the understanding of the idea of global sociology.

Background of the research

Global sociology and the issues traditionally identified with this idea, occupy more and more space in publications and gain more attention from researchers from different countries (Burawoy, 2010; 2015; Patel, 2010; 2019; Bhambra, 2014; 2015; Hanafi, 2019, 2020). Historically, “global sociology” is used to describe diverse phenomena and it is difficult to identify this collocation with one concrete direction of the research (Connell, 2007; Turner, 1989; Akiwowo, 1999).

There is a lack of research on the historical analysis of the existing discussion due to the specific characteristics of the field (variability of the usage of the term, the initial vague borders of the research area, etc.). Authors prefer to work with the history of local traditions and mostly do not focus on the history of debates (Genov, 1989; Patel, 2010; Facing an unequal world, 2010; Alatas SF, 2014). The majority of such research concentrates on exact parts of the world: the alternative non-western history of sociology or national traditions in social sciences (Alatas SH, 1979; Alatas SF, 2006ab; Alatas SF & Sinha, 2017; Patel, 2011).

Some authors also consider the history of international sociological organizations such as ISA and IIS, as a part of the internationalization processes in sociology, but concentrated only on this important, but restricted area (Platt, 1998; Schuerkins, 1996). Others focus on the empirical testing of the internationalization of sociology on the national and global scale (Koch & Vanderstraeten, 2019; Collyer, 2018). Sociologists also consider historical aspects of eurocentrism, academic dependence or postcolonial and subaltern perspective in history and in social sciences (Amin, 1989; Alatas SF, 2003; Chakrobarty, 2000; Guha, 1989; Mignolo, 2012; Santos, 2007). All these works are extremely important for global sociology. They analyzed issues that were no less significant and eventually became a classical part of the global mosaïque of the discipline. Nevertheless, they do not reflect, and certainly never aim to make a historical

overview of the discussion – only some elements, which are obviously connected to the state of debates.

The most accurate attempt to evaluate the idea of global sociology from a similar standpoint was made by Martin and Beittel (1998). They tried to analyze both sides of the discussion and create a “map of ideas” in global sociology. This work is the most representative attempt to properly historically reconstruct the debates in global sociology. These authors described the majority of crucial ideas, even though they ignore some important moments, such as some aspects of the early stages of the discussion and the variability of terminology. More than 20 years has passed since Martin and Beittel’s work was published. For this reason, the necessity to properly present and reconstruct the arguments of scientists emerged since the state of affairs in the framework of the research direction has changed significantly. New ideas, approaches and interpretations have appeared, which were absent in the authors' work, for obvious reasons, but it requires appropriate consideration. In addition, such a genre as a scientific article is limited in the means of representation and analysis of the discussion. For this reason, the necessity for a proper presentation of the arguments of the scientists and the reconstruction of the historical perspective of the discussion has become apparent.

It is also necessary to highlight Russian and Russian-speaking authors, who made a significant contribution through publications both on global sociology itself and on issues (in)directly connected to the field: Pokrovskii, Devyatko, Sorokin, Zdravomyslov, Zdravomyslova, Titarenko, Yadov, Filippov, Polyakova, Romanovskii and others (2011, 2019; 2001; 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018; 2007; 2008; 2012; 2011; 2008; 2019;1999).

The following authors worked with issues related to southern theories, epistemologies of the South, indigenous and national sociologies, eurocentrism, academic dependence and other topics: Akiwowo, Makinde, Taiwo, Lawuyi, Oommen, Bhambra, Cardoso, Santos, Connell and others (1986, 1988, 1999; 1988; 1990; 1991, 1995; 2007, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2017; 1977; 2007, 2015; 1997, 2007ab, 2014, 2017, 2019).

The ideas researched by the following authors influenced the development of non-Western-centered discourse: Amin, Said, SH Alatas, SF Alatas & Sinha, Patel, Go, Guha, Mignolo (1989; 1978ab, 1985; 1963, 2006ab; 2006, 2014; 2001, 2017; 2013, 2014, 2019; 2012, 2017, 2020; 1989; 2009, 2012). Understanding of global sociology through the prism of global civil society, public sociology, the third wave of marketization, through criticism of neoliberalism, and the development of social movements, was actively developed by Burawoy (2005, 2007, 2008ab, 2010, 2011, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2019). The basic ideas of the universal sociological discipline were protected by a relatively small number of social scientists: Albrow, Archer, Heller, but most actively by Sztompka (1987; 1987, 1991, 1998; 1987; 1988, 1991, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2011, 2013).

