Abstract: Calls for "global sociology" are nowadays commonplace. Sometimes they are framed in a positive way, but more often are presented in a negative register, suggesting that sociology's evident institutional inequalities and related analytical failings are so great that the discipline risks losing any claims to relevance as the world changes around it. Such demands suggest the need for partial or total "intellectual overhaul" of sociology, to render it fit for purpose today, epistemically, institutionally, and ethically. Sociology is seen to be overwhelmingly located in metropolitan locations in the Developed World and Global North. This institutional imbalance is widely understood to reproduce chronically Euro-American-centred analytical orientations. There is much to be gained today by taking a position on "global sociology", forwarding one's own preferred position while simultaneously criticising the positions of others. Sociological careers can be forged and intellectual kudos and recognition, which, by the very terms of the debate itself, are truly planetary in scope, can be won. This paper critically assesses some major positions in today's "global sociology" game. Against the background of controversies over universalism and indigenization, the paper focuses particularly on Southern Theory and Postcolonial Sociology, indicates some of their major problems.

Keywords: global sociology, universalism, indigenization, Southern Theory, Postcolonial Sociology.

"[N]ot that sociologists will themselves help unify the world, for they can scarcely unify themselves"

(Moore 1966, 476)

Introduction

Contemporary demands for "global sociology" have overtaken earlier calls for "internationalizing" sociology (Genov 1991). When calls were made for "global sociology" in the 1980s and early 1990s (e.g. Robertson 1987; Turner 1990), they may have fallen on many deaf ears. But in the wake of influential work by scholars such as Ulrich Beck (2000), such calls have found much more receptive audiences. Demands for "global sociology" are nowadays commonplace, and frequently reproduced in worldwide sociological debates (see e.g. Smith 1990; Phillips 2001; Alatas 2003; Connell, 2007; Della Faille and McLaughlin 2008; Jacobs and Townsley 2008; Sandstrom 2008; Back 2009; Burawoy 2009; Holmwood 2009; Patel 2009; Burawoy et al 2010; Manza et al 2010; Martin and Beittel 1998; Sohoni and Petrovic 2010; Keim 2011; Benbehanian and Burawoy 2012; Keim et al 2014; Pelayo 2015).

The term "global sociology" is open-ended. While it putatively refers to one single entity, "Sociology", existing everywhere across the world, there are multiple differing ways of practicing sociology, including different national and regional traditions and orientations (Abend 2006). Sometimes demands for "global sociology" are framed in a positive way (e.g.

Lee 1994). But more often, calls for "global sociology" are presented in negative registers, suggesting that sociology's evident institutional inequalities and related analytical failings are so great that the discipline risks losing any claims to relevance as the "real world" changes around it (Burawoy 2016). Demands for more "global sociology" are today a prominent part of apparently "never-ending and ever-expanding attempts at sociological reflexive diagnostics", concerning questions to do with "sociology – of what kind, to what end, and for whom?" (Mišina 2015, 529).

The present-day ubiquity of demands for "global sociology" can be explained in various ways. Such demands seem intuitively appealing to social scientists who see themselves as somehow cosmopolitan, in socio-political and/or epistemological terms. As Jacobs and Townsley (2008, 499) note, it "seems self-evident that the project of global sociology is connected in fundamental ways to the growing interest in globalization" among social scientists, politicians, activists and citizens over the last several decades. Early contributors to the rising tide of calls for "global sociology" (Tiryakian 1986; Albrow 1990; Archer 1991) had already recognised the connection to "globalization" in the early 1990s, with the latter being framed as a game-changer for a discipline hitherto overly oriented towards the study of life within particular nation-states (Rousseau 1999). The increase of calls for "global sociology" from that time until now are intimately "connected to the swirl of anxieties" that underpins a lot of globalization discourse, like "worries about the intensifying hegemony of the United States, concerns about deepening global inequalities, and fears about the possibilities of planetary devastation through war and/or environmental degradation" (Jacobs and Townsley 2008, 499-500). The post-Covid-19 world also seems to demand more and better "global sociology".

