

Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for a Global Sociology¹

Michael Burawoy, University of California, Berkeley, USA²

Yuan-Tseh Lee, former president of Academia Sinica and Nobel Prize Winner, opened the second conference of the Council of National Associations with a call to scientists the world-over to come together and confront ever-deepening global problems. Some of the most serious challenges facing mankind -- climate change, energy crisis, and disease -- stem from processes that transcend national boundaries and social divisions, yet the tools to tackle them are still largely locked within national boundaries and controlled by powerful, vested interests. The problem, Dr. Lee insisted, is not so much globalization but its incompleteness. Developing global communities along with global governance is necessary for tackling global problems. We can no longer retreat back to an insular localism, so we must move forward to realize the potentials of a more complete and complex globalization. He posed the challenge to sociology: how did we respond?

As sociologists we specialize in studying the downside of globalization, the *obstacles* to a globalization that will benefit humanity. We are experts in the ways inequality and domination present the deepest barriers to tackling the daunting challenges of our epoch. We postulate conditions for overcoming such barriers while criticizing false solutions that redistribute rather than diminish the ill-effects incomplete globalization. It is the presumption of this conference that for sociologists to address the exclusion and oppression underlying poverty and war, disease and environmental degradation on a global scale, our scientific community must itself first assume a global character ruled by dialogue and accountability. We gathered together in Taipei, therefore, to examine our own discipline through the bifocal lens of domination and inequality -- a risky but necessary project -- so as to create and embrace a global sociology that is equal to the global tasks we face.

¹ I am grateful to Emma Porio for her comments on an earlier version of this paper.

² Michael Burawoy is the Vice President for National Associations of the International Sociological Association.

There is an obvious resistance to focusing on such divisions in our midst. Thus, the great theorists of inequality and domination, when it comes to the sociological field itself, revert to proclamations of unity rather than interrogating the inequalities and dominations that divide us. Immanuel Wallerstein (1999) proposes the absorption of sociology into a unified field of historical and social sciences, Ulrich Beck (2004) calls for a global cosmopolitanism, while Pierre Bourdieu (1989) announces the formation of an international of intellectuals, pursuing a “corporatism of the universal.” It is as if all divisions in our midst must spontaneously evaporate in the face of the world system crisis (Wallerstein), the depth of global inequalities (Beck), or the havoc wreaked by neoliberalism (Bourdieu). All differences among us, with respect to how we experience crisis, inequality and neoliberalism, must somehow be summarily buried to meet the challenge. Their genuine concern for the fate of humanity leads these sociologists to normative, if not utopian projects, abandoning the sociological tools that they have spent a life time sharpening. Projected from the pinnacles of Western academia these projects, at best, appear remote from the everyday practice of sociology in most of the world and, at worst, are deployed as universal arbiters of good practice.

This is not to deny there is a unity that we share as sociologists, but it is not a unity that can be imposed by fiat. That which binds us together can only be produced by a laborious elaboration from below, stitching together commonalities in a complex global mosaic. The building block of that mosaic is the national sociology, for the nation has always been sociology’s basic unit of analysis as well as defining the parameters of its field of action. Such, at any rate, is the argument of this introductory chapter. We have to construct the bonds of unity through articulating and interweaving the differences that separate us. Thus, to explore those differences in our midst and the divergent interests they foreshadow is not to discredit others, but to simply recognize that we, like the people we study, cannot escape the inequalities in which we are embedded, and that it is only out of confronting these inequalities that common enterprises can possibly be forged.

Such a reflexive project demands that we subject our own relations and practices to sociological analysis -- not to discredit their authors but to move sociology to a higher scientific plane. This introduction, therefore, sets out from the obvious inequalities we face within our discipline and association, before excavating their embeddedness within structures of domination beyond our discipline. From there I consider how those dominations, especially the symbolic ones, can be challenged by alternative sociologies. Finally, I ask how such alternatives can be grounded in experiences, institutions and movements within local and national con-

texts, so as to knit them together into a global configuration, albeit contingent and precarious. I base my reflections on the papers delivered at the conference, now revised and assembled in the three volumes that follow, papers that address the obstacles to be overcome, but also point beyond those obstacles to different ways of constructing global sociologies from below.

THE CONTEXT OF INEQUALITY AND DOMINATION

The challenges we face are immediately apparent in our own association. The International Sociological Association was established in 1947 under the auspices of UNESCO and, in the beginning, it was almost entirely dominated by sociologists from Europe and North America. Since then it has made enormous strides toward broader representation from different parts of the world. Individual members come from 120 countries while 57 countries are collective members of the ISA. At its last World Congress in South Africa participants came from 104 countries.

The real progress that has been made, however, only accentuates the negative side of the balance sheet. Thus, membership is still heavily concentrated in the rich countries: 68.7% of individual members and 40% of the collective members are from "A" countries.³ Leadership is drawn from rich countries: at present the President and all 5 Vice-Presidents are from "A" countries. This may be unusual -- in the previous regime only half were from "A" countries -- but equally important 92% of the Presidents of the 53 Research Committees come from "A" countries. Nor is this surprising if only because sociologists with the resources and time to build international contacts and influence and, then, to carry out organizational and administrative tasks are more likely to come from richer countries with their greater educational endowments, their greater affluence, and their fewer local and national obligations. The ISA can be a perfectly fair and neutral field but, situated in the context of global inequality, inequality in representation is the inevitable outcome. Although we can and must strive for greater equality in our midst, that it exists is not due to some Western conspiracy.