A detailed discussion on the North/South issues was produced by Frank, Arrighi, Chase-Dunn, Brandt, Pomerantz, Tomlinson and others (1980; 2003; 2009; 1998; 1980; 2003). Intensive criticism of (neo)colonialism can be found in the works of Fanon, Cesaire, Bhabha, Nkrumah, Rodney and others (2007; 2000; 1965; 2012; 2018).

The aim of the dissertation is to implement a structured systematization of the ideas identified with global sociology through the reconstruction of its intellectual history.

The aim is specified in the following tasks:

- to analyze the background and context of the idea of global sociology;
- to define the role of the concepts of “global North / South” in the discussions on global sociology.
- to analyze the main existing approaches to understanding the idea of global sociology.
- to make a historical and sociological reconstruction of the existence of the concept and discussion on the issue;
- to offer an original periodization of the intellectual history of the concept;
- to implement the procedure of systematizing and distinguishing the existing strategies to discuss global sociology in the context of the international sociological agenda.

The object of the research – the main theoretical approaches to the understanding of global sociology.

The subject of the research – the diversity in the ways of interpretation of the notion and the intellectual history of global sociology.

Research methods. Two main methods were used in the work. The method of historical and analytical reconstruction was used to outline the field of discussion on global sociology, to construct a history of the concept, and to show the main arguments of authors retrospectively. The comparative method allows us to compare the key positions of the authors in the discussion, to highlight the diversity of the field of the idea, and to demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of the positions of opponents at different historical stages of the discussion.

The scientific significance of the dissertation

1. The dissertation identifies the origins of the idea of global sociology. The background and historical context of the formation and its existence in publications are described.

2. The role of the concepts of the global North/South, the issue of decolonization in history as well as the role of international organizations in the development of sociology, have become crucial for global sociology and play a dominant role in the discussion.

3. The dissertation suggests the intellectual history of the idea of global sociology from a retrospective point of view. The identified and described storylines related to the history of the debates restricted by historical brackets from 1982 till nowadays with all necessary to references to the previous historical context.

4. The variety of the idea's usage in research publications is demonstrated. The content of the main approaches is analyzed within the global sociology umbrella notion. The arguments of the authors in the discussions on the issue are reconstructed. The variability and flexibility of criticisms of sociologists in international discourse is shown.

5. The periodization of the discussion on global sociology is presented, based on the research of its development in the international sociological agenda. Since the concept is an invention of the second half of the 20th century, a large number of historical milestones are not supposed. The division into “before” and “after” is based on the entry of Burawoy into the discussion in 2006, which determined a huge part of the debates on global sociology. It is suggested that the discussion started around 1982 – after the first ISA congress at the global South (Mexico City, Mexico).

6. A historical and sociological systematization of the research field was presented. Appropriate typology of the strategies is proposed, which is used by different authors in order to discuss a variety of global sociology practices across the world. Such a typology includes the various ways of usages of the idea. Using the metaphorical phrase “global sociology is similar to the two-faced god Janus”, it was determined that there are two main ways to talk about global sociology and a number of smaller and less influential approaches that use similar ideas of the main “faces”. Thus, global sociology is able to use the “masks” of small approaches in order to “disguise” itself as one direction or another, depending on the desire of the authors.

The main results of the dissertation

1. The idea of global sociology is diverse and a large number of authors use different strategies in order to talk about the idea in different ways. It creates confusion in the usage of the notion as well as in the debates on the intellectual history of the concept. Therefore, the dissertation suggests a way of solution in order to close the existing gap in this issue.

2. The concepts of “global North” and “global South” in discussions on the issue have vague boundaries. They are neither economic nor geographical, but more epistemological in nature. They correspond to the sociological practices and ideological beliefs, which sociologists reproduce in the discussion. To be a southern sociologist does not mean to be a sociologist from the global South, but to accept the ideas of the southern theory. The boundaries of these conditional camps are not strict. The sociologist of the geographical North could support

particular southern views. Nevertheless, the reverse transition from South to North never happens, with extremely rare exceptions.

3. The history of the discussion on global sociology should be divided into two historical stages. Despite the availability of earlier mentions of the idea, the starting point in the discussion should be the 1982 ISA Congress in Mexico City, which was held for the first time at the global South, and provoked huge interest in third world sociology. This stage lasted until Burawoy entered the discussion in 2006, identified with his positions in the ISA. The second stage started from this date and continues to the present time.

