

Introduction: Diversities of Sociological Traditions

Sujata Patel

Since the seventies and particularly after the nineties the dynamics of the world have changed. Global integration has promoted a free flow of ideas, information and knowledge, goods, services, finance, technology and even diseases, drugs and arms. At one level the world has contracted. It has opened up possibilities of diverse kinds of trans-border flows and movements: that of capital, labour and communication together with interdependence of finances, and has widened the arenas of likely projects of cooperation. But it has also created intense conflicts and increased militarization.

At another level, the contexts of the flow of capital and labour have changed; if these have encouraged voluntary migration, they have also encouraged human trafficking, displacement of populations and the making of refugees. Space is being reconstituted as sociabilities criss-cross within and between localities, regions, nation-states and global territories, in tune with the changing nature of work and enterprise. Each of these locations has become a significant site of scrutiny and analysis as sociabilities are being constituted within multiple locations.

Inequalities and hierarchies are being differently organized even though we all live in one global capitalist world with a dominant form of modernity. Lack of access to livelihoods, infrastructure and political citizenship now blends with exclusions relating to cultural and group identity in distinct spatial locations. This process is and has challenged the constitution of the agency of actors and groups of actors.

Today, the globe is awash with differential forms of collective and violent interventions, concurrently asserting diverse representations of cultural identities, together with livelihood deprivations as the defining characteristics of these collectivities. Fluidity of identities and its continuous expression in different manifestations demands a fresh perspective to assess and examine the world; it needs to be perceived through many prisms.

Are sociology and sociologists across the world ready to take the challenge that contemporary times pose for us? What kind of resources do they have to tackle the demands presented by contemporary dynamics? In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Europeans and later the Americans took up the

challenge to assess societal changes and evolve new perspectives. Since then, this legacy has been interrogated from distinct locations as the discipline has spread across the world. This inheritance has been assessed to be dominant – both over theories and practices – and explored as being uneven in its spread and distribution within nation-states and regions.

Each spatial location has evolved specific perspectives and resources to define its sociological knowledge and has institutionalized these in terms of its material and political capital. The European and the American emanated as reflections of local and *provincial* processes (Chakrabarty, 2000) and have been exported as universal processes elsewhere; some have become adaptations of imported external and/or dominant perspectives and yet others have evolved a critique of these dominant universal paradigms. The range of these perspectives and resources is extremely wide. Can these ideas, scholarships and practices of sociological knowledge help us to assess today's challenges?

The goal of this Handbook is to present and debate the various ways in which power has shaped and continues to shape the practices of sociological knowledge across the world. This is not a Handbook of national sociologies. There is also no attempt to make an exhaustive examination of sociological knowledge in all nation-states. Its objective is to create discussion on how to assess all aspects of the discipline organized and institutionalized across the globe: ideas and theories; scholars and scholarship; practices and traditions; and ruptures and continuities, through a globalizing perspective that examines the relationship between sociological knowledge and power.

It debates the processes that structure these in different nation-states organized within five different regions. It presents diverse ways of producing and reproducing sociological knowledge, that is, as theories, research and teaching practices in various nation-states, asserting that each of these interpretations of this collective experience is equally privileged and legitimate.

Together, these diversities cannot be placed in a single line and considered equal and neither is any one of these superior or inferior. Collectively, they are and remain both diverse and universal sociological traditions, because they present distinct and different perspectives to assess their own histories of sociological theories and practices. Each of these traditions has also evolved its own assessment of its relationship with other traditions, and the accumulation of sociological knowledge and power. In this sense these perspectives of tradition continue to remain and exist as being diverse and comparative.

An earlier publication of essays on national sociological traditions had defined traditions as being ‘. . . first, social relations associating the different aspects of sociology (knowledge complex, research activity and social institution) and its external social milieu; and second, the internal social relations in science organization itself’ (Genov, 1989: 2).

Genov's text considered three issues as being particularly significant in defining national sociological traditions: technological development of research orientation; economic organization of society; and political factors. While recognizing differences between traditions of sociological theorizations, Genov also suggested that weak traditions remain locked in an analysis of ‘given national and social context’ while strong national traditions make major contributions to world sociology (Genov, 1989: 16).

This distinction between weak and strong is part of a debate within strands of European and American sociology regarding the necessity of crafting uniform sociological knowledge and has become once more significant in the context of a discussion on contemporary processes of globalization. Recently, Jurgen Habermas and Ulrich Beck have framed a new agenda for social theory by arguing for a need to evolve ‘post-national’ sociologies (Habermas, 2001) and trans-national social theory to embrace the new cosmopolitanism being ushered in by contemporary globalization (Beck, 2006).

Beck in particular advocates a need to move beyond ‘methodological nationalism’ – the study of sociology and social sciences through the prism of nation-states – and, as he says, ‘we live and act in self-enclosed spaces of national states and their respective national societies’ (Beck, 2000: 20). He suggests that today’s task implies the invention of a new methodology which opens up the theoretical and research perspectives of the social sciences to transnational interdependencies and connections of society which cannot be contained in perspectives that are restricted within the nation-state (Beck, 2006).

Within Europe and the USA, a discussion of sociological traditions has been generally restricted to debate regarding social theories, the development of a culture of professionalization and an affirmation of universalization of its perspectives and practices. However this universalization has been questioned since the late sixties as a consequence of the growth of protest movements, the reconstitution of Marxist theory and the interrogation of dominant positions of social theory from feminist and environmentalist perspectives, and by new interventions in identity theory. These ‘silences’ opened up the debate on European and American sociological knowledge to an assessment of its relationship with power from a non-elite and subaltern perspective.

By the late eighties, there was recognition that European and American social theory incorporated a multiplicity and diversity of approaches with no agreement regarding the fundamentals of what constitutes social theory (Giddens and Turner, 1987) and that there was a need for ‘. . . the explicit search for (new) models of inquiry and conceptual frames which can express the uniqueness of cultures’ (Albrow, 1987: 9). Additionally, there was a demand for sociology to ‘open’ itself to incorporate the challenges from interdisciplinary social sciences such as gender studies, race and ethnicity studies, environment studies and cultural studies, along with trends incorporating new perspectives within Marxism.