Demands for "global sociology" suggest the need for partial or total "intellectual overhaul" of the discipline, rendering it fit for purpose today (Park 2019). This would encompass both epistemic and ethical elements: "global sociology" must become better able to grasp the world around it, and it must rectify its own institutional and organisational failings. The main features of the latter are widely understood to involve sociology being overwhelmingly located in, and dependent on, metropolitan locations in Western Europe and North America, and more broadly the Developed World and the Global North, to the detriment of all other parts of the planet. This institutional imbalance in turn is widely understood to (re)produce chronically Eurocentric and US-facing analytical orientations. These debilitate sociology in two intertwined ways: failing to provide adequate frameworks for understanding social life in other regions of the world; and failing to understand how the various parts of the globe influence each other in complex ways (Sztompka 2011).

Given that so many people seem to be *for* "global sociology" today, who but the most chauvinistic could possibly be *against* it? The viewpoint put forward here is that there much to be gained today by taking a position on "global sociology", forwarding one's own preferred position while simultaneously criticising the positions of others. In this manner, sociological careers, and the stocks of intellectual capital they rely upon, are forged and augmented (Bourdieu 1988). After all, what apparently more important debate could someone in sociology contribute to than that about *global* sociology? For as it is a debate that is assumed to be truly "global" in scope, it must be of huge and surpassing importance. To set out what becomes an influential – or better, hegemonic – position in that debate, can be to win a great deal of intellectual kudos and (putatively) global recognition.

This paper reflects on such matters, critically reviewing some major positions in the "global sociology" intellectual game. Against the background of controversies over universalism and indigenization, the paper focuses particularly on Southern Theory and Postcolonial Sociology. None of these are wholly intellectually satisfactory, but they have all afforded their advocates

power, prestige, and the right not only to speak for others, but also for the very discipline of Sociology itself.

Sociology Between Universalism and Indigenization

Something like a universally applicable, proto- or quasi-sociological vision of human affairs has been found by some scholars in certain pre-modern philosophers and historians, such as the north African Arab of the 14th century CE, Ibn Khaldun (Alatas 2006b). But it was not until the second half of the 19th century that the *universalism* of sociology was widely assumed and claimed, this time in western Europe and North America. The sociological paradigms of figures like Comte and Spencer were understood by their progenitors as variants of "a science of, and for, humanity based on timeless principles and verified laws" (Albrow 1990, 6). Marx and Engels also promulgated an avowedly universal social science, allegedly applicable to all times and places. Most of these grand theorists were (male) independent intellectuals, rather than waged professors in universities, their non-institutionalised positions both reflecting and making possible the grandiosity of their various sociological visions. Burawoy (2016, 949) notes that these figures "thought of sociology as offering universal knowledge, independent of its mode of production or place of application. This assumption of context-free knowledge was an illusion, but a necessary illusion that propelled sociology's development".

Turner (1990, 344) has argued that since its beginnings, sociology has displayed "a tension between a global science of humanity and a "local" discipline in the service of the nation-state". The latter tendency was arguably significantly accentuated at the end of the 19th century. In both Europe and North America there were three interrelated dynamics: the institutionalisation of what was now taken as the "discipline" of sociology in universities; the professionalization of the intellectual producers who professed sociological thinking (Albrow 1990); the emergence of various identifiable "national sociologies", the most internationally prominent being those in France, Germany, and the US (Levine 1995). There were also somewhat less prominent national cases, such as Italy, as well as ambiguous instances, notably the UK (Scott 2019).

Within the various national sociologies came the notion of "society" as a territorially bounded unit coterminous with the borders of nation-states. This territorial conception of "society" was arguably framed as *the* major object of sociological investigations from the 1920s onwards, at the same period as the discipline was further institutionalised in universities across major Western countries. Distinct departments of "sociology" were differentiated from other social science departments – including politics, economics, and anthropology – on the base of their apparently unique subject matter - "society" considered "as a whole". Textbooks and teaching formulated and reinforced this notion (Urry 2000).