4. Burawoy's approach is deeply connected to the institutional features and resources of the International Sociological Association, which were available to him during his vice- (2006-2010) and presidency in the organization (2010-2014). It had a huge impact on the popularity of the idea among sociologists, but eventually, it negatively affected the viability of his project. The ideological effect of the idea declined after 2014. The author eventually abandoned the further development of the idea of global sociology and used nominally other labels (e.g. new sociology of social movements), formally confirming the thesis above.

5. The typology of approaches consists of two main and a number of smaller strategies. For the most accurate representation of the approaches, the metaphorical expression "global sociology is a two-faced God Janus" is stated. The two dominant strategies should be identified with its faces and designated as the international and public faces of global sociology. Less common approaches were called "masks" that can be put on these faces and thereby disguise a variety of usages.

The scientific and practical significance of the work: this PhD thesis can be used to orientate in the field of modern sociological thought and in order to write the other works in a similar field. In addition, the dissertation is a part of the "Global sociology" course, which was written by the author during PhD studies, which is ready to be implemented.

The published results: The main results of the work are presented in four publications, which are included in the list of articles approved by HSE University. Three of them are included in the Scopus citation system. One of them in the Russian scientific citation index on Web of Science. The text of this dissertation meets all the regulations required by Ghent University.

1. Kislenko, I. Debates on global sociology: “Unity and Diversity” of interpretations // *The American Sociologist*, 2021 (Scopus Q1, In English).

2. Kislenko, I. A sociological analysis of the institutional aspect of global sociology of Michael Burawoy // *Russian sociological review*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp 172-194, 2019 (Scopus Q2, In Russian).

3. Kislenko, I. Southern Theory: Does Sociology Exist Outside the Western Canon? // *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes Journal* (Scopus, Q2, in Russian).

4. Kislenko, I. On the role of the global North / South notions in global sociology // *Vestnik of St. Petersburg University. Sociology*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2020 (RSCI, In Russian).

The author also participated in the following events, where the main results of the work were presented. IV ISA Forum, Porte Alegre, Brazil. Report topic: Debates on global sociology: “unity and diversity” of interpretations, 2021. 12th All-Russian Conference – Contemporary Russian Society and Sociology, 2019. Report topic: On the problem of demarcation of the approaches in global sociology. International Social Theory Consortium Conference, Dubrovnik, Croatia, 2019. Report topic: A sociological analysis of the institutional aspect of global sociology of Michael Burawoy.

The preliminary results of the PhD thesis were discussed and presented at the Center for Social Theory (Ghent University), at the Center for Fundamental Sociology (HSE University) and at the Department of Sociology (HSE University). The various parts of the work were written and discussed during internships at University of Zagreb (Department of Sociology), at Ghent University (Center for Social Theory) and at George Mason University (Department of Sociology and Anthropology).

The main results and the brief description of the structure of the dissertation.

Issues related to sociological science itself have always been in the focus of sociologists in different periods of history. The genesis of the science about society was implemented under the sign of formation of its basic principles, which distinguished it from other disciplines, primarily from philosophy and psychology. The classical period of sociology was connected to the development of the basic methodological principles of sociology and its institutionalization. It was assumed that such principles would be uniformly used by all sociologists in order to understand the social reality. The main representatives of any of the existing ideas of that time are natives of Europe or North America. Thus, sociology has developed throughout its history in the Euro-American context as the science could be only western in that level of significance, which we can recognize (Weber, 1990). None of the sociological ideas from other parts of the world could not even have as much influence. The great sociological crisis, which struck sociology after 1968 and left it without a dominant sociological project, exposed the need for finding alternative ways to describe social reality. Various attempts were made to propose new ideas for this role. Eventually, it would lead to the turn towards the epistemologies of the South, indigenous sociology and southern theory (Akiwowo, 1986; Connell, 2007; Santos, 2015). Simultaneously, sociologists faced neoliberalism and the third wave of marketization. For this reason, they began to gradually realize that the inequality, which has been researched by leading scientists for a long time, exists within the sociological discipline itself (Burawoy, 2010; 2015). The combination of these factors eventually led to the active interest in global sociology.

The final part of the PhD thesis summary should sum up all the efforts put into the work and concentrates on the finalization of the author's arguments. It reflects the main results of the dissertation, which were designed to systematize the field of global sociology, to propose an appropriate typology and to present a history of the idea.

To solve this problem, it is better to use of a common method in sociology – the use of sociological metaphors. Paraphrasing the expression of Burawoy, it is necessary to deduce

suitable for this purpose formula – “global sociology is similar to the two-faced god Janus”. Except for the fact that his faces look in different directions, while in global sociology they are turned in the same direction. In this case, global sociology tends to put on “masks” on its “faces”.