However, these discussions remained limited to an assessment of theories (and did not particularly discuss practices), an assessment that accepted diversities of perspectives but postulated the imperative of a uniform culture of science, limiting its discussions within itself rather than evaluating its organic relationship with the ‘other’, that is, it ignored the impact of global distribution of power on the production and reproduction of conservative, radical and reflexive sociological knowledge across the world. As a result, scholars in the rest of the world have argued that the universalization of European and American perspectives (what Alatas (1974) calls the ‘captive mind’), provided one grand vision and a ‘truth’ of assessing changes taking place in the world (Wallerstein, 2006).

From the forties to seventies, as many nations of the world became states, sociologists in these countries advocated the use of indigenous philosophies, epistemologies and methodologies to conceptualize, understand and examine ‘local’ and national cultures and structures (Mukerjee, 1955; Mukerji, 1958; Alatas, 1974; Akiwowo, 1989, 1990). This perspective also affirmed the need for the nation-state to remain a critical locale for the classification and assessment of a range of sociological practices including social theories.

Indigenous positions have suggested that European and American perspectives were ethnocentric, and obfuscated the analysis of specific contexts and processes, refracted and misrepresented and simultaneously defined one particular way of evaluating them (Alatas, 1974; Mukerji and Sengupta, 2004). This was not only true of conservative and positivist theories but also radical theories, such as Marxism, and those representing subaltern and excluded voices, such as feminism (Mohanty, 1988; Mani, 1990) and environmentalism. As these were exported to other countries, they too have become dominant universal models.

Sociologists also argued that such domination organized an array of sociological practices, including those that dealt with teaching,

such as import of syllabi and textbooks, and research (what to study, how to study and what is considered best practice in research, including the evaluation of research projects and the protocols of writing and presenting empirical and theoretical articles in journals) (Alatas, 1974). Also, these issues together with a discussion on who funds research and who defines its agenda opened up for debate the way social theory and its practices are embedded in the uneven distribution of global power – an issue of significance in the context of contemporary globalization.

In recent interventions, Latin American dependency theorists have reiterated this position, arguing that this universalization is part of the geopolitics of knowledge, and have suggested that there is a need to examine sociological knowledge as a discourse of power, particularly in the context of contemporary developments. They argue that both classical and contemporary European theories, and now American social theory, represent a discourse on power. They contend that it is premised on assessing itself, the 'I' (the West), rather than the 'other' (the rest of the world), which was and remains the object of its control, even after the formal demise of colonialism and imperialism. Universalism implies legitimating the knowledge of the 'I' regarding 'society' (Mignolo, 2002).

European and American social theories, they argue, incorporate a set of axioms to frame knowledge of society and consist of several features, which come together in terms of binaries to become a matrix of power and a principle and strategy of control and domination. These scholars contend that this discourse has universalized the precepts of European and American modernity (as part of the imperialist project) disallowing legitimacy for new ways of thinking, of assessing processes in the rest of the world and unearthing its tradition(s) of philosophies and epistemologies together with its specific practices. They argue for a need to study not only sociological theories but the entire range of practices of production and reproduction of sociological knowledge

within nation-states and regions. These have to be examined in terms of their organic link with the dominant discourse, with each of such reflections indicating diverse universal ways of understanding these symbiotic linkages (Quijano, 2000; Lander, 2002; Mignolo, 2002).

Critical and reflexive sociology has been the first to initiate a discussion on the symbiotic relationship between knowledge and power, including its own. This question becomes significant because globalization is also reorganizing knowledge and its institutions in new and seminal ways. Can we delineate the way this process is affecting the nature of sociological knowledge? How is power and domination in its complex, colonial, neocolonial, patriarchal, discursive and material manifestations affecting epistemology, its claim to truth and its strategies of representation? Whose ideas and perspectives is it reflecting when it enumerates the nature and content of consequences of globalization? What is the relationship between national, regional and global knowledge?

Given that the relationship between knowledge and power may be structured in distinct ways across the world and within nation-states, it is argued in this Handbook that there is a need to assess sociological traditions at three levels. First, while the papers agree that the disciplinary traditions need to be studied from multiple spatial locations: within localities, within nation-states, within regions and the globe, they assert that the nation-state is a key element in fashioning the traditions of the discipline. The nation-state defines sociological traditions in many ways.

It does so directly. Whether it is democratic, authoritarian, fascist, socialist or theocratic plays a critical role in legitimizing the needs of the discipline and framing its function for society. The papers indicate that democracies have generally encouraged the teaching of sociology; this is not so for states that have propagated fascism, communism, theocracy, apartheid and military dictatorships. These have instead barred it and/or controlled its teaching.

In countries where the subject is not proscribed, the nation-state can intervene in a myriad of ways including when private institutions play a direct role. This it does by determining the content of knowledge to be transmitted to learners and through a gamut of policies, and regulations on higher education which both encourage and constrain the development of the discipline. These policies determine the protocols and practices of teaching and learning processes, establishment and practices of research within research institutes, distribution of grants for research, language of reflection, organization of the profession and definitions of scholars and scholarship.

Second, traditions need to be discussed in terms of their sociological moorings in distinct philosophies, epistemologies, and theoretical frames, cultures of science and languages of reflection. Papers in this Handbook have analysed how at various points of time in the history of the discipline, new perspectives on understanding social life have emerged by questioning dominant universalized and colonized sociological ideas. Papers present arguments of how the discipline has evolved to incorporate the subaltern voices and use these voices in order to understand, assess and comprehend evolving sociabilities. They also highlight how external and dominant processes, together with colonialism and neocolonialism, have reframed knowledge, and assert a need to excavate new endogenous and/or autonomous ways of thinking and of practising sociology.

Third, the intellectual moorings of sociological practices are extensive. The papers discuss the diverse and comparative sites of knowledge production and its transmission. These range from campaigns, movements and advocacies; classrooms and departments; syllabi formulations and protocols of evaluating journal articles and books. These involve activists, scholars and communities in assessing, reflecting and elucidating immediate events and issues that intervene to define the research process together with organizing and systematizing knowledge

of the discipline in long-term institutionalized procedures for organizing the teaching process.