Ironically, the more successful the ISA has been in broadening its membership basis, the more we face inequalities within the organization and the more cognizant we become of those sociologists left outside our

³ A, B, and C countries -- with A countries the richest -- are defined by the World Bank on the basis of per capita Gross National Income. They are used by the ISA as a sliding scale for membership and conference fees, travel subsidies, etc.

organization and beyond our reach. The inequalities within the ISA inevitably reflect and mask far deeper inequalities between countries and, no less important, within countries. We are deeply enmeshed in global inequalities tied to the unequal distribution of material resources (income, research funds, teaching obligations, working conditions), social capital (professional networks, patronage) and cultural capital (educational credentials, university prestige, language facility, publications). As sociologists we are especially skilled in discerning such inequalities.

From Academic Dependency to Western Hegemony

Inequalities don't simply exist, but are produced through relations of domination conceptualized by Farid Alatas (2006a) as "academic dependency" and "intellectual imperialism." He sees domination in the cognitive realm – Eurocentrism, Orientalism, the "Captive Mind"⁴ – as tied to but also legitimating dependency in the institutional realm, that is, dependency on foreign funds, foreign journals, foreign publishers, foreign training, and foreign demand for skills.

A number of papers express this dependency as legacies of different forms of colonization:

- Using Alatas's framework, Shaikh Mohammed Kais describes just what academic dependency looks like in the postcolonial context of Bangladesh – from the difficulties of teaching, doing research, a process of hybridization that leads to the reproduction of marginality. When we talk of global sociology we should not forget the challenges faced by those who are more or less excluded.
- Ifeanyi Onyeonoru describes the social legacies of colonialism in Nigeria and of continuing metropolitan domination, that has been countered by indigenization, engagement with local and national issues, as well as by connections based on national, regional and international associations.
- Janusz Mucha describes the history of dependency in Poland, how that led to the development of an authentic but non-institutional sociology, you might say a public sociology of the 19th. century, but then institutionalization set in under different regimes during the 20th. century. So "Polish sociology" in-

⁴ The theory of the "Captive Mind" was developed by Syed Hussein Alatas to describe the uncritical and imitative adoption of U.S. and European social science in Asia. See, for example, Alatas (1974).

creasingly has become “sociology in Poland,” even more so after the fall of socialism.

Three other papers lay out the working of Western hegemony in Turkey, Australia and Japan, countries where one might not expect it:

- Despite Turkey’s history as empire Aytül Kasapoğlu, Nilay Çabuk Kaya and Mehmet Ecevit describe the hegemony of Western sociology, manifested in the application of Western theory to the local context.
- Similarly, Raewyn Connell presents Australia as a settler colony in the global periphery, a status that invites sociology’s unreflexive embrace of metropolitan sociology, what she calls, following Hountondji, “extravertion”. She shows how being responsive to local context and history or even to local publics does not necessarily feed back into an original professional sociology.
- Japan is manifestly an independent nation within the core, which prompts Yoshimichi Sato to undertake a subtle analysis of the hegemony of Western sociology. He asks why Japanese and Chinese scholars do not develop their concepts (e.g. *aidagara* and *en, guanxi*) into universal ones, to compete with notions of *social capital*. Sato suggests it is necessary to go beyond such *thick* local concepts, formulated as a reaction to the inadequacies of social capital, by turning them into *thin* concepts that can travel to different places where they can be relocalized.

Then there are cases in which the hegemony of the West, but especially of U.S. sociology is tied to geopolitics

- Thus, Sammy Smootha presents Israel as part of the core actively embracing and participating in US sociology as its appendage. In his view, the result is that sociologists pay too little attention to Israeli specificity, which could provide the basis of an original contribution to world sociology.
- Mau-kuei Chang, Ying-hwa Chang, and Chih-chie Tang from Taiwan offer a far more complicated picture of the effects of geopolitics on sociology. They write about the effects of a succession of external subjugations: first, of Japanese who used survey methods as an arm of colonial rule, then the sponsorship of sociology by the U.S. in the early years of the Nationalist KMT government, which led to the elevation of the (mainland) Chinese roots of Taiwanese sociology. When Taiwan lost its international status in the early 1970s, displaced by the People’s Republic of China, sociology took a new turn.

Sinicization was replaced by a move toward indigenization as a reaction to the continuing dependence on the US and the threat of PRC. The combination of economic growth and geopolitical insecurity led to the institutionalization of sociology, but also intensified pressure on Taiwanese universities in general and sociology in particular to establish their international ranking, which, in turn, fed indigenization.

While it is customary to condemn the enormous influence the US wields throughout the world, this should not lead us to overlook other circuits of North-South hegemony, such as the impressive presence of French sociology in much of Latin America as well as parts of Asia, Middle East and Africa. Such competing hegemonies, in this case over the valuation of different linguistic capital, do give some leverage to the dominated groups. There are three official languages in the ISA yet English prevails, not only because of the influence of the Anglo-American world, but also because so many countries in the global south, including India, China and much of Africa, have invested in English as a second language.

National and Regional Hegemonies

Hegemony within world sociology cannot be reduced to a simple North-South, West-East, developed-underdeveloped, metropolis-periphery dichotomy. First, there are important gradations in the world system and we might even invoke Wallerstein's notion of semi-periphery to capture distinctive societies that combine within themselves features of both periphery and core. Thus, countries such as India, Brazil, South Africa, and China contain within themselves conditions approximating to the "North" as well as the "South". Second, there is a center and a periphery in the production of knowledge *within* such countries that can be as stark as the difference between any rich and poor country. The model of academic dependency shouldn't lead us to overlook patterns of inequality and domination within countries.

- Tina Uys reports the criticisms of South African sociologists toward the rating system of their scholarly output, designed to promote international competitiveness. First, it presumes a false consensus on standards. Second, ratings based on publications in international journals and relying on international reviewers draws research away from issues and problems of local and national importance. Third, it devalues the teaching and training of the next generation of sociologists, and instead creates an elite status of researchers. In short, the

rating system effectively internalizes the hegemony of Northern sociology, thereby deepening the divide among South African sociologists.