As the “faces” should be defined as the two most common strategies, analyzed in chapters 2 and 3. On the one hand, global sociology focuses on purely internal scientific issues and concerns on the nature of sociological knowledge on matters of national sociology and on the prospects of southern theory. It is the international perspective of the development of global sociology, including issues related to differences in sociological practices across the globe. On the other hand, it is a way to discuss global capitalism, neoliberalism and criticism of the marketization of knowledge, applying such issues to sociology itself. In this case, the most influential approach is the interpretation of Burawoy, described in detail in chapter 3.

These are the faces of Janus, which could be found in global sociology. These are the two most dominant approaches to define the theoretical topography of the research field. Reading any work on global sociology, a scientist can expect to find precisely these two options.

Most often, the author’s perspective is limited by strategy, when scholars add the notion to any specific sociological field, according to the scheme: global sociology + one or another sphere, where the author of the work wishes to concentrate on. Moreover, as stated above, such a transfer can happen on different “faces”. In this case, there is a tendency to consider it from different angles: from the standpoint of Eurocentrism, North / South division, southern theory, from the point of view of post-colonial countries, etc. If this method is chosen, then this is more consistent with the “international face” of global sociology, as its classical moves are shifted to “masks” and are put on this “face”. This was considered in chapter 2 of the dissertation. Others, using a similar procedure for attributing the chosen sphere to the stated notion, refer the reader to another direction – the “public face” of global sociology, which is based on Burawoy’s understanding of this idea (see chapter 3). This version, as the previous one, is able to put on the

“masks” of various sociological areas or the so-called theories of the middle range. In this case, the direction, attributed to the notions, will be based either on the idea of division of the sociological labor, or on the idea of a third wave of marketization.

It gave rise to a new corpus (albeit a relatively small one) of works considering global sociology as a direction connected to the studying of the prospects of a global society and somehow affecting globalization processes, but not strictly correlating with the research field itself. They defined the spectrum of such approaches as the mask of globality. This state of affairs is partially connected to the name of Burawoy, since his approach focuses on the idea of global sociology, based on a criticism of the third wave of marketization. Moreover, such ideas in different forms appeared before Burawoy, but his figure played an important role in popularization of the issue in the most ideological of possible options.

As a result, completing one of the key lines of the work on the distinction of the approaches, we can define the most significant results, which smoothly pass into a full traditional conclusion to the dissertation. Existing use cases can be summarized as follows.

There are two dominant ways that emerged through the expression “global sociology – two faces and several masks”.

1. The international face of global sociology
2. The public face of global sociology

Somewhat smaller masks, using the moves of the two main approaches.

- a. The mask of theories of middle range in global sociology
- b. The mask of globality
- c. In addition, it is necessary to highlight the attribution of the concept by various

authors to other areas.

In order to present the existing “map” of ideas inside the global sociology umbrella term, a number of additional actions were implemented within the framework of the work as well as several problems being solved.

First of all, it was achieved by the second main line of the dissertation. In order to describe the internal structure of global sociology, it was necessary to reconstruct an intellectual history of the idea, highlighting the milestones of its development and considering all the approaches associated with the discussion on the issue. The development of debates on global sociology from the description of necessary context, and from the beginning of the formation of the idea to the current state of affairs, has been researched. The historical stages of the discussion are highlighted and the appearance of the notion in publications, preceding the main state of the discussion has been presented. Therefore, two main problems were solved in the dissertation: to make a historical and sociological reconstruction of the discussion on the global sociology idea, as well as to implement the procedure of systematizing and distinguishing the strategies, which were used by authors in order to present their arguments.

In addition, the dissertation presents a solution to smaller related problems. **Chapter 1** presents the background of the debates on global sociology. This part of the text precedes the key aspects of the work. It helps to get familiar with the context, which is necessary for understanding all of the aspects of the discussion.

Section 1.1. deals with classical sociology and describes that some of ideas from the researched field was partially a part of classics' works. It was devoted to the references to the classical stage of sociological history from the participants of the debates on global sociology in the context of universalism / particularism.

Section 1.2., dedicated to the concepts of global North / South, explains the meaning, content, and role of these notions in global sociology. The history of their emergence and transformation from other categories is demonstrated through the transition “third world – postcolonial countries – global South”. It demonstrates that the North / South division in the discussion of global sociology is neither geographical or political in nature. It corresponds to the practices of northern / southern theories, which sociologists use. It also coincides with ideological beliefs of the authors.