Many of those calling for more "global sociology" today would agree with Burawoy's (2016, 950) assertion that sociology's "universalistic claims" became more marked again in the 1950s and 1960s, but this time especially within the terrain of the US's national version of sociology. This was the era of the dominance of modernization and structural functionalist theories. When such theories were exported around the world, American sociology took on greater universalist pretensions (Armer 1987). "[T]o this day many US sociologists remain staunch believers in a positivist universalistic social science, unreflective of the national parameters of their research and thinking" (Burawoy 2016, 950).

Nonetheless, dissenting voices were beginning to be heard by the early 1960s, even within the heartlands of American sociology. Wilbert Moore (1966), in his Presidential Address to the

(arguably deeply nationally inward-looking) American Sociological Association, rued the fact that sociology in his country had become "the all-American science", its focus "often minutely local" (Moore 1966, 477). He noted that at least thinkers of earlier generations like Durkheim and Spencer had – albeit in limited and flawed ways – reached out to consider Oriental and non-Western tribal societies, but these had now been ceded to Anthropology and Area Studies. Moore offered both an early call for something explicitly dubbed "global sociology" (defined as "sociology of the globe, of mankind"), and also a statement as to how such an entity was necessitated by processes which would later be referred to as "globalization". Sociology must become less parochial and more genuinely "global" (Moore 1966, 481). As Oromanner (1969, 327) pointed out in response near the time, "the internationalization of sociology everywhere may become almost equivalent to the Americanization of sociology", as US sociology's research styles spread across what were then called the First and Third Worlds, including into newly independent post-colonial nations in Asia and Africa (Lamy 1976). By the late 1960s, this had arguably created a situation of "strong intellectual dependency of Third World sociologists on their First World counterparts" (Lee 1994, 60).

By the 1970s, the "parochialism, ethnocentrism, and universalism" of such sociology (Smith 1990, 150) was being brought into question by scholars in, or concerned with, non-Western locales. Portes (1976, 51) pithily summed up the problems identified by various others: "A major gap ... exists between theoretical perspectives chosen by modern sociology and the recurrent dilemmas and restrictions faced by the non-industrialized world". The dichotomous conceptions of Western "classical" theory – *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, mechanical and organic solidarities, tradition and modernity (Bendix 1967) – had been universalized, but were in fact too rooted in distinctly European conditions to be able to grasp adequately social change outside of the Euro-American region (Singham and Singham 1973, Mukherjee 1977, Mugbane and Paris, 1985, Abé 2008). The so-called "internationalization" of sociology was seen to be camouflaged Westernization or Americanization (Oommen 1991). This came to be regarded as one part of a much broader problem of epistemological colonialism:

> … at least for the last 500 years, it has not been possible to recognize the epistemological plurality of the world. On the contrary, a single way of knowing the world, the scientific-technical rationality of the Occident, has been postulated as the only valid episteme, that is to say the only episteme capable of generating real knowledge about nature, the economy, society, morality and people's happiness. All other ways of knowing the world have been relegated to the sphere of doxa, as if they were a part of modern science's past, and are even considered an "epistemological obstacle" to attaining the certainty of knowledge (Castro-Go'mez 2007, 3).

Various scholars, perhaps especially those from non-Western backgrounds, from the 1970s onwards demanded that sociology be radically reconstructed, in the form of epistemological "indigenization" (Muyiwa 1988; Lee 1994). The search for truly "global sociology" thus took the form of identifying the limitations of what was framed as a hubristic, falsely universal, but apparently universally institutionalized, "Western sociology". This was a species of "epistemological imperialism" said by its critics to silence, on racist and chauvinist grounds, non-Western "others", even while studying them (Khoury and Khoury 2013). It was to be challenged and replaced by forms of "indigenous" sociology, centred on concepts taken to be somehow "internal" to the (national) societies that they were now to be used to study (Gareau 1988). As Lee (1994, 60) noted, rather paradoxically "the globalization of sociology nurture[d] parochial national sociologies that reflect[ed] the social and political conditions of specific countries". Global sociology at this point became "an instrument for the construction of national [or regional] sociologies".