- Emma Porio describes the pressures on Philippine universities, subject to a range of audits and pressure for policy driven research with the result that there is increased differentiation both within and between universities, and this takes place at the same time as dependency on Northern funding increases.
- From Egypt Mona Abaza tells another story – one in which the field of sociology is subject to a pincer movement of commodification and criminalization. Critical voices, even the seemingly most protected, such as Saad Eddin Ibrahim's, are pilloried as subversive, jailed as spies. Public sociology becomes life threatening in an authoritarian regime with no autonomous civil sphere. In this case an international campaign in Ibrahim's defense easily redounded against him, and even made him suspect among some of his colleagues.

The semi-periphery not only draws attention to internal divisions within countries but between countries within regions. Thus, Brazilian sociology is the best resourced sociology within Latin America, Indian sociology within South Asia, South African sociology within Africa, just as the core countries of the European Union have richer traditions of sociology than its periphery. Inequality, yes, but does this imply domination? What are the possibilities of collaboration across these divides?

- Tom Dwyer does not mince words when writing about the different mechanisms guaranteeing the domination of metropolitan sociology – from linguistic domination, to the control of journals and rating systems. Based on the experience of Brazil he proposes an alternative multi-polar vision of internationalization – one that emanates from countries of the South as well as from the North. A vibrant Brazilian sociology rates its own Portuguese-language journals on an international ranking system, and has actively pursued South-South collaboration (and Latin America has long been a leader in this regard).

From the standpoint of the peripheries of yesterday's empires things don't look rosy, especially when countries are cast to Western wolves under the spell of socialist legacies.

- Abulfaz Suleymanov describes the difficult situation in Azerbaijan where the Soviet legacy has left a vacuum in sociological training, the underdevelopment of social theory, coloniza-

tion of research by Western interests, the reduction of sociology to commercially sponsored surveys, and more generally the subordination of sociology to the market at the cost of public concerns. In this context building a national association and making regional and international connections become especially important.

- Rastislav Bednárík, writing about Slovakia, reminds us just how difficult it is for a young and barely recognized discipline, facing growing numbers of students with very limited teachers and resources. Slovakia may be in the European Union but its peripheral situation makes for a dramatically different conditions of knowledge production when compared to core countries such as Germany, France or U.K.
- Inga Tomić-Koludrović describes the reaction of Croatian sociologists to the Bologna Process, integrating higher education in the European Union. She sees the opposition as a legacy of the socialist past and rooted in outdated nationalist sentiments that fail to come to grips with the new global dispensation – second modernization -- to which the Bologna process is a response. The Bologna process, she argues, is not simply an arbitrary imposition from above but is responsive to needs from below, from groups, identities and interests that have been marginalized.

While not denying an overwhelming concentration of institutional resources and symbolic domination, emanating from the North, reinforced by the circulation through the North of a few privileged scholars from the South, nonetheless a simple North-South division, let alone a notion of US imperialism, does not capture the complex articulation of hegemonies of very different types within as well as among nation states.

The Neoliberal Crisis

Academic dependency across nations is itself being reconfigured as the position of sociology and more broadly of the university is challenged within the core. Sociology has become more precarious in Britain, Germany, and France as the golden years of sociology recede into the past and as the discipline has been threatened by neoliberal regimes which question the very idea of the social.

- Louis Chauvel offers a chilling analysis of the decline of the salaried middle class in France since the 1970s. This class includes sociologists who find their positions under assault as the

value of the sociology credential falls relative to other credentials, such as economics, exacerbated by the decline in funding for the public university relative to the *Grandes Écoles*.

- Marina Subirats warns of the dangers of disciplinary fracturing. She is precisely critical of sociology for *not* emulating the unity of economics. Reflecting on the experience of Spanish sociology, she proposes a “global sociology” that recognizes increased global interdependence, transcending national parochialism and disciplinary fragmentation, and facing the real problems of a world in crisis.

Michel Wieviorka directly addresses the crisis of our times by accusing economists of misunderstanding its true character. The crisis does not have a simple teleology -- crisis-resolution-crisis, down-turn followed by the inevitable upturn. Such a cyclical account cannot comprehend what is qualitatively new because what is new is produced by collective actors, especially social movements, whose retreat in the first place was responsible for initiating the crisis three decades ago. The way out of the present crisis, Wieviorka avers, is through the birth of new actors, such as the anti-globalization movement, or the rebirth of old actors, such as the trade union movement. What he does not consider, however, is the possibility of sociologists becoming a global actor in their own right, simultaneously participant in and observer of the world they study. The chapters in the three volumes explore precisely this possibility, but it is a possibility that rests upon negotiating our internal differences.

FROM DIVERSE TRADITIONS TO ALTERNATIVE SOCIOLOGIES

Farid Alatas argues that, in the short run, there is little we can do about the material side of academic dependency, and we should concentrate, therefore, on the side of ideas and theory. How can we combat Eurocentrism, Orientalism, and the “Captive Mind”? Challenging the universalism of Western sociologies is a two-step project: first, to show that they do not reflect the experience of subjugated populations and then, to demonstrate that there are alternative theories that have been ignored or suppressed by metropolitan sociology.

Diverse Traditions

The ISA has long recognized the existence of multiple sociological traditions, signaled by a number of books. The first collection, *National Tra-*

ditions in Sociology, edited by Nikolai Genov (1989), emerged from the 11th. World Congress held in Delhi in 1986. A second volume edited by Martin Albrow and Elizabeth King (1990), *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*, was a collection of papers that appeared in the ISA journal *International Sociology* since its founding in 1986. It was during this period that the Nigerian, Akinsolo Akiwowo (1986), made his famous intervention on behalf of “indigenous” sociology. In response to these debates Martin Albrow optimistically claimed that sociology goes through a series of stages: universalism, national sociologies, internationalism, indigenization and finally globalization. Most recently Sujata Patel (2009) has brought out *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions*, showing how sociological traditions can be broadly grouped into regions that have shared common historical experiences. The recognition of multiple sociologies is already a challenge to the idea of a single science that universalizes the experiences and thoughts of the most advanced capitalist countries.