Section 1.3. is the most non-sociological part of this work. It describes issues related to the politics of (neo)colonialism, its formation and eventual elimination from a historical point of view. The influence of these factors on the possibility of the emergence of an alternative sociological discourse is considered. An analysis is presented, based on the study of the colonial background of the discussion on global sociology from the point of view of the global South.

Section 1.4. is devoted to the distinction between the concepts of indigenous and national sociologies. Issues, related to different connotations of the notions, are considered. The problem of erasing the boundaries between them is tackled and the argumentation for the corresponding demarcation is discussed. The concepts differ in the degree of radicalism of the judgements and level of claims to a special status. Also, this section was accompanied with the Russian case of the debates, which had influence not only on the local sociological community, but also on the international agenda.

Chapter 2 dwells on the examination of the international face of global sociology in accordance with the proposed distinction and typology. It considers the ideas that came to sociology from the global South and also presents a range of approaches that defend the universalism of northern sociology.

Section 2.1. examines the opposition to the northern dominance in social theory. It contains the key ideas and the historical twists in the fate of the sociologies of the global South. Arguments against the dominance of the northern theory in sociology are considered. The sociological meaning of each of the presented interpretations is shown: from indigenous sociologies to the epistemologies of the South and connected sociologies.

Section 2.2. demonstrates key features of southern theory. It contains the issue of classical sociology and its canon, criticizing the current state of affairs and proposing to look at the issue from a different point of view. It is a known fact that the canon is changeable; it can be transformed and accept or reject certain names. According to Connell, the process of its formation is an additional argument in the discussion on ignoring the southern discourse.

Nevertheless, a critical remark was suggested, presenting the weaknesses of the southern theory and the doubts on the prospect of the South, developing a positive agenda in social theory.

Section 2.3. is ideologically opposite to the two previous sections. Here, the main arguments of the authors against the possibility of an alternative development of sociology through a southern perspective are given. A small number of sociologists decided to defend sociological universalism. Nevertheless, this is an important point in the discussion, which could not be ignored.

Section 2.4. is located between the second and third chapters of this dissertation. It considers a set of the “masks”, which global sociology uses for its “faces”, namely international (Chapter 2) and public (Chapter 3). It also presents the spectrum of the attribution of the idea to the related areas of sociological knowledge.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the ideas presented as a struggle for the influence on international agenda via international sociological organizations. This chapter is mostly identified with Burawoy, who is the one of the key figures in global sociology. The work has been done to periodize the author's work with the idea. The key arguments in this approach are elucidated.

Section 3.1. considers the role of international sociological organizations in the formation of the idea of global sociology. It analyzes the processes within the International Sociological Association and its international events. Also, it refers to the confrontation between ISA and International Institute of Sociology (IIS), which ultimately reduced its public activity to a minimum and does not have any influence on the international agenda any longer. Due to the number of circumstances, the ideological victory of the ISA was finally formed when Burawoy took significant positions in ISA.

In addition, the issue of the role of the presidential address within the framework of various organizations in the history of the idea is examined. This element has been present throughout the history of global sociology. The authors use it as a declarative opportunity,

because at the moment of the address the real and virtual attention is completely concentrated on the speaker. Sociologists use such an instrument in order to promote their ideas.

Section 3.2. examines the influence of public sociology on its global version. It demonstrates that Burawoy's idea of global sociology is based on the influence of one idea on another, which largely corresponds to the early interpretation of public sociology.

Section 3.3. breaks down Burawoy's late understanding of global sociology, which would eventually become the most dominant. It is based on the idea of the total criticism of neoliberalism and the third wave of the marketization of knowledge, but applying exclusively to sociology as a science itself. Such an idea in Burawoy's works appears under the influence of Polanyi's book, *The Great Transformation*.

Section 3.4. reflects on the global sociology discussion between Burawoy and Sztompka, which took place from the second half of the 2000s till the early 2010s. The main ideas of the authors and the key points of criticism of both sides of the dispute are demonstrated.

Section 3.5. is a critique of the centralization of Burawoy's idea on the ISA through critical reflection of his approach. The main focus of the section is the demonstration of the fact that his idea is tightly connected to institutional preferences, which were available to him at the position of (vice)president.

The conclusion concentrates on the historical and systematic analysis in order to highlight a specific typology with the definition of the primary and secondary methods of the demarcation of the idea.

For a long time, global sociology as a research area was not considered as an independent theoretical field. It did not have its own intellectual history and was not considered as a unified space. Discussion practices varied from case to case, and there was a need to fill in the existing research gap. In addition, a brief history of the idea has to be written. Both tasks were completed within the text of this PhD Thesis.