The papers in the Handbook discuss the nature and structure of sociological traditions in different nation-states. These are examined in terms of five spatial regions, classified according to the historically constructed global distribution of power as it emerged with the spread of European modernity in the late nineteenth century. It includes old and new regions, such as Europe and the USA, Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa, Middle East/West Asia, South Asia and the Far East/Asia Pacific. The papers interrogate this classification of the world as they debate its role in devising universal and diverse knowledge and state new ways of 'reading' these.

THE DEBATE: ONE SOCIOLOGY OR MANY SOCIOLOGIES

The four papers in this section have different entry points to assess and debate the perspectives that govern sociological tradition(s). There are fundamental differences among the authors about defining and assessing the themes. Are there many traditions or are there variations within one tradition? Is sociology a universal science or does it have a plural tradition of many particulars? These papers acknowledge that the project of universalism is a political one with some emphasizing its relation with the global division of knowledge. Some situate the problem historically and analyse whether the question of universalism was related to colonialism, while all ask whether contemporary globalization demands one or many sociologies. The papers provide various ways to reconstitute universalisms and thereby internationalize the discipline.

Piotr Sztompka's paper argues that, historically, sociology has organized itself as 'national sociologies'. These sociologies differed from each other in terms of their

emphasis on the defining characteristics of their nation-states, theories and concepts, use of methods and methodologies, recognition of scholars, link with other disciplines, use of language, together with the assumptions governing the formation of the discipline, and its institutional embeddedness.

He suggests that today we need to go beyond national sociologies, because there is on the one hand a globalization of society and on the other internationalization of sociology. Henceforth, he asserts that we need to combine the received formulae of 'one sociology for many worlds' and 'many sociologies for one world'. Sociology needs to maintain universal global standards, uniform conceptual frameworks, models, orientations, theories and methods while studying local problems. Sztompka calls for the universalization of one sociology that recognizes diversity in societies and analyses these differences.

Syed Farid Alatas's search for a new way to universalize sociology was a consequence of an assessment of European sociological traditions. These claimed to be universal, but were in fact Eurocentric in their orientations. These sociological traditions represented Europeans as the sole originators of ideas, universalized European categories and concepts and created the binary of the subject (West) and the object (East). According to Alatas, for sociology to universalize itself, it has to incorporate the sociological theories of non-western thinkers.

His paper stresses the need for developing autonomous sociological traditions based on alternative sociological tradition(s) that can recast concepts and theories from non-European contexts. He cites the works of two such thinkers, José Rizal and Ibn Khald n to assess new perspectives. They allow us to interrogate commonsensical language regarding the colonized, redefine new research agendas outside the interests of international powers and reframe the subject-object binary in order to construct new hypotheses in autonomous terms. Alatas would like sociology to be made universal in this manner.

Raewyn Connell follows the logic of colonialism and its impact on sociological theory to construct a global sociology. She divides sociological traditions historically into two phases. In the first, she argues that there was an organic relationship between the metropole and the periphery leading to museumization of the periphery. In the second phase, this aspect, though silenced, remained embedded in the way sociology was envisioned and institutionally developed. To change this received inequality of domination-subordination in the knowledge structure, Connell maps a new programme.

This includes a sensitivity to assess and empirically examine ways of living and doing in the periphery, encouraging contested theoretical frames regarding evaluations of processes in the periphery, incorporating knowledge about this in teaching and learning practices in the metropole, together with the introduction of participatory and critical pedagogies. She asserts the need for continuous theorizations of ways of examining the relationship between knowledge and the unequal distribution of global resources. This implies changing the assumptions of thinking sociologically.

This section ends with a paper by Michael Burawoy who urges us to rethink global sociology from a bottom-up approach. Sociologies are of four kinds – professional, policy, critical and public, with the last being most relevant because it relates to the concerns of people. He argues that for too long we have been concerned with national sociologies. Rather, we should now be oriented to regional sociologies which are sensitive to their national histories and relate these in terms of the global division of sociology.

He divides the world into four regions constituted in terms of contemporary social change – transitions from colonialism, authoritarianism (military dictatorship), socialism and industrialism. Burawoy argues that post-industrial countries have fashioned professional sociology and dominate the world of sociology and its practices. This has to be

countered by the project of global public sociology.

These papers assess the critical history of sociology and debate ways to examine the problem of universalism on the one hand, and diversities on the other. All the authors agree on the need for an inclusive perspective in the contemporary context of globalization, although the solutions they present are varied. In the course of the debate they discuss the politics of assessing contexts and milieus, theories and concepts, methods and methodologies, teaching and learning, scholars and academy and the profession and its audience. Many of the issues that they raise, together with the perspectives they have outlined, are debated in the following chapters.

BEYOND THE CLASSICAL THEORISTS: EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY TODAY

The five papers in this section explore the traditions of sociology in Europe where the discipline originated and in the USA where it spread and became dominant in the twentieth century. On one level, the papers question the commonsensical myth that there was one sociological tradition in Europe and that the same was true later in the USA. On another level the papers indicate that in some European countries sociology is a new discipline and was only institutionalized after democracy was consolidated within the region (between the fifties and the eighties), suggesting a symbiotic relationship between sociology and democracy.

Over the course of the last hundred years the discipline in the various nation-states has had many ups and downs, related to resources invested in academia, the nature of demand from the market and the strength of its culture of professionalism. In spite of these trends, the singularity of this tradition is in its investment in theorizations regarding modernity, and in contesting and refashioning the classical theoretical frameworks from

new perspectives. These papers highlight how universalized sociological theories have reflected on local processes in their early history and how these tended to become generalized with the growing convergence between nation-states over issues such as rising inequalities, and as Europe and the USA become part of one region – the North Atlantic.

We begin with a paper that elaborates the way in which the specific tradition(s) of sociology were mapped out in France since Durkheim. Louis Chauvel discusses the creative tensions between the themes of holism and individualism, suggesting that theorizations in France are distinct from those practised in the Anglo-Saxon sociological language and work. He explores the relationship between holism and individualism over three periods, late nineteenth century, post seventies and in the present.

Chauvel argues that the French notion of the individual combines many aspects – the role, its significance, centrality, autonomy and imagination, with ‘self expression, subjective identity, and self determination’. This conceptualization allows the discipline to raise issues regarding the individual without collapsing the concept into structure/society. He suggests that this localized perspective may have enormous significance in visualizing a new global sociology.