- Sujata Patel’s keynote address develops this theme, challenging those who would abandon national formations and their sociologies, sensitive to the relation of sociology and power at global as well as national levels, and defending the necessity of developing multiple sociological traditions in conversation with one another.

A long line of Presidents of the ISA have emphatically supported the plurality of sociologies, even if they still searched for an underlying or projected unity. Ulf Himmelstrand (1978-1982) made a point of opening dialogue with sociologists from Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as well as with Africa and Latin America. Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1982-1986) wrote in his foreword to the first issue of *International Sociology*: “This will be the endeavor of our journal: to increase our knowledge about contemporary societies and sociologies, by showing pluralistic paths of concern in sociology rooted in different historical and cultural traditions” (1986: 2). Margaret Archer (1986-1990) proposed to develop a unified sociology but one based on diversity, and Piotr Sztompka (2002-2006), similarly called for a uniformity of world sociology combined with uniqueness of local sociologies.

T.K. Oomen (1990-1994), however, was far more cautious about any proposed unity, concerned that internationalization could be a proxy for Westernization. Too hasty an internationalization without protection for weaker sociological traditions could lead to intellectual colonialism. He called for “multidirectional flow of sociology, particularly strengthening the flow from the weak to the strong centers” (Oomen, 1991: 81). The

only President to come from a recently decolonized society, he was the most forthright about the hegemony of Western sociology.

Perhaps the ISA President to have done most for the development of regional sociologies, despite his unitary vision of sociology, was Immanuel Wallerstein (1994-1998). He orchestrated regional conferences that led to the publication of 10 edited volumes, one for each region's sociology. His was a major step toward recognizing the diversity of traditions, and gave birth to a new generation of international sociologists. Alberto Martinelli (1998-2002) followed Wallerstein with another important institutional innovation that brought together young sociologists from all over the globe -- the annual PhD Laboratory. In short, President after President has defended the plurality of coexisting sociologies, even if they have been less willing to tackle their arrangement in a hierarchical order.

Southern Theory

A more radical project thematizes the relations among these diverse traditions as one of domination, and proceeds to challenge that domination by valorizing what Raewyn Connell and others call Southern Theory. In *Southern Theory* (2007) Connell problematizes the canonical works of metropolitan theory – from the so-called classics of Marx, Weber, and Durkheim to the contemporary theories of James Coleman, Pierre Bourdieu and Anthony Giddens – whose silence on the South portends a distinctively Northern perspective disguised as universalism. Connell presents us with an alternative project that foregrounds social thinkers from the South who have not made it into the “mainstream” – from Africa the Dahomeyan philosopher Paulin Hountondji, from the Middle East, three Iranian thinkers al-Afghani, Al-e Ahmad, and the more contemporary Shariati, from Latin America the Argentinian economist Raúl Prebisch, the Brazilian sociologist Fernando Enrique Cardoso, the Mexican anthropologist García Canclini, from South Asia subaltern thinker, Ranajit Guha, anthropologist Veena Das, and public intellectual Ashis Nandy, and from South Africa, an early African nationalist and gifted public intellectual, Sol Plaatje. Around such thinkers Connell proposes to build an alternative social science. In seeking out alternative traditions, theories or discourses that challenge the assumptions of mainstream U.S. and European sociology, she raises a number of intriguing questions.

First, is it significant that the thinkers Connell dismisses are all sociologists from the North whereas those she embraces are a motley group of thinkers of whom none are declared sociologists, with the exception of Cardoso, who after all was deeply influenced by French sociology. Is sociology, then, only a (Northern) metropolitan project? No less problem-

atic is the fact that so many of Connell's Southern Theorists, e.g. Cardoso, Plaatje, Prebish, and Shariati, are thoroughly infused with Northern (French, English, and U.S.) thinking. If there is a Southern sociology then what makes it Southern and what makes it sociology?

Second, can one dismiss "Northern" theory when it includes the critique of the very theorists Connell takes as representative of Northern sociology. Feminism, critical race theory and even Marxism have relentlessly attacked the economism of James Coleman, the functionalism of Pierre Bourdieu and the third way of Anthony Giddens. Does that make these Northern critical theories part of Southern theory? Are there not, at least, two hegemonies: an hegemony within dominant countries/regions and a hegemony exercised by those dominant countries/regions over the subaltern countries/regions? Does that not open up the possibility of alliances struck between subjugated sociologies of the North and "Southern Theory"?

Therefore, third, rather than homogenizing metropolitan sociology, can we not see it as a contested field with dominant and subordinate moments. Doesn't this also apply to the South? Connell's chosen Southern theorists have to be restored to their context. Once we place Plaatje, Cardoso and Prebish, for example, in their own intellectual fields, we will see how they reflect, refract and represent particular interests in their countries of origin. Thus, are there not hegemonic and subordinate sociologies within the South? Can one understand the thinkers to which Connell draws our attention without locating them in their national fields – intellectual and political?

- Mohammad Ghaneirad shows how and why Shariati's complex hybrid of Islamic and Western thinking has dropped out of the present day Iranian sociological field. The state initiated drive for an Islamic sociology or a sociology that would promote the Islamicization of society has provoked a phobia of Nativism among professional sociologists concerned to defend their autonomy. Alternative sociologies are difficult to develop in this complex situation. There is a plurality of responses -- from the embrace of universalistic sociologies, inspired by Western concepts, to seeking new directions in public sociologies. But Shariati's ideas are shunned from both sides of the divide.