References

1. Abdel-Malek. *La dialectique sociale* / Éditions du Seuil / 1972
2. Akiwowo A. (1986) Contributions to the sociology of knowledge from an African oral poetry. *International Sociology*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 343-358.
3. Akiwowo A. (1988). Universalism and indigenization in sociological theory: Introduction. *International Sociology*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 155–160.
4. Alatas S. (2006b). The autonomous, the universal and the future of sociology // *Current Sociology*. Vol. 54. № 1. P. 7–23.
5. Alatas S. and Sinha V. (2017). *Sociological Theory Beyond the Canon*. Palgrave Macmillan: London. 391p.
6. Alatas S. F. Ibn Khaldūn and contemporary sociology // *International sociology*. – 2006. – T. 21. – №. 6. – C. 782–795.
7. Alatas S. F., Sinha V. Teaching classical sociological theory in Singapore: The context of Eurocentrism // *Teaching Sociology*. – 2001. – C. 316–331.
8. Alatas S. H. The Weber Thesis and South East Asia // *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions*. – 1963. – T. 15. – №. 1. – C. 21–34.
9. Alatas S.F (2006). The autonomous, the universal and the future of sociology. *Current Sociology*, vol. 54. no. 1. pp. 7–23.
10. Alatas S.H (2006). Editorial introduction: The idea of autonomous sociology: Reflections on the state of the discipline. *Current Sociology*, vol. 54, no. 1. pp. 5–6.
11. Alatas, S. F. *Applying Ibn Khaldūn: The recovery of a lost tradition in sociology*, Routledge, 2014.
12. Albrow M. (1987). *Sociology for One World*. *International Sociology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp.131-147.
13. Amin S. *Eurocentrism*. – NYU Press, 1989.

14. Archer M. (1991). Sociology for one world: unity and diversity. *International sociology*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp.131-147.
15. Archer M. S. *Resisting the Revival of Relativism // Globalization, Knowledge and Society/* Ed. by M. Albrow & E. King. L. etc.: SAGE, 1990
16. Bhabha H. K. *The location of culture.* – Routledge, 2012.
17. Bhabra G. (2007). Sociology and postcolonialism: Another «missing» revolution? *Sociology*, vol. 41, no. 5, pp. 871–874.
18. Bhabra G. (2010). Historical sociology, international relations and connected histories. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 127–143.
19. Bhabra G. (2013). The Possibilities of, and for, Global Sociology: A Postcolonial Perspective. *Postcolonial Sociology*, pp. 295-314.
20. Bhabra G. (2014). Introduction: Knowledge production in global context: Power and coloniality. *Current Sociology*, vol. 62. no. 4, pp. 451–456.
21. Bhabra G. K., Medien K., Tilley L. *Theory for a global age: From nativism to neoliberalism and beyond.* – 2020.
22. Bhabra G. K., Santos B. de Sousa (2017) *Globalnye vyzovy sotsiologii [Global challenges of sociology] //Sotsiologicheskiye issledovaniya.* – C. 3-8.
23. Burawoy M. (1972). *The Colour of Class on the Copper Mines: From African Advancement to Zambianization.* Manchester University Press.
24. Burawoy M. (1979). *Manufacturing consent: Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism.* University of Chicago Press, p. 267.
25. Burawoy M. (1985). *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism.* London, Verso, p. 272.
26. Burawoy M. (2008a). For a subaltern global sociology. *Current Sociology*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 435-444.

27. Burawoy M. (2008b). What is to be done? Theses on the degradation of social existence in a globalizing world. *Current Sociology*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 351–359.
28. Burawoy M. (2011). The Last Positivist. *Contemporary Sociology*, vol 40, no. 4, pp.396-404.
29. Burawoy M. (2014). Introduction: Sociology as a combat sport. *Current Sociology*, vol. 62, no. 2. pp.140–155.
30. Burawoy M. (2015). Facing an unequal world. Presidential address. *Current Sociology*, vol. 63, no. 1. pp. 5–34.
31. Burawoy M. Public sociology vs. the market // *Socio-Economic Review*. – 2007. – T. 5. – №. 2.
32. Burawoy M., Chang M., & Hsieh Michelle F. (Eds.) (2010). Facing an unequal world: Challenges for a global sociology. Vols. 1–3. Jointly published by the Institute of Sociology at Academia Sinica, Council of National Associations of the International Sociological Association, and Academia Sinica, Taiwan.
33. Burawoy, M. *A New Sociology for Social Justice Movements //Sociology and Social Justice*. SAGE, 2019.
34. Burawoy, M. The promise of sociology: Global challenges for national disciplines // *Sociology*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 949-959, 2016.
35. Cardoso F. H., Faletto E. *Dependency and development in Latin America (Dependencia y desarrollo en América Latina, engl.)*. – Univ of California Press, 1979.
36. Césaire A. *Discourse on colonialism*. – New York : Monthly Review Press, 2000. – C. 42
37. Chakrabarty D (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
38. Chase-Dunn C. K. *Global formation: Structures of the world-economy*. – Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