For example, following the precedent of his father, S. H. Alatas (1974), who wrote a stinging critique of colonial mindsets in social science, the Malaysian-born, Singapore-based S. F. Alatas (2006a) has over the last several decades pursued the possibility of getting beyond Western models in sociology. This is done by developing frameworks based in non-Western epistemologies, which are said to be more attuned to local, national and regional experiences. Such frameworks could, for example, include the work of Ibn Khaldun on macro-level and long-term social change (Alatas 2006b). Another striking, and subsequently widely debated, attempt to "indigenize" sociology was provided in the 1980s by Akiwowo (1986), who sought to erect a distinctively "African" sociology upon an epistemology constructed out of folklore, poetry and other "traditional" sources. Such a position was vigorously debated in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Makinde, 1988). Such endeavours still inspire attempts to indigenize sociology today (Foley 2003), although the related trend towards "decolonizing" theories and methodologies has arguably become more prominent recently (Denzin et al, 2008; Smith 2012). A problem for indigenizing initiatives is that what they may take to be "indigenous knowledge" may actually be a product of colonial, neo-colonial and/or post-colonial social relations, the alleged cosmology being constructed on the assumption of "primitive" unanimity (Kuper 1988), while concealing fracture lines and inequalities in the society it allegedly derives from (Hountondji 1983[1976]).

Negative assessments of attempts to indigenize sociology have come from prominent (mostly white male) Western scholars. One such is the American sociologist Neil Smelser (1991), a former President of the International Sociological Association, an organisation which has been the institutional location of many of these scholarly battles. In the 1990s Smelser rejected such indigenizing projects altogether, regarding national or regional adjectives being put in front of the word "sociology" – as in "Asian sociology", "Nigerian sociology", etc – as dilutions of, and distractions from, the real and universal core of sociology, which is and should be the same everywhere (Michalski 2008). Another former ISA President, the Polish scholar Piotr Sztompka, in the 2000s took aim at what he saw as the orthodoxy that had developed in ISA circles since the late 1980s, and which was allegedly systematized by a more recent ISA President, Michael Burawoy. The orthodox stance is said by Sztompka (2011, 388-9) to involve three questionable assumptions:

> First, sociology in the world is dominated by Western (North American and European, or in short "Euroamerican") sociology, which in itself is bad for the discipline. Second, there are some alternative, indigenous sociologies outside of the United States and Europe, which are highly valuable, and suppressed or entirely excluded by the American and European hegemony. And third, the normative imperative derived from these two claims is the struggle for global sociology, which would safeguard the egalitarian representation of many sociologies actually existing in the world today, achieving a balanced unity of the discipline and eliminating presumed biases of American and European sociologists.

Sztompka argued that "indigenous" is a slippery term to apply to sociology, as it could refer to many things: everything non-Western, or phenomena limited to one civilization or world region (which are themselves difficult to define and circumscribe), or those limited to one nation-state. But even in the latter, more easily identifiable case, it is not clear exactly what, for example, "Ghanaian sociology" would refer to. He also argues that allegedly "indigenous" terms – like "bao" or "quanxi" in Chinese – are far from referring to uniquely "Chinese" phenomena, for they are in fact simply Chinese names for internationally accepted sociological concepts, which in English would be rendered as "reciprocity" and "interpersonal networks" respectively. The fact that much sociology is written in, or translated into, English, need not be seen as an instance of linguistic imperialism, but rather as a benefit. Anyone in the world need "learn only one