Finally, and relatedly, if Southern theory exists to express, albeit in complex and mediated form, the experience of the South, then what is this experience of the South? How is that experience expressed in theory? If the experience of the South is multiple, what distinguishes the South from the North? How come Australia ends up in the "South"? If South-

ern theory is not embedded in some material experience, nor reflective of some real interests, how can we expect social science to emerge from Connell's Southern theorists?

- Farid Alatas has pursued a similar project but rather than dismissing Western theory he proposes different ways of amalgamating Western sociology with alternative intellectual traditions emanating from non-Western societies. In his contribution here he dwells on the history of a distinctive Chinese sociology and its relevance to the modern world. Elsewhere (2006b) he has creatively introduced Ibn Khaldun's cyclical theory of history into Western debates about Asiatic society.

In constituting her North/South binary Connell has raised a host of problems – problems that we can no longer side step. Together with Alatas she has fired the all-important opening shot, inverting the taken-for-granted hierarchy that all new ideas in sociology come from the North. They inspire us to think outside conventional sociological frames. We owe them both a great debt for making the project of alternative sociologies imaginable, now we must make it feasible.

BUILDING NATIONAL SOCIOLOGIES

We must come down from heaven to earth, we must ground any alternative theories in the living practices and concrete social relations of actually existing sociologists. If they are to spark the sociological imagination they must be rooted in the division of sociological labor, defined by its four elements – professional, policy, public and critical sociology.

At the core of this division of labor is *professional sociology* that develops scientific research programs and is accountable to peers. Whether we are living in Colombo or Paris, Auckland or Oakland, Johannesburg or Sao Paulo, Tokyo or Beirut what defines us as sociologists is our connection to traditions of sociological research and theorizing, traditions that have been defined by our predecessors, traditions that are being continually redefined and rearticulated in a community of fellow scholars. To be sure professional sociology can be overdeveloped here and underdeveloped there, but it still lies at the core of our discipline.

It is important, therefore, that professional sociology does not come to be monopolized – and the danger is ever-present -- by universities and research institutes in the North. National professional sociologies cannot, however, spring from nowhere. They must be responsive to and inspired by problems defined by local or national actors. This is what I call a *policy sociology* which is borne of but also feeds back into professional so-

ciology. Whether we are talking of surveys or case studies, policy sociology should retain an intimate connection to professional sociology. If it does not maintain that connection it is easily captured by the clients it serves. There is, however, a second way of being connected to the local and national context, and that is through *public sociology*. Here the point is not to solve a problem defined by a client but to generate discussion and debate about the basic values and direction of society. You might say public sociology is the conscience of policy sociology in that it often debates issues of policy and influences the direction of policy.

If professional sociology is the core of our discipline critical sociology, the fourth element, is the heart of sociology. Critical sociology is first and foremost the critique of professional sociology. Here, indeed, we find the agenda for alternative sociologies – a critique of the theoretical foundations of much professional sociology. Critical sociology interrogates the assumptions made by policy sociology, just as it infuses new visions into public sociology. Critical sociology involves sociologists in conversation with one another as to the foundations of their common enterprise.

The assumption behind this model of knowledge production is that a flourishing discipline depends on the interaction among all four types of knowledge, on preventing the introversion of professional and critical sociologies or the extroversion of policy and public sociologies. The success of our conference lay precisely in the manifold ways these four types of sociology entered into a common discourse. Let me elaborate.

Public Sociology

Whether one is struggling for the rearticulation of sociologies within the existing global hegemony or one is seeking a new hegemonic order revolving around Southern Theory, new directions can only take root if grounded in real experience, in institutional life, and even in social movements. This requires a sociology that makes itself *relevant* to local or national issues, and *accountable* to local or national publics. The undertaking of such a public sociology should, therefore, be valorized by a national sociological community as a way to develop shared perspectives and deflate the universalistic claims of metropolitan sociology.

Public sociology is dialogue between sociologists and publics – a dialogue that recognizes the autonomy and reciprocal interdependence of each side. It can work in two ways: either through an *organic* connection of sociologists with a community, organization or movement, or alternatively through addressing a far broader audience, and cultivating national debate, what I call *traditional* public sociology. Organic public sociology

would include Alain Touraine's action sociology, deepening the consciousness of social movement militants and Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed working through an interaction between sociologist and peasantry. Traditional public sociology would include the writings of Pierre Bourdieu in France, M.N. Srinivas in India or Shariati in pre-revolutionary Iran. They all contributed to national debate about pressing social issues.

A number of papers in these volumes provide examples of public sociology from the past as well as the present.

- Dénes Némedi presents the history of Hungarian sociology as a complex interlacing of internal and external influences starting with original versions of traditional and then organic public sociology in the 19th and early 20th centuries, superseded by Soviet Marxism that generated its own critical sociology before the embrace of a Western oriented professional sociology.
- Georgy Fotev describes the dilemmas of traditional public sociology in Bulgaria battling with the communist legacy of a dependent and policy-oriented sociology. There are risks on all sides: threats to value free professional sociology, dangers of populism but also distancing, and ambiguous relations with the media.
- With Indonesia as their case Rochman Achwan and Iwan Sujatmiko show what can be done when there is synergy between "sociology for society" and "society for sociology" (between professional-critical and public-policy sociologies). They point to the involvement of public sociology in the reform of governance and labor laws, economic empowerment, agrarian reform, and constitutional amendment.
- Luis Baptista and Paulo Machado describe the efflorescence of sociology in Portugal after the end of the dictatorship in 1974. There sociology has had a close connection to national politics and policy science, but never at the cost of a public sociology. Indeed, the Portuguese Sociological association has organised open public debates about civic issues in different cities up and down the country.

Between traditional and organic public sociologies there should not be a relation of hostility and exclusivity but one of synergy and interaction. Traditional public sociology gives direction to organic public sociologies, connecting them to one another, while organic public sociology grounds wider public debate in the realities facing different communities.