Most students of sociology believed in the myth that German sociology has had a long history of institutionalized production of knowledge. This is contested by Karl-Siebert Rehberg, who explores the implications of its limited institutionalization in the first part of the twentieth century. He argues that developments after the Second World War allowed sociology to grow across West Germany. In East Germany its presence can be documented only recently, after the unification of the two Germanies.

Despite the lack of significant state support in the earlier part of its history, the individual scholar’s contribution in developing new theories and perspectives has been impressive. Interestingly, the German contributions of Max Weber and Norbert Elias were

rediscovered by German sociologists after World War II. German sociology has developed rich and diverse traditions, which range from culturist theories to action-oriented theories with anthropological perspectives, to the analysis of forms and social systems, to Marxist theories together with new interpretations of modernity. Rehberg discusses the need for sociology to emphasize these diversities but simultaneously wishes to ensure that such trends do not lead to negation of disciplinary boundaries.

John Scott narrates a distinct history of sociological theory in the UK. He highlights the initial contribution of such theorists as Herbert Spencer and later, Patrick Geddes, and indicates how the discipline came into its own after its integration with radical alternatives in the post-seventies period. Scott also suggests that from the fifties sociology found its identity through perspectives imported from the USA. However, British empirical work was able to conceptualize changes in the class structures of that period, which was and remains its major contribution to sociology. Post-seventies sociology has evolved to become plural and diverse as it has interacted with other disciplines, new sociological approaches from France and Germany and with new social movements such as the new left and feminism.

The Portuguese experience has been distinctive in many ways. First, its history of fascism did not create conditions for the growth of sociology until the mid seventies. Portugal was cut off from intellectual ideas within Europe and from the rest of the Portuguese speaking countries as well. Analia Torres describes how a certain culture of sociology was maintained despite the oppressive Salazar regime and this came into its own in the post-seventies decades, after democracy was restored and when research and teaching was expanding.

Second, she suggests that the unique aspect of Portuguese sociological tradition(s) as against other European countries is its diversity of approaches and perspectives, combining the work of European scholars with that

of Latin Americans. Third, she argues that sociology in Portugal was for a long time oriented to public and policy issues, and thus the profession in Portugal is not restricted to universities and research centres but has a presence in various professions, including the civil service, the media, advocacy organizations and trade unions. These characteristics make Portuguese sociology distinctive in Europe and in the world.

Craig Calhoun, Troy Duster and Jonathan Van Antwerpen argue that the history of American sociology is not that of a homogenous unified whole, but represents competing theoretical and methodological traditions, continuous professional conflicts, constant engagement with public issues (such as class, race and gender), and continuous dialogue with European tradition(s).

The paper narrates the hundred-year history of the professionalization of the discipline, and suggests that since the seventies there has been an inclusive tendency in its tradition(s) as new specializations have developed due to its interface with growing social movements, the market, and with changing university and research agendas. Despite these trends the American tradition also has a history of being 'ethnocentric' and continues to have selective engagement with groups that identify themselves as ethnic and first nations. The paper argues that there remains a creative tension in American sociological tradition and this allows it to be responsive and imaginative.

Papers in this section attest to a long tradition of making and remaking of sociology as it has incorporated new issues, perspectives and methodologies. In the process it has explored domination and subordination in its society to make the discipline inclusive. However, there is a silence on one matter: the relationship of domination that exists between sociologies from Europe and the USA and the sociologies of the rest of the world. This issue becomes a key theme in a discussion of sociological tradition(s) in the following four regions.

LOCAL TRADITIONS AND UNIVERSAL SOCIOLOGIES: THE DILEMMAS OF POST-COMMUNIST STATES OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

This section introduces us to the state of sociology in former socialist countries where the Party and the Communist state controlled the nature and growth of the discipline. The papers argue that this development displaced earlier sociological tradition(s) in some nation-states. They suggest that Party control led to substituting these with a standard, uniform and universal perspective of assessing new 'socialist societies', though there remained differences in the way the discipline was perceived in each of these countries. This undermined the development of critical perspectives within sociology and its professionalization, with some sociologists, critical of the regimes, being either forced into exile or imprisoned.

After the demise of communism and the establishment of democracy, the region was integrated with European and US interests, once again bringing to the fore the relationship between the discipline and politics. There was a sudden expansion of university education and existing sociological frames were replaced with North Atlantic perspectives. Research dominated by public opinion polls using quantitative methods gained popularity. There also emerged, as a reaction, a culturist perspective to assess contemporary society in some countries, wherein conflicts regarding nation and ethnicity took precedence over other subjects. Sociological perspectives in Central and Eastern Europe continue to examine the relationship between ideology and theory in order to resolve questions regarding the framing of new relevant sociologies.

This section starts with a general introduction to the changes that took place in the region from the forties onwards, presenting specific developments in each of the nation-states. Janusz Mucha and Mike F. Keen assess

the changes in the late eighties with the interrogation of Marxism, the resultant developments with the expansion of teaching and research and new specializations. They argue that this institutionalization will help to study the changing nature of modernity within the region, and professionalize sociology in Central and Eastern Europe to become a model for the rest of the world.

Elena Zdravomyslova assesses the Russian case by exploring the four visions of sociology in the Soviet Union and later in Russia. The paper argues that these visions compete with each other for a critical political space to define the tradition of sociology. This space is vested with enormous significance because it defines sociological knowledge in the context of the expansive institutionalization of sociology. The first vision was articulated by sociologists during the Khrushchev years. They presented the sociology of the micro, the use of quantitative methods and positivistic perspective, and ignored the earlier history of sociology of the pre-revolutionary period, which assessed the Russian processes of modernity as part of a pattern occurring in Europe.

The second vision emphasizes the pre-Soviet sociological trends, while the third highlights Russian values and wishes to develop a nationalist sociology. The last vision is that of liberal scholars who wish to use international perspectives to examine the particular Russian context. Zdravomyslova argues that the scholars and the profession are divided politically between the need to profess a nationalist and culturist sociology against a need to accept an internationalist professional vision that explores the specificity of social conditions in Russia today and that involves civil society in its reframing.

As against the experience of Russia, Dénes Némédi maps out the rich traditions of sociology in Hungary since the late-nineteenth century. The Hungarian sociological tradition, he argues, is characterized by a creative tension between 'external' (North Atlantic) and 'internal' theoretical frames.