39. Collins R. A sociological guilt trip: Comment on Connell //American Journal of Sociology. – 1997. – T. 102. – №. 6. – C. 1558–1564.
40. Collyer F (2012) Sociology, sociologists and core-periphery reflections. Journal of Sociology (online). DOI: 10.1177/1440783312448687.
41. Collyer F. M. Global patterns in the publishing of academic knowledge: Global North, global South // Current Sociology. – 2018. – T. 66. – №. 1. – C. 56-73.
42. Connell R. Collyer F, Maia J. Toward a global sociology of knowledge: Post-colonial realities and intellectual practices //International Sociology. – 2017. – T. 32. – №. 1. – C. 21-37.
43. Connell R. Southern theory and world universities //Higher Education Research & Development. – 2017. – T. 36. – №. 1. – C. 4-15
44. Connell R. Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science. – Allen & Unwin, 2007.
45. Connell R. Using southern theory: Decolonizing social thought in theory, research and application //Planning Theory. – 2014. – T. 13. – №. 2. – C. 210-223.
46. Connell R. W. Why is classical theory classical? //American journal of sociology. – 1997. – T. 102. – №. 6. – C. 1511–1557.
47. Devjatko I. (2001). Modernization, Globalization and Institutional Isomorphism: Towards a Sociological Theory of Global Society [Modernizacija, globalizacija i institucional'nyj izomorfizm: k sociologicheskoj teorii global'nogo obshhestva] //Globalization and post-soviet society [Globalizacija i postsovetskoe obshhestvo], Moscow, Aspekty-2001, pp. 8-38.
48. Fanon F. The wretched of the earth. – Grove/Atlantic, Inc., 2007.
49. Filippov A. (2008) On the notion of theoretical sociology [O ponjatii teoreticheskoj sociologii] // Russian sociological review [Sociologicheskoe obozrenie]. vol. 7. no. 3. pp. 75-114. (In Russian).

50. Frank A. G. *The Great Divergence: Europe, China, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*. By Kenneth Pomeranz. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. 382 pp. // *The Journal of Asian Studies*. – 2001. Vol. 60. no. 1. P. 180-182.
51. Genov N. (ed.). *National traditions in sociology*. – London : Sage, 1989.
52. Go J (2012) *For a postcolonial sociology*. *Theory and Society* (online). DOI: 10.1007/x11186-012- 9184-6.
53. Guha R. (ed.). *Subaltern Studies VI: Writings on South Asian History*. – Oxford University Press, 1989.
54. Hallen G. C., Prasad R. (ed.). *Towards global sociology: essays in honour of Professor Kewal Motwani*. – Satish Book Enterprise, 1970.
55. Heller, A. *Sociology as a defetishization of modernity*. 1987 – T. 2. – №. 4. – 391 – 401
56. Hountondji PJ (1983 [1976]) *African Philosophy: Myth and Reality* (trans H Evansand J Rée). London: Hutchinson.
57. Hountondji PJ (ed.) (1997 [1994]) *Endogenous Knowledge: Research Trails*. Dakar, Senegal: Codesria.
58. Jean Comaroff & John L. Comaroff (2012) *Theory from the South: Or, how Euro–America is Evolving Toward Africa*, *Anthropological Forum*, 22:2, 113–131, DOI: 10.1080/00664677.2012.694169
59. Kolbanovskii V. (2010). *Citizenship and Global Sociology [Grazhdanstvennost' i global'naja sociologija]* // *Sociological studies [Sociologicheskie issledovanija]*. no. 3. pp. 112-121.
60. Lawuyi, O. and Taiwo O. (1990). *Towards an African Sociological Tradition: A Rejoinder to Akiwowo and Makinde* // *International Sociology*. Vol. 5. № 1. P. 57-73.
61. Makinde M. (1988). *Asuwada Principle: An Analysis of Akiwowo's Contributions to the Sociology*. *International Sociology*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 61-76.