Policy Sociology

In some contexts public sociology faces major obstacles while in other contexts it is simply a luxury. On the one hand, aspiring traditional public sociologists may have difficulty accessing the national media, indifferent or hostile to sociological perspectives. On the other hand, sociologists may not have the resources to develop the time consuming organic relation to communities, and communities may not be interested in debate and discussion. They want sociologists to deliver something much more concrete. In other words, they want policy rather than public sociology.

In addition, there may be real material pressures impelling sociologists into the policy realm, where they can garner necessary “extra” income, by serving external agencies that define problems as well as acceptable solutions. But here too there are different ways for sociologists to go about their business. On the one hand, there is the *sponsorship* model in which the client defines problems -- sometimes broadly, allowing sociologists considerable autonomy to bring critical perspectives to bear, and sometimes narrowly, serving as a paid expert or survey technician, often destined to legitimate policies already decided. On the other hand, there is the *advocacy* model in which sociologists takes it upon themselves to make policy proposals, seeking out advocates in the policy world. The initiative here lies with the sociologist rather than the client. Advocacy policy sociology can easily bleed into public sociology when the sociologist drums up support in the wider community.

The following are examples of the advocacy model in which the policy sociologist formulates the character of the social problem and then defines appropriate (and inappropriate) responses or even solutions.

- José-Vicente Tavares-Dos-Santos, writing from Brazil, shows the influence of neoliberal punishment-centered policing models within the criminology imported from the United States. In Porto Alegre he has developed alternative sociological models that protect citizenship security, on the basis of closer relations between police and community.
- Napoleón Velástegui Bahamonde from Ecuador, offers a programmatic statement, insisting that sociology must join the social and natural sciences in promoting modernization and the university’s engagement in the knowledge-based society.
- Vu Hao Quang writes of the role of sociology in analyzing social problems such as the fate of Vietnamese farmers under policies of the WTO. Here sociology is a technocratic discipline for the purposes of promoting social and economic development.

On the other hand, many of the papers describe the dangers of a sponsored policy sociology of a narrow contractual character that gives little autonomy to the researcher. If widespread this approach can have a distorting effect on the general practice of sociology in a given country.

- Abdul Mumin Sa'ad describes the impediments to the sociologist's influence over Nigeria's legal policy making -- narrow perception of development, prejudices against academics, inadequate media access and coverage, no appropriate body for receiving and utilizing sociological research.
- Patricio Langa describes another aspect of sociology's limited significance -- the "instrumentalization" of the Mozambiquan university whereby the social sciences are relegated below the more "useful" and technical disciplines. Political interference in university life, a legacy of the previous socialist regime, advances neither science nor the national "fight against absolute poverty."
- Sari Hanafi describes the proliferation of private research centers throughout the Arab world, channeling resources away from and undermining public universities in the region, This new NGO-based global elite produces shoddy policy-driven research, competing for funds from foreign donors with their own political agendas, creating superficial knowledge of the region, abandoning any critical capacity toward fashionable paradigms.

European welfare states have always had a strong policy orientation, combining both advocacy and sponsorship models. These cases from Denmark and Finland point to the emergence of new arenas of policy science, so-called mode-2 type knowledge, that is policy oriented knowledge produced outside the university by inter-disciplinary teams.

- Kristoffer Kropp and Anders Blok also describe shifts toward policy science (and to some extent "mode-2" type knowledge) in Denmark, linked to a whole gamut of institutions broadly connected to the welfare state, leading to what they call "welfare reflexivity." In the 1990s to the present, strategies of re-professionalization and policy research rescued Danish sociology from the state-led offensives of the 1980s against the radicalism of the 1970s.
- Pekka Sulkunen from Finland writes of the growth of "Mode-2" type transdisciplinary knowledge concerned with application and what works, with evaluation research, corresponding to transformations in welfare states toward programs proposed from below rather the plans imposed from above.

Professional Sociology

The focus on public and/or policy sociology is not intended to reproduce the existing global division of sociological labor with the metropolitan monopoly of theoretical work and scientific research, so it is important that national policy and public sociologies feed into a national professional sociology. Without that the enterprise would be of diminished value and significance. Here, too, there are multiple challenges and risks. Thus, limited resources make it more feasible to simply import professional sociology from abroad, or where resources are not so limited states may be intent on bench marking universities to “international,” i.e. metropolitan standards. This is what we might call *formal* professionalization. By contrast *substantive* professionalization involves the development of a relatively autonomous professional sociology, based on expanding research programs influenced by the issues brought to the table by public and policy sociologies. We can find examples of this in different continents, for example, subaltern studies in India, labor studies South Africa, participatory action research in Latin America, but, note, in each case the professionalization stems from embeddedness in local or national issues.

Certainly formal professionalization is one way to bring theories and methodologies, new paradigms to the attention of national sociologies, but it should not overwhelm substantive professionalization. Between the two there should be a reciprocal relation without the one outweighing the other. Indeed, at their best the Research Committees of the ISA can foster such a balance, fostering the fruitful circulation of ideas that can advance the autonomy and energy of national sociologies.

Sustaining a relatively autonomous professional sociology can be very difficult due to the paucity of resources, the pressure for narrow policy-driven research and inhospitable national legacies. Below we have cases from Africa, the Former Soviet Union, Latin America and India that face very different challenges.

Africa:

- Simon Mapadimeng writes of the complexity of continuities and breaks with apartheid South Africa. The massive expansion of sociology students and thus ever-increasing teaching loads, the continuing divide between historically black and white universities, and the turn to client-driven policy research, are threatening the advance of research-based and critical sociologies, and South Africa’s place in the global division of sociological labor.
- Feleke Tadele maps out the history of sociology in Ethiopia – an exceptional African nation without a colonial legacy. It has

experienced rapid growth in the recent period (manifested in degrees at all levels), owing to the demands for sociologists in the NGO sector. There is a strong emphasis on the applied dimension of sociology at the expense of building research tradition and indigenous social theory.