foreign language to have access to the worldwide academic community, including all important books ever written" (Sztompka 2011, 393). Promoting the value of epistemic diversity blinds sociologists to the promise of their discipline, which is indeed equipped to search for universal principles of social behaviour. Despite "all its weaknesses and lacunae, the canon of sociological knowledge tells us important things about human beings … whether they live in Paris, Dakar, Quito or Kyoto", because "personal relations, formation of groups, establishment of rules, operation of power, and emerging of inequalities are the same" everywhere (Ibidem.). This is even more so the case now than it ever was, as actual historical tendencies (of "globalization") have led, and are leading, to ever more convergence between different places and peoples (Sztompka 1988). Yet redefining, as Sztompka and others do, "global sociology" as putatively "universal sociology", which supposedly exists above and beyond earthly borders and real social inequalities, is a strategy very much open to question, not least for itself being apparently non- or anti-sociological in nature (Gareau 1987).

Burawoy's (2016, 951) own influential version of "global sociology" has dismissed both indigenization and its antagonist, a revived universalism, as two sides of the same worn-out coin. He has remarked that "particularistic responses to false universalism land … sociology in the same cul-de-sac they claim to escape". This is because there is today "a global field of sociology and so slicing off "alternative" discourses, be they called indigenous sociology or [something else] is no more viable then laying claim to a singular, universal sociology". The latter is bound to generate a ""counterhegemonic" strategy of a plurality of particularistic sociologies. Both sides are misguided since the contest is not a warring of the holy and the unholy but takes place in a field of hierarchically interconnected sociologies". Moreover, there are no "authentic" national sociological traditions today, if indeed there ever were. National sociologies are not homogeneous but rather fields of struggle, with different actors appealing for legitimacy "to opposing strands within US sociology and French sociology as well as sediments of national traditions themselves, shaped by and in reaction to [N]orthern sociologies" as a whole (Burawoy 2016, 954).

Pitfalls on the Road to the South

One of the most significant endeavours in recent years to revitalise earlier forms of sociological indigenization is offered by the Australia-born and -located scholar Raewyn Connell, with her polemics against what she presents as the limitations of globally hegemonic "Northern Theory", and her advocacy of so-called "Southern Theory" in its place. Northern Theory is the dominant form of sociology in the world, and it has been so since the start of the discipline. It is the sort of theory made "by men, by capitalists, by the educated and the affluent" (Connell 2007, i), especially by those in the metropoles of Western Europe and North America.[1]

Drawing on the ideas of Beninese philosopher Paulin J. Hountondji, for Connell (2007, ix) "a pattern in colonial science" is "carried forward to the postcolonial world, where data-gathering and application happen in the colony, while theorizing happens in the metropole". Much of early sociology was a creation of the period of European high imperialism, with Social Darwinism and evolutionary theory naturalizing differences between colonizers and colonized. While post-WWII sociology eschewed the overt racism of some of its 19th century antecedents, it was nonetheless founded "on ethnocentric assumptions that amounted to a gigantic lie – that modernity created itself within the North Atlantic world, independent of the rest of humanity" (Connell, 2007, x). While Northern sociology was "shored up by the weight of metropolitan wealth and power", alternative "ways of thinking about the world [we]re marginalized,

intellectually discredited, relegated to outdated historical thinking, or appropriated" (Hickling-Hudson 2007 367).

The Northern metropolitan biases and blindness of classical sociology continue to be expressed in the work of hegemonic figures of the North, such as Coleman, Bourdieu, and Giddens. The work of such white, male, elite thinkers is indicted for its abstract, falsely universalising conceptual apparatuses – as if they did "not come from anywhere in particular" (Connell 2015, 32) – as well as for the way that they omit proper consideration of colonial and neo-colonial dynamics and structures, and unreflectively create accounts of social change which both express and normalise Northern experiences (Connell 2006).