In spite of the influence and control by the Party, the Hungarian sociological tradition has debated Marxist concepts such as alienation, bureaucratization and emergence of classes within socialism. There is also an attempt to theorize what constitutes the nature of 'socialist structure'.

These theorizations were possible because sociology was located within research centres and more concerned with 'urgent problems' than the systemization that comes with university education. Nemedi argues that the debates with official Marxism notwithstanding, sociologists in Hungary could not develop a general theory of socialist transformation with an understanding of its structure and its classes during and after the collapse of the Communist regime. A possible answer to this lacuna may relate to the history of Hungarian sociology – of not engaging with 'internal' theoretical frames.

Like Nemedi, Pepka Boyadjieva explores the specific developments that occurred in Bulgarian sociology after World War II and relates it to post-1989 trends. She confronts the problems regarding professionalization of the discipline and asks how sociology can produce socially relevant and objectively valid knowledge given its history in ideological positions. In this context she discusses the way sociologists have assessed the relationship between ideology and the discipline.

She argues that these two trends are symbiotically related to each other and that a possible way is to move beyond a one-dimensional relationship between the discipline and politics and accept competing and plural paradigms. This pluralism should be part of the university structure as well as the professional community. It can help sociology to assess the many risks facing contemporary society in the region as a result of the transition from socialism to capitalism.

Sociology in Eastern and Central Europe faces the challenge of its modernity – to make a critique of its earlier 'internal' tradition(s) and its heritage classified as official knowledge during the socialist years. Its challenge is to find an identity that can be political

without being ideological and wherein it can combine social commitment to academic practices.

AUTHORITARIANISM AND CHALLENGES TO SOCIOLOGY IN LATIN AMERICA

Although sociology as a discipline may have struck roots in Latin America a hundred years ago, its institutionalization in various nation-states has been weak and uneven. Lack of resources for teaching and research, and intermittent closure of universities with the imposition of authoritarian regimes made a smooth development of the discipline impossible. Scholars retreated into contemplative rather than empirical research.

In the early twentieth century its theories were imported from Europe and later the USA, while radical reflection on contemporary conditions including its own weakness in assessing the moot problems of its society found expression outside academia – within agitation, protests and social movements. Ultimately these reflections, based on a critical reading of Marxism, led to the development of the dependency theory in the sixties in Allende's Chile. Today the sociology of this region is searching for its own distinctive identity.

The dependency theory examined the economic, political and cultural dependence of the Latin American region on the USA. It questioned the universalism built into theoretical frames, assumptions of linearity of history and progress, and political conservatism of the European and American sociological traditions. It asserted a need to study the unequal relationships that structure the region in terms of global distribution of resources, power and knowledge. Today most, if not all, nation-states of the region have become democratic and are trying to develop sociological tradition(s) in debate with the dependency paradigm, outside the ideological narratives of orthodox Marxism

and received conservative US theorizations. The debate on diversity in Latin America is principally about theorizing sociology in terms of the politics of location and in the context of unequal global knowledge production.

Roberto Briceño-León introduces the history of sociology in the region by posing the five dilemmas that define the culture of sociology within Latin America. These dilemmas affect the discipline across the world but are differentially constituted in this region in terms of its history. The first dilemma relates to sociological practice – should it emphasize its philosophical or its empirical and scientific procedures? The second dilemma relates to the distinction between the universal and the particular. The third relates to the different methods of logic – induction or deduction. The fourth relates to presentation of analysis – should it be as an essay or based on scientific methodologies?

Lastly, should sociology emphasize micro- or macro-processes? Briceño-León argues for a need to evolve new sociological tradition(s) based on empirical (assessment of social processes and everyday lives of individuals), eclectic (engagement with multiple positions) and committed (to the excluded and the poor) features. This would help to create a new regional sociology for Latin America and a global model for others to follow.

The next paper examines the sociological conditions that led to the growth of the dependency theory. Fernanda Beigel discusses its diverse approaches as manifested in research centres and in various universities in Santiago de Chile. These approaches encouraged the need to diagnose underdevelopment from an interdisciplinary perspective. Dependence was a historical condition of the region, combining national and international processes of the global structure of underdevelopment.

The focus of the dependency theory group of intellectuals was to examine the relationship between core and periphery and not to focus only on national societies, thereby questioning and displacing European

assumptions of sociological theorizing. The paper also examines the lively exchange of ideas and thoughts within formal and informal sites of knowledge production aided by a socialist democratic state of Chile (this experience being in contrast with the situation in Eastern and Central Europe). Finally, she asks whether dependency theory can be termed as an endogenous perspective, thereby repositioning the debate of diversities of sociological traditions in a novel way.

While a socialist state offered a platform for the development of dependency theory in Chile in the sixties, the imperatives of having a civil service sponsored the initial development of sociology in Brazil. No wonder this sociology was framed within conservative demands and the discipline understood its focus to be on an analysis of classes, rationalization and secularization and production of solidarities.

Maria Stela Grossi Porto and Tom Dwyer argue that focus changed in the eighties and nineties with the decline of military power, the return of exiled scholars and the growth of social movements. The authors suggest that today, the professional association has played a major role in institutionalizing sociological practices and made them relevant to contemporary issues of growing inequalities. As a result, there is growth of empirical research, promotion of new specializations and use of combinations of methods to study in detail almost all aspects of Brazilian society. Unlike Beigel, who suggests the need for an endogenous theorization, Porto and Dwyer argue for a need of Brazilian sociology to engage with the European and US traditions.

While Brazilian sociology has developed an institutionalized strength over the last three decades, this is not true across all the nation-states in Latin America. Some states in Latin America have been and remain weak, and neither its elite nor alternative social movements have been able to organize a cohesive agenda for the formation of nationhood. This fragility of the nation has affected the ideas and lives of individual

scholars, university systems and investment into knowledge production, and thereby the nature of research and teaching.

Diego Ezequiel Pereyra examines such a case and explores the weak professionalization of the discipline in Argentina and its reduction to conflicts and confrontations between individual scholars rather than emphasizing perspectives. The cyclical crisis of legitimacy of the regime and institutions has led many to doubt whether there is hope for sociology in Argentina with scholars interacting within regional frames and not in terms of the nation-state.