62. Martinelli A. (2003). Global Order or Divided World? Introduction // *Current Sociology*. Vol. 51. № 2. P. 95-100.
63. Mignolo W. D. *The idea of Latin America*. – John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
64. Moore M. (1966). The world as a singular system // *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 71. № 5. P. 475–482.
65. Motwani K *Towards Indian Sociology*. – Agra: Satish Book Enterprise, 1971.
66. Nations World Macro Regions and Components // Available at [unstats. un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin. htm](http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm) (United Nations, 2000). – 2000.
67. Nkrumah K. *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism*. – 1965.
68. Oommen T. K. (1995). Contested boundaries and emerging pluralism // *International Sociology*. Vol. 10. pp. 251–268.
69. Patel S (2013). Towards internationalism: Beyond colonial and national sociologies. In Kuhn W. and Yazawa S. (eds). *Theories about and against Hegemonic Social Sciences*. Tokyo: Centre for Glocal Studies, Seijo University. pp. 111–124.
70. Platt J. (1998). *History of ISA: 1948-1997*. International Sociological Association. 74 p.
71. Pleyers G. (2020). Global sociology in the pandemic. *Global Dialogue*, 10(2), 47.
72. Pokrovskii N. (2011) Patient Denied Hospitalization or “In Defense of Sociology” // *Global Dialogue*. vol. 2. no. pp. 9-15.
73. Poljakova N. (2019). Global sociology. Basic research strategies. Part I. Universalist approach. [Global'naja sociologija. Osnovnye issledovatel'skie strategii. Chast' I. Universalistskij podhod] // *Vestnik of Lomonosov Moscow State University. Sociology and political science* [Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serija 18. Sociologija i politologija]. no. 4. pp. 154-174. (In Russian).

74. Pomeranz K. The great divergence: China, Europe, and the making of the modern world economy. – Princeton University Press, 2009.
75. Rodney W. How Europe underdeveloped Africa. – Verso Trade, 2018.
76. Romanovskii N. (1999). Sociology and sociologists face global cataclysms [Sociologija i sociologi pred licom global'nyh kataklizmov] // Sociological studies [Sociologicheskie issledovanija], no. 3. pp. 3-11. (In Russian).
77. Said E. Introduction to Orientalism // Media Studies: A Reader. – 1978b. – P. 111-23.
78. Said E. Orientalism. – London, 1978a.
79. Said E. W. Orientalism reconsidered // Race & class. – 1985. – T. 27. – №. 2. – C. 1-15.
80. Schuerkens U. The Congresses of the International Institute of Sociology from 1894 to 1930 and the Internationalization of Sociology // Revue Internationale de Sociologie. – 1996.
81. Sorokin P. (2015). Global sociology in different disciplinary practices: Current conditions, problems and perspectives. Current Sociology, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 41-59.
82. Sorokin P. (2018). Global Sociology from a Comparative Perspective: A Multidimensional Analysis. Comparative Sociology, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1-28.
83. Titarenko L. (2011). National and supra-national in sociology [Nacional'noe i nadnacional'noe v sociologii] // Sociological studies [Sociologicheskie issledovanija], no. 1. pp. 22-29. (In Russian).
84. Tomlinson B. R. What Was the Third World? // Journal of Contemporary History. – 2003. – T. 38. – №. 2. – C. 307–321.
85. Turner B. Two faces of sociology: global or national? // Theory, Culture & Society. – 1990. — №. 2–3.

86. Wallerstein, I (1996) 'Eurocentrism and its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science', paper presented at the East Asian Regional Colloquium on The Future of Sociology in East Asia, jointly organized by the Korean Sociological Association and the International Sociological Association, 22–3 November.

87. Yadov V. (2008). What is the purpose of Russian national sociology today? [Dlja chego nuzhna segodnja nacional'naja russkaja sociologija?] // Sociological Studies [Sociologicheskie issledovanija]. no. 4. pp. 16-20. (In Russian).

88. Zdravomyslov A. (2007). National sociological schools in a modern world [Nacional'nye sociologicheskie shkoly v sovremennom mire] // Social sciences and the modernity [Obshhestvennye nauki i sovremennost'], no. 5. pp. 114-130. (In Russian)

89. Zdravomyslov A. (2008). Towards the issue of culture of the sociological thinking [K voprosu o kul'ture sociologicheskogo myshlenija] // Sociological Studies [Sociologicheskie issledovanija] no. 5. pp. 4-15. (In Russian)

90. Zdravomyslova E. (2008). Make way for professional sociology! Public sociology in the Russian context. Current Sociology, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 405–414.