> Within the dominant conventions of our disciplines, the works of Foucault, Habermas, Deleuze, Bourdieu, and so on are simply "theory"; they are not read as specifically European ideas arising from the social experience of the global North. Social scientists, like natural scientists, often think they are part of a search for universal knowledge that is untainted by place or local interest. They can even become angry when asked to think about the global structures of power in which their knowledge work occurs (Connell 2015, 34).[2]

The overall effect of such a situation is "the erasure of the experience of the majority of humankind" from classical and contemporary social theory (Connell 2007, 46). When non-Northern conditions are not erased altogether, they are seriously distorted. Yet "colonised and peripheral societies produce social thought about the modern world which has as much intellectual power as metropolitan social thought and more political relevance" (Ibidem, xii). One needs to turn to such sources to theorize otherwise neglected issues, such as the nature, causes and consequences of existential and material dispossession, especially in relation to aboriginal people's claims to ancestral lands. Connell points to a wide range of thinkers from around the global South whose ideas could be used to inspire alternative sociologies, if they have not already done so. All of them can be drawn upon to produce "dirty theory" – that is, sociology well-attuned to the experiences of non-metropolitan parts of the globe, and how they have interacted with the (neo)colonial centres.

Critics of the concept (or brand) of Southern Theory have alleged that it creates an extreme and unconvincing Manichean division between "North" and "South", homogenizing and caricaturing both, and creating a false dividing line between the two (Burawoy 2009). The selected theorists "are known to Connell because of their cosmopolitan reach, they speak from the South because they are deeply entangled with the North", and most ideas often do not have a "Southern" or "Northern" origin but instead circulate globally in complicated ways (Burawoy 2016, 951). Connell has focused too much on social critics whose contributions to the discipline of sociology remain unclear; she has passed over too lightly on the complex processes whereby "Northern" ideas have been used and transformed by the "Southern" intellectuals she identifies; and she has neglected to note that some of the highlighted thinkers are regarded as simplistic or passé in their countries and regions of origin (Arjomand 2008). It is not, and cannot, be clear where the border between North and South is, and it is arbitrary why, for example, Chile and Iran both count as somehow intrinsically "Southern", in the same way as Australia supposedly is. The North/South division seems more empirically, conceptually, and politically untenable as a basis for "global sociology" than do the imperfect but perhaps more justifiable categories Western/non-Western and Developed/Developing worlds (Lundstrom 2009, 86). In more recent work, Connell (2014) has responded that the intention of naming and promoting Southern Theory is not to create further division between two "worlds", but is rather to promote communication between them, and to ask those in the global North, who are in the privileged

position to do most of the talking most of the time, start to listen more to their global South counterparts.

Making Sociology Postcolonial?

Southern Theory is a relative of Postcolonial Sociology, which has become prominent over the last decade or so as another potential grounding for "global sociology". Postcolonial sociology applies to the conceptual fabric of sociology ideas taken from the interdisciplinary field of postcolonial studies (Gandhi 1998; Young 2001; McLeod 2007).

Postcolonial studies may be defined as a set of varying, sometimes contradictory, but thematically related investigations of the ways whereby colonialism continues today to shape former colonies and metropoles, and a new set of approaches to understanding historical colonialism. Postcolonialism is less a periodizing term and more a stance of "theoretical resistance" to neo-colonial ways of thinking (Steinmetz 2014, 81). In addition to the intention to "locate the hidden rhizomes of colonialism's historical reach, of what remains invisible, unseen, silent, or unspoken", postcolonialism is also "a wide-ranging political project – to reconstruct Western formations, reorient ethical norms, turn the power structures of the world upside down, [and] refashion the world from below" (Young, 2012, 20; also Harding 2008). More recognisably sociological and political-economic approaches to global neo-colonial structures and processes, such as world-systems theory, are both augmented and criticised by postcolonial theory's emphases on cultural, epistemological, and socio-psychological entities and processes, and its associated deconstruction and challenging of Western knowledge-systems and truth-claims (Grosfoguel 2007).