These papers bear out that differences between sociological tradition(s) relate to the nature of unequal experience of modernity in each nation-state and region. It also indicates that sociological knowledge is dependent on regimes and their legitimacy, the strength of institutions, investments in the history of writing and thinking, support for research and professionalization, together with engagement with those who are on the margins.

In Latin America, it is the latter that provided the wherewithal for theorizing a new sociology and has become a model for assessing modernity for the globe. The Latin American experience suggests that there is a different definition for professionalization than that institutionalized in the USA. The concerns of the profession here are similar to those in Central and Eastern Europe – sociologists here affirm the necessity for politics that is however autonomous from ideology.

THE COLONIAL HERITAGE AND ITS SOCIOLOGICAL TRADITIONS: AFRICA, THE MIDDLE EAST/WEST ASIA, SOUTH ASIA AND THE CARIBBEAN

This section and the next bring together fragmented and uneven histories of sociological tradition(s) within different continents and nation-states. The papers draw attention to the weaknesses characterizing the state

structures as a result of colonialism that in some cases have been carried forward after independence. This has resulted in discontinuous institutionalization of universities, irregular and uneven access to research grants and a weak culture of scholarship.

The papers also interrogate the nature of the sociological theories across these continents and argue that these are characterized by dominant discourses of race, ethnicity, religion or caste. Thus they claim the need for an integration of voices of the various subalterns in the construction of new sociologies. The papers debate the ways in which new perspectives and concepts can be evolved to interface with various identities in these ex-colonial and highly internally diverse countries across continents.

We start this section with a discussion of sociological tradition(s) in two parts of Africa – one a region, that of Western Africa, comprising many poor nation-states with as many as eight currencies and colonized by the French; and one an economically powerful nation-state, South Africa, colonized by the British. Ebrima Sall and Jean-Bernard Ouedraogo argue that the tradition(s) of the discipline in West Africa have to be perceived in terms of a discourse of power.

This discourse has been dialectically constructed through an interface between Western theorizations, ‘endogenous’ perspectives and contemporary interventions by non governmental organizations and development agencies, that define the discipline and take it in an applied direction. The journey for locating new endogenous perspectives in West Africa, the authors suggest, needs to engage in double reflexivity, that is, to create a sociology that represents the voices of the subalterns, simultaneously examining these subjectivities as part of ‘dominant normative models’.

Tina Uys narrates the contradictory and contesting history of South African sociology that has been structured by race and class and which can be narrated in three phases. Its early history in the beginning of the twentieth century was related to university

education with major contributions in research and teaching, emerging from the work on assessing the sociology of white peoples. From the mid-twentieth century, with the introduction of apartheid and the division within universities in terms of race and ethnicity, the culture binding this small sociological community was divided between those who wanted to retain a racist isolation and others who wished to displace it. This weakened both the profession and the community.

A new history of the discipline was inaugurated when it became organically linked with the movement against apartheid. This is when it identified with subaltern concerns. A third history can be seen in the post-apartheid phase with the community organizing itself as an inclusive professional body and redefining its agenda for the challenges faced by the discipline in the new post-apartheid nation-state. Today, South African sociology needs to combine the criticality of its earlier phase that led to the growth of various subaltern perspectives with institutionalized professionalism. Can it take on this challenge?

The next three papers explore the sociological traditions in Israel, Palestine and Iran. All three highlight the differential interventions made by geopolitics in the way their sociological traditions have been constructed. Israel, being a stronger state, has a longer institutionalized tradition of higher education and its sociology is symbiotically related to that of the USA. Victor Azarya assesses various cultural practices institutionalized within the profession for progress in an academic career.

These practices are related to the orientation of scholars addressing an international audience, linked to a need to publish in internationally accredited journals, having 'universal' protocols for judging standard publishable articles leading to papers being focused on theories rather than on empirical analyses. Azarya suggests that these practices enhance a singular definition of academic excellence that is embedded in one conception

of professionalization. This deflects efforts to conduct empirically relevant research that is related to the deeply divided Israeli society, tearing up the nation-state caught in everyday violence. Sociologists do not assess the nature of Israeli modernity but have remained detached and disconnected from their own society.

The Palestine tradition of sociology is starkly dissimilar. Its nation is fragmented and it is at war. Its people are settled as refugees across the West Bank and Gaza strip, and other parts of the Arab world. Though the Palestinians have opportunities to study in universities, their everyday existence is controlled by violence and curfews, and conflicts with Israel and political interventions by international actors and their various agencies.

Since the Oslo accord of 1993, some of these international agencies have promoted sociological research. Sari Hanafi makes a study of these interventions and argues that non-governmental organization aid has controlled the structure and organization of research to create some negative practices. While the small community of sociologists competes with each other for limited resources, there is very little space to critically theorize on the Palestine situation. The extremely fragile sociological traditions in Palestine remain caught in the paradigm of identity constructed by the West – the problems and issues of a refugee community.

In the paper on Iran, Ali Akbar Mahdi traces the intermittent and conflict-ridden history of sociology as it embraced at first, western American frames, later, Marxist theories and much later, Islamic perspectives. The story of the discipline in Iran is also of the close connection of state and religion and thus of dismissals, exiles and in some cases, imprisonment of sociologists. In the initial years after the Islamic revolution there was strict control by Muslim clerics on sociological knowledge and its transmission. The close association of social sciences and western modernity promoted a discourse that posited Islam against modernity.

Since then, political conditions have not allowed sociologists to fully discover how Islam can also explore ways to assess science, methodology and ethics and create its own language of social science. Some spaces were carved out when in periods of peace Islam and sociology engaged with each other. However, the constant swings between liberal and conservative Islam structured much of these openings and defined the nature of theorizations and dictated the closures. This broken and irregular history has institutionalized a culture of inadequate solidarity within the sociological community, insufficient reflection on the conditions and processes of modernity along with insignificant investment in research, with scholars finding it easier to translate rather than create new texts.

The paper on India explores the three themes that have been considered seminal in assessing the history of the discipline of sociology in India. The first is the role played by colonialism, its discourse and its institutions in framing the discipline's identity and perspectives as anthropology, leading to the growth of indigenous perspectives. The second phase was inaugurated in mid century, when India became independent, wherein the nation was identified by the elite as an upper-caste group. In this phase, sociology continued to be seen as the study of 'tradition' – that of institutions of caste, family and marriage through social anthropological perspectives.