The Former Soviet Union:

- Gevorg Poghosyan depicts the dilemmas of Armenia released from the former Soviet Union as an independent state, struggling to constitute a national sociology de novo in a context of open borders and free markets. Facing the exodus of sociologists from the academic world into jobs abroad or private polling companies, the Armenian Sociological Association tries to promote professional sociology through regional, diasporic and international connections.
- Valery Mansurov offers a more optimistic picture for Russia, where he sees the convergence of postSoviet and Western sociology. As old restrictions are cast aside, Russian sociology has developed a multi-paradigmatic studies of elite formation, the continuing power of the Soviet nomenklatura, gender inequality, poverty and homelessness, conflict as in the Chechen War, adopting qualitative methodologies within new theoretical frameworks, including a reconstructed Marxism.

Latin America:

- Alicia Palermo from Argentina takes on one aspect of substantive professionalism, the challenges of sustaining national journals of sociology that are recognized nationally, regionally and world-wide. She emphasizes the biases of international rating systems, as well as the lack of funding and training, and calls for greater involvement of state agencies and collaborations among sociology journals across Latin America.
- Jorge Carrillo writes about the challenges facing the sociology of work in Mexico – one of the strongest subdisciplines in Mexico, and renown throughout Latin America. With tightening economic resources, there are fewer research projects, and growing inequalities within the research community. Studies are more descriptive than theoretical, and miss an international comparative dimension, although there is a very fruitful collaboration across Latin America.

India:

- As Ishwa Modi writes, even a country as large as India with its large body of sociology, and its long traditions finds the development of an autonomous sociology difficult, especially in an

era of marketization and privatization. But the Indian Sociological Society has tried to foster greater communication within India but also between India and other countries, especially those of the Global South, namely Brazil and South Africa.

Professional sociology is also struggling in richer countries, under competitive pressures of internationalization.

- Charles Crothers from New Zealand argues that policy and public sociologies have not borne fruit in a strong professional sociology. Indeed, in recent years sociology has been absorbed into other disciplines, leaving only one autonomous sociology department. Even though this white settler colony is part of the semi-periphery, it is a periphery of Australia which sets intellectual patterns for the region.
- John Holmwood examines the consequences of the British “research assessment exercise,” that is designed to benchmark academic knowledge to international standards. He sees this formal professionalization as a form of “governmentality” that threatens the professional core and its critical alternatives by fragmenting sociology, with parts migrating into other disciplines.

As all these cases suggest, the development of an autonomous professional sociology is very much dependent upon the largesse of the state, and the autonomy of a university system as well as the standing of the discipline within the university. One of the reasons for the expansion of Ethiopian sociology has been its ability to make teaching a priority, to offer degrees or diplomas in “applied” sociology that attract students. On the other hand, of course, excessive teaching loads can also sink the possibility of developing serious research agendas. Since teaching absorbs so much of the time of so many sociologists we have to give serious attention to innovative synergies between teaching and research, especially as electronic media become more widely dispersed.

Critical Sociology

It is critical sociology that sustains the integrity of the division of sociological labor. It sustains a balance between substantive and formal professionalization, between sponsored and contract policy research, and between traditional and organic public sociology. The project of critical sociology is to make us accountable to ourselves as well as others, and to build a reflexive community, reflexive about the values we think are im-

portant, values that might be infused into professional, policy and public sociologies.

Critical sociology may be aimed at our discipline, but it is also a conduit of ideas from other disciplines. Again it is especially important to fend off pressures for narrow disciplinary chauvinism that can mark the social sciences of the North, especially in the United States. Interdisciplinarity is very important where public and policy sociology is emphasized since neighboring disciplines can offer important perspectives on social issues, but it is also very important where social science disciplines are individually very weak. Interdisciplinarity does not mean the dissolution of disciplinarity. Quite the opposite it feeds off disciplinarity, which is its *sine qua non*, just as it often provides intellectual sustenance for disciplinarity.

Metropolitan sociology developed through the synergy of four types of knowledge – professional, policy, public and critical – even if now one or more dominate their disciplinary fields. It's important to replicate that synergy, not just within countries but within regions too. Thus, Latin America, as a region, offers probably one of the best examples of a broad gauged synergy among the four types of knowledge and has given rise to one of most vibrant sociological fields in the world.

- Marcos Supervielle, reflecting on the four phases of post-WWII history of sociology in Latin America, underlines its continuing engagement with society – whether at the level of policy experts or public dialogue. It is this engagement that becomes the spring board for original sociologies, creatively appropriating and critically appraising metropolitan theories while generating autonomous research traditions. Making itself accountable to local and national communities has been one ingredient but the creation of a regional community of scholars has been the second ingredient for the dynamic auto-centric expansion of theory and research.
- Takashi Machimura describes the very different situation in Japan where research and teaching has been largely conducted in Japanese. This has favored a synergy among the four types of sociology, including a strong public sociology, but communication with other sociologies is difficult. Although Western classics are translated into Japanese, Japanese classics rarely become a reference point for international sociology, despite Japan being the second or third most numerous concentrations of sociology in the world.

If one way to resist the false universalism of metropolitan hegemony is to build robust national sociologies throughout the South, another way

is to nationalize or “provincialize” Northern sociology. The universal claims, implicit or explicit, of U.S., French, German sociologies must be qualified by recognition of the particular realities they reflect and from which they have emerged. Here, too, more attention to a public sociology might help, but also openness to the contestation of universalistic claims by other national professional and critical sociologies. There is nothing like open discussion among sociologists from different parts of the world to clarify the particularity of universal claims!