Contemporary postcolonial studies has come to operate with its own Canon of authors, made up of anti-colonial thinkers and activists of the 20th century, such as Frantz Fanon and C.L.R. James; of critical schools of thought, such as Indian subaltern studies, which like other related positions has made complex uses and adaptations of neo-Marxism; and of star postcolonial academics of recent times, especially in the humanities, such as Gayatri Spivak, Edward Said, Stuart Hall and Homi K. Bhabha, who have used and subverted various forms of originally Western thinking, notably post-structuralism, Gramscianism and Foucauldianism (McLeod 2007). There is some overlap here with the concerns and major figures of Southern Theory.

Some postcolonial critics have been very dismissive of sociology (McLennan 2003). But while those scholars self-identifying as postcolonial sociologists regard Western neo-colonialist thinking as thoroughly permeating standard sociological discourse and categories, including the master category of "modernity", they also believe sociology can be reformed in postcolonial directions (Bhambra 2007a, 2007b; Seth 2009; Gutiérrez Rodríguez et al 2010; Bortohici and Jansen 2013; Go, 2013a, 2013b).

For postcolonial sociologists, the emergence of sociology coincided with the high point of Western imperialism, and colonialist traces have remained embedded in mainstream sociology ever since (Seidman 2013; Kemple and Mawani 2009). Sociology was, and continues to be, an exercise in ongoing coloniality (Maldonado-Torres 2007), exhibiting some fundamentally racist aspects because of its failure to account for the histories and current conditions of anyone other than Euro-Americans. What is still missing in sociology is "systematic consideration of the world-historical processes of dispossession, appropriation, genocide, and enslavement as central to the emergence and development of modernity and its institutional forms" (Bhambra 2016, 962). Hence a fundamental conceptual revolution is required (Bhambra 2007a), to "postcolonialize" sociology, to decontaminate it of a Western pseudo-universalism that is in

fact parochial and provincial (Chakrabarty 2000), and thereby to render sociology properly "global" at last.

Classical sociology is criticised for its substantive and methodological Eurocentrism (Amin 1989), which reserved all "dynamism, social creativity, energy, and enlightenment for European societies alone" (Go 2013a, 32). Colonial relations were generally kept out of the conceptual apparatuses of sociology. Marx is criticised for viewing colonialism as merely an extension of capitalism, rather than as a central element in the forging of that system itself. Frantz Fanon (2004 [1961], 58) had already remarked in the early 1960s that "Europe is literally the creation of the Third World". Postcolonial sociologists have pursued this idea, criticising what they see as the widespread notion that European development was both unique and endogenous. Allegedly key "moments of Western modernity, for which the sociological approach was supposed to offer an explanation, were considered to be the French Revolution and the English-led Industrial Revolution, but not Western colonial politics or the accumulation of capital through the Atlantic Slave Trade and the overseas plantation economy" (Boatcâ, Costa and Gutiérrez-Rodríguez 2010, 16).

More recent sociological approaches with global pretentions, such as the "multiple modernities" approach developed by S.N. Eisenstadt and collaborators, are criticised for assuming, in a typically Eurocentric manner, that the core of "modernity" is a set of initially Western institutional arrangements of society, culture, politics and economy, which then were "diffused" around the world, taking on local colourings as they travelled (Bhambra 2016). But this ignores the possibility that "modernity" was itself the product of multiple types of interactions – pre-eminently colonial settlement and slavery – between so-called "cores" and "peripheries" in the world, and between colonizing and colonized locations (Bhambra 2007a, 2007b). Edward Said's (2003) accent on analyzing "overlapping territories" and "intertwined histories", as well as Sanjay Subrahmanyam's (2005) advocacy of "connected histories", have been invoked as guides to creating postcolonial "connected sociologies" (Bhambra 2016).

Moreover, instead of turning to intellectual sources outside of institutionalised Western sociology, as do indigenizing sociologies and Southern Theory, one may also take standardised sociological theory of more recent times and turn it against itself, taking it in new post-colonial directions. For example, Go (2013a) does this with Bourdieusian field theory, rendering it more adequately transnational in tenor, and thereby able to deal with, for example, the co-constitution of the process conventionally called the "French Revolution" by actors in both France and the French colonial Caribbean. Such work is both part of, and inspires, the new sociology of empires literature, which, like postcolonial thought, foregrounds issues such as slavery, racialisation, cultural mixing, and ethnic inequalities (Steinmetz 2013, 2014; Magubane 2013).