From the sixties onwards there was an expansion of university education and standardization of the identity of the discipline as doing 'field view' (ethnography). Since the late seventies, Sujata Patel argues, the discipline is confronting a segmentation that has emerged in disciplinary practices as a result of contradictions arising due to the rapid expansion of the higher education system. It is also facing the demands of incorporating regional aspirations and the voices of various oppressed groups in the country and is unsure about relating its identity to global and/or national issues, or to regional and local ones – or should it combine all four?

As in the countries of the continents discussed above, Caribbean society is characterized by the interface and interaction of many subaltern identities that structure exclusions in a mix of race, ethnicity and gender. Ann Denis explores the sociological language that can articulate these relations in context with the institutionalization of power and authority within the nation-state and that of global division of power. She suggests that sociology needs to assess contemporary processes in terms of the concept of inter-sectionalism that explore the multiple interconnecting sources of subordination in a dynamic spatial and temporal context. Globalization has challenged contemporary sociology to theorize on ways to assess fluidity of domination–subordination of identities, as a way forward.

LOCAL OR UNIVERSAL: IDENTITY AND DIFFERENCE IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF THE FAR EAST

In the context of contemporary globalization, the Far East (now known as the Asia Pacific) encompasses nation-states that are large and small, economically powerful and weak, having both capitalist and socialist political systems. The process of modernity in each of these countries is distinctive and relates to specific 'local–national' aspects – and yet its sociological language is dominated by western conceptualizations. The sociological tradition of each country is debating these tensions as they find the means to articulate their specific processes of modernity.

The first paper on China continues the debate flagged up earlier by papers on Central and Eastern Europe regarding ways to analyse socialist transformations. Given that sociology theorized on capitalist modernity, it asks what conceptual language we now need to assess socialism and particularly that which is occurring in China. Guo Yuhua and Shen Yuan suggest that we must recognize that the Chinese transformation is

civilizational and has defined a 'special route to modernity'. While countries in Central and Eastern Europe underwent political liberalization, this has not occurred in China, which thus needs its own concepts to assess its distinctive institutions and changes.

The authors identify Chinese society as being segmented and polarized. They present their specific sociological perspective relating to labour studies and the use of oral history to record the nature of transformations in China and argue for the need of a sociology of practice. As they say: 'If sociologists do not attend to practices, there is no way to understand the real nature of society and social transformation'.

The Taiwanese experience of the discipline explored by Ming-Chang Tsai shows how its professional practices of evaluation have universalized the US model of competence to distribute grants and evaluate performances of scholars rather than evolve one that is related to local needs. The paper assesses the role played by the state in codifying these protocols of evaluation and the distribution of grants. It also makes an empirical investigation of the criteria that allowed more than a hundred sociologists to access these grants. It argues that the state has enormous control in defining all levels of practices of the discipline and has given enormous authority to peer reviewers. The displacement of these structures alone can help to make sociology accountable to the local public and orient it to social commitment.

The third paper, on Japan, examines how Japanese sociology engaged with local conditions while accepting western theoretical positions. Koto Yousuke assesses three phases of sociological thought since the Second World War. In all these phases Japanese sociologists attempted to present new sociological concepts and theories to identify specific processes. Koto also argues that post-modernist perspectives had a long history in Japan and thus contemporary interventions by Japanese scholars add to the repertoire of concepts and language on this perspective. Koto suggests that the concept of individuality in Japan

is perceived to be constituted in 'play' and 'feelings' and that these perceptions help us to redefine human nature and thus the universal sociological language. Contemporary processes of globalization have emphasized a need for universalism. But does that mean that the social specific no longer exists?

Emma Porio, in a paper reminiscent of earlier ones investigating the negative role of colonialism, explores how the global tradition has affected the constitution of local sociological traditions in the case of the Philippines. The initial theoretical interventions made by Jose Rizal and others who followed him, she argues, were sidestepped as sociology and higher education institutions came to be dominated by the USA in the beginning of the twentieth century. This is the moment when the discipline slowly institutionalized. In the seventies, sociology connected with radical movements including Marxism and reframed its quest in terms of people's perspectives.

However, in the last two decades sociological practices have been influenced by the decline of universities and increasing privatization and commodification of knowledge with the growth of non-governmental organization supported action-oriented research. Theoretical frames continue to be plural and borrow from western theorizations and yet the demand for local assessments and autonomous and indigenous sociology continues. The sociological tradition in the Philippines swings from domination of western thought to an assertion of 'local' identity.

Charles Crothers assesses the local and the universal through the concepts of periphery and the metropole when he analyses the sociological tradition in Australia and New Zealand. These two countries, although being part of the metropole, are in the periphery geographically. This paper explores the various interstices that have been used by scholars to define Australasian sociology. The formal structures of sociological traditions evoked British and later American theories such as Weberian perspectives and positivism. But research has intervened to

define new interdisciplinary perspectives such as migration studies, cultural studies and gender studies, and has engaged with Marxism in an innovative way. In spite of these creative spaces, the sociological tradition of Australasia remains 'locked' into the metropole frame.

DIVERSITIES, UNIVERSALITIES AND THE GLOBALIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

What kinds of insights do the compilation of these histories present to us in terms of practising sociology? The first relates to the several ways to assess the many sociological traditions. These can be explored at three levels – that of space: within localities, regions, nation-states and the globe; that of intellectual and praxiological sites: agitations, campaigns and movements; classrooms, departments and research institutes, and communities that define best practices relating to the transmission of cultures of teaching and research; and that relate to: ideas, theories, perspectives and discourses.

These different traditions are best understood if perceived as being organized within the nation-state after the Second World War – though there exist also traditions in terms of language communities. However, the former provides the most significant spatial and political locale to assess this history together with the evaluation of the many contradictions and contestations that have defined the organic linkages between these tradition(s). Sociological knowledge, it is argued in the Handbook, is imbricated in the identity of the nation-state and within its politics.

Thus, within each nation-state, one can assess the many starting points, many achievements and many failures, and many continuities and discontinuities. These ups and downs dealing with the organization, consolidation and institutionalization of sociological traditions involve confrontations between dominant universal traditions and newly emerging

subaltern ones. In this sense there is and will be diversity of sociological traditions within nation-states.