TOWARD FEASIBLE GLOBAL SOCIOLOGIES

So, what does this mean for the development of global sociologies? One form of global sociology, global sociology from above, is simply the universalization of a single, usually Northern, sociology. Here a comparison with economics is pertinent. Economics has managed to constitute its own object of analysis – the market economy – over which it has a monopoly of knowledge, and thereby it has created a theory and methodology with claims to universal applicability. The center of this univocal but ever-changing paradigm, is the United States. The paradigm imposes itself through transnational socialization (flows of students, prestige of US credentials), through flows of resources (scholarships, research funding, think tanks) and through the domination of international agencies (World Bank, IMF, etc.), which employ mainly U.S. trained economists (Fourcade 2006). A large part of its success lies with the constitution of “national economies” which underpin an ongoing synergy between professional and policy science. Once the Soviet order had disintegrated it was hard to even imagine challenges to the domination of U.S. economics, although, of course, Europe always had its alternative models and there have been critiques emanating from the South. Undoubtedly, their success in creating a distinctive object of knowledge and in convincing others of their insights into its working undergirds the influence of economists in diverse political fields (Fourcade 2009).

Sociology is different in that it has not successfully constituted its own object over which it has a monopoly of knowledge. Therefore, there has been no umbilical cord connecting professional and policy sociology – although a close approximation may be found in Scandinavia. Generally, efforts to establish a single paradigm with “society” as its object have failed. There is simply no well-defined object that sociologists study and over which they have a monopoly of knowledge. They study everything: from institutions to identities, from states to schools, from economies to families, from deviance to consent, from domination to social

movements. The ISA has 55 research committees, all focused on different topics. Thus, instead of having its own object, sociology has a distinctive *standpoint*, namely the standpoint of civil society – those institutions, organizations, and movements that inhabit the space between economy and state. This does not mean that sociology only studies civil society. Rather it studies state and market through their effects on civil society, and vice versa how civil society provides the conditions of existence of state and market. Because civil society is made up of competing forces, organized into patterns of domination and exclusion, so sociology is a contested and plural discipline, very different from the paradigmatic science of economics.

To look upon sociology as defined by its standpoint means to recognize that the sociologist is simultaneously observer of and participant in society, that there is no place outside society not even for the scientist. Sociology, therefore, is always potentially an actor within the society it studies. In taking up such a stance sociology is necessarily skeptical of economists' claims to neutrality, objectivity and universality. Indeed, these claims mask the interest of orthodox economics in the unrestricted expansion of markets, an expansion that threatens civil society and thus, not just sociology but also humanity's capacity to protect itself against, for example, the degradation of the environment and labor. Sociology becomes, therefore, not only a potential opposition to economics in the academic field but also contributes to the counter-movement against markets in the wider society.

As markets become global so sociology aspires to become global too, contributing to a global civil society, knitting together communities, organizations and movements across national boundaries. If orthodox economics is constituted globally from above through a process of academic imperialism, global sociologies are laboriously constituted from below out of particular national sociologies. This depends on the viability of those national sociologies discussed in the previous section, and then on building multiple connections among such national sociologies. This can be done directly or through the development of regional ties and regional sociologies, as has been done in Latin America, Europe and North America, and to a lesser extent in Asia and the Arab World. Moreover, through such linkages and circulations, conferences and joint projects, weaker sociologies are strengthened.

Building a global sociology from below is a daunting and precarious task. If there is a paucity of collective actors in the world then sociology may have little alternative but to enter the vacuum. Indeed, faced with the possibility of being condemned to irrelevance, its very livelihood may be at stake. Can we look for global actors of tomorrow in the legions of so-

ciologists, whose peculiarity is to simultaneously diagnose and confront the unequal world they inhabit. If sociology can be constituted as a collective actor, can it also reach beyond a trade union defensiveness, important though that is, to embrace wider interests and global awareness? That's the challenge of a global sociology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alatas, Syed Farid. *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Science: Responses to Eurocentrism*. New Delhi: Sage, 2006a.
- _____. "A Khaldunian Exemplar for a Historical Sociology for the South." *Current Sociology* 54, no.3 (2006b): 397-412.
- Alatas, Syed Hussein. "The Captive Mind and Creative development." *International Social Science Journal* 36 (1974): 691-99.
- Albrow, Martin and Elizabeth King (eds.). *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*. London: Sage, 1990.
- Archer, Margaret. "Sociology for one World: Unity and Diversity." *International Sociology* 6, no.2 (1991): 131-47.
- Akiwowo, Akinsola. "Contributions to the Sociology of Knowledge from an African Oral Poetry." *International Sociology* 1, no.4 (1986): 343-358.
- Beck, Ulrich. *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge, U.K., Polity Press, 2004.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Corporatism of the Universal: The Role of Intellectuals in the Modern World." *Telos* 81 (1989): 99-110.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique. "Foreword." *International Sociology* 1, no.1 (1986): 1-2 Connell, Raewyn. *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 2007.
- Fourcade, Marion. "The Construction of a Global Profession: The Transnationalization of Economics." *American Journal of Sociology* 112 (2006): 145-94.
- _____. *Economists and Societies: Discipline and Profession in the United States, Britain, and France 1890s to 1990s*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Genov, Nikolai (ed.). *National Traditions in Sociology*. London: Sage, 1989.
- Himmelstrand, Ulf. "The Role of the ISA in Internationalizing Sociology." *Current Sociology* 39 (1991): 85-100.
- Oommen, T.K. "Internationalization of Sociology: A View from Developing Countries." *Current Sociology* 39 (1991): 67-84.

Patel, Sujata (ed.). *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions*. London: Sage, 2009.

Sztompka, Piotr. "One Sociology or Many?" in Patel (editor), *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions*, pp.21-28. London: Sage, 2009

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The End of the World As We Know It: Social Science for the Twenty-First Century*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.