A Critique of Critiques

In the various attempts to create "global sociology" which were reviewed above, critiques both of previous and existing institutional arrangements, and of epistemological orientations, go together indissociably. The inequities of the former are seen to generate, and in turn are reproduced and stimulated by, the shortcomings of the latter. The insufficiently "global" (meaning fair and balanced) social organisation of sociology fundamentally runs together with faulty thinking. Institutional biases towards the global North and Developed World are cause and consequence of Euro-America-centric ways of thinking. In assessing sociology's shortcomings, and its possibilities for being reformed in more genuinely "global" directions, the institutional and epistemological realms therefore cannot be separated.

If that viewpoint is accepted, then such an insight can, and logically must, also be applied to the claims of those scholars who criticise sociology's current form and who endeavour to create alternative futures for it, including the "decolonizing" of sociology (Kim 2019) and of social science more generally (Stavenhagen 1971). The critics of sociology can and must themselves be criticised in light of their own style of critique. Critical assessment of scholars' work concerned with creating "global sociology" must perforce go together with critique of their institutional position within professional sociology, for that is what they do to those that they themselves criticise. This is the rule of *tu quoque – your types of criticisms of other people also apply to you*. I will now focus in this regard on Southern Theory and Postcolonial Sociology.

Connell's (2015, 33) recent writings on the inequalities of intellectual production draw attention to the fact that "whether in Africa, China or Australia", one must "read the leading journals published in the metropole, learn the research techniques taught there and gain recognition there. Career paths include advanced training in the metropole, attending conferences in the metropole and, for the more successful, getting a job in the metropole". Following this analysis, we can add that "star" scholars of the global North, whose work is published by what are defined as the leading journals and book publishers, are courted, through being invited to give keynote lectures at conferences and by other means, in the hope that some of the intellectual and institutional "stardust" will brush off onto the less privileged who are doing the courting.

But this glosses over the fact that Connell has herself become a world-recognised star scholar, achieved partly through her writings about Southern/Northern Theory. This has given her potentially great intellectual clout both in Australia and in the putatively global sociological field – the kind of power once enjoyed by the figures like Giddens she has criticised for being too globally influential. If a strategy of talking about "global sociology" becomes successful by reaching enough readers, especially those whose paying attendance to your writings may in turn pay various dividends, then it can win you (more) power in the putative global sociological field. That power includes the capacity to shape how that field itself is understood by others (e.g. as being fundamentally biased against the global South), as well as bringing symbolic and material rewards, like prizes, significant funding, invitations to speak around the world, and suchlike. Whether intended or not, talking of "global sociology" can be a highly successful career-enhancing strategy, making one's career "go global" at the same as, and through the means of, discoursing about rendering sociology more truly "global".

Of course, the more famous one becomes as a result of one global sociological vision, especially when it is rooted in a promotion of the global South, the more one is open to criticism as to how exactly a relatively very privileged white Professor in Australia can legitimately speak for the whole of that (rhetorically constructed) region. This is especially so if that scholar has had to frame Australia as if it were in the same position as every country in that huge region, and was not itself in a highly privileged situation vis-a-vis most of Africa, Asia and Latin America (Lundström 2009). The privileged global position of that scholar's own country could be more clearly seen if it was categorized as being part of the advantaged "Developed World", and not framed, as does Southern Theory's rhetoric, as part of the disadvantaged "global South".

Who gets to speak for whom? This is a question that a critic may utter, and then might have posed against themselves by others, including those who have learned from them (Glenn 2007). Critics of sociological privilege may themselves occupy privileged positions in their own national contexts, while otherwise parading their apparent "indigeneity" as a form