These diversities exist not only within nation-states but between them. Because the histories of sociological traditions in nation-states are differently constituted, the collective experience of growth and spread of sociological traditions across the world is and remains diverse and unevenly organized. This unevenness is related to the relationship of each tradition with that of Europe and later of the USA, and relates to the way these traditions came to be universalized across the world.

Universalization of the North Atlantic tradition(s) is associated with the global distribution of power (Wallerstein, 2006). In this sense, the Handbook attempts to move beyond the binaries of universalism versus relativism/particularism to posit a third position that suggests that sociological traditions are both universal and diverse. It argues that the claims of each of the traditions of sociological knowledge are distinct and universal, but together these are not equivalent or plural or multiple or hybrid nor relative-positing claims based on criteria internal to each of these tradition(s) (Chakrabarty, 2008).

These are diverse because each tradition makes its own assessment and perspective of how it is structured within the global distribution of ideas, scholars and scholarship (whether these are adapted from imports or are stated to be indigenous/endogenous/local/national/provincial), how these relate to its contexts including the culture of teaching and research, institutions, the state and the economy. While these claims are universal, the interpretations of how these are interconnected to the North Atlantic traditions(s) and with each other remain different for each nation-state. Or to put it in other words, what is distinct is how each tradition has contested with the claims of those from the North Atlantic and evolved its own internal assessment of this relationship. In this sense collectively sociological traditions can be stated to be diversely universal or incorporating 'diversality' (Mignolo, 2002: 89).

Second, following from the above we can suggest that sociology was globalized from the moment of its birth with the assertion of the singularity of the process of modernity through the universalization of European and later the American *provincial* experience(s) (Chakrabarty, 2000). A discourse of power structured universalization of knowledge regarding sociabilities. In this sense while globalization has been debated to be a recent process, globalization of sociological knowledge has had a longer history.

This globalization has sometimes erased earlier histories of modernities, reinterpreted these and displaced ways of thinking, being and living. As a result some traditions have not evolved perspectives and theories to assess their relationships with dominant universalized traditions, although these have been recognized. Others have adapted to external and dominant ones; yet others have made a critique of the legacy of dependence and domination to assess and to reflect on their own modernities. If globalization of sociological knowledge has ‘silenced’ the formation of many voices, it has also challenged it by asking new questions and providing novel answers, as Alatas in this Handbook has argued in his paper. Working from the margins of all borders has helped to provide a new identity. These are the resources available to us and the most significant legacy of global sociological tradition(s).

Third, it implies that that not only do we recognize that we have inherited diverse legacies but that we also need to develop interfaces between them in order to create a ‘communicative’ dialogue between and within them. These claims are differently presented by authors in this Handbook. While Sztompka argues for the need to combine the binary of one sociology versus many sociologies, Connell suggests that this dialogue needs to be initiated from the ‘core’, that is, from the North Atlantic traditions. The latter may have recognized internal diversities but have not interrogated the relationship of domination–subordination between their tradition(s) and those of other

nation-states and regions. Burawoy argues that in addition, this dialogue also needs to be structured within and across nation-states and within economic and political regions. Obviously, what is needed are dialogues at multiple levels which can transcend barriers of ‘captivity’ structured by dominant universal knowledge on the one hand, and relate with the experience of culture and language constructed at local and/or provincial spatial and intellectual sites, on the other.

As we globalize and as our students do comparative research between and within countries of the world, we need to acquaint them with different ways to do sociology across the world. This Handbook introduces these trends to the students and elaborates a perspective on how to perceive sociological tradition(s) of various nation-states in tandem with global developmental changes in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The attempt here is to create a ‘communicative’ dialogue to formulate an internationalist perspective of sociology. Hopefully, this will allow more bridges to be built to foster institutionalized dialogue from which ‘we learn from each other’ and construct diverse reflexive sociologies.

REFERENCES

- Akiwowo, A. (1987) ‘Building National Sociological Tradition in an African Subregion’, in N. Genov (ed.) *National Traditions in Sociology*, pp. 151–66. London: Sage.
- Akiwowo, A. (1990) ‘Contributions to the Sociology of Knowledge from an African Oral Poetry’, in M. Albrow and E. King (eds) *Globalisation, Knowledge and Society: Readings from International Sociology*, pp. 103–18. London: Sage.
- Alatas, S.H. (1974) ‘The Captive Mind and Creative Development’, *International Social Science Journal* 36(4): 691–9.
- Albrow, M. (1987) ‘Sociology for One World’, *International Sociology* 2(1): 1–12.
- Beck, U. (2000) *What is Globalisation?* Cambridge: Polity.

- Beck, U. (2006) *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2008) 'In Defense of Provincialising Europe: A Response to Carola Dietze', *History and Theory* 47(February): 85–96.
- Genov, N. (ed.) (1989) *National Sociological Traditions and the Internationalization of Sociology*, in N. Genov (ed.) *National Traditions in Sociology*, pp. 1–17. London: Sage.
- Giddens, A. and Turner, J. (1987) (eds) *Social Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habermas, J. (2001) *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lander, E. (2002) 'Eurocentrism, Modern Knowledges, and the "Natural" Order of Global Capital', *Nepantla: Views from South* 3(2): 249–68.
- Mani, L. (1990) 'Multiple Mediations: Feminist Scholarship in the Age of Multinational Reception', *Feminist Review* 35(Summer): 24–41.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2002) 'The Geopolitics of Knowledge and the Colonial Difference', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101(1) (Winter): 57–96.
- Mohanty, C. (1988) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', *Feminist Review* 30(Autumn): 61–88.
- Mukerjee, R. (1955) 'A General Theory of Society', in B. Singh (ed.) *The Frontiers of Social Science: In Honour of Radhakamal Mukerjee*. London: Macmillan.
- Mukerji, D.P. (1958) *Diversities: Essays in Economics, Sociology and Other Social Problems*. New Delhi: People's Publishing House.
- Mukherji P.N. and Sengupta, C. (2004) (eds) *Indigeneity and Universality in Social Science: A South Asian Response*. Sage: New Delhi.
- Quijano, A. (2000) 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentricism and Latin America', *Nepantla: Views from South* 1: 553–800.
- Wallerstein, I. (2006) *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power*. New York: The New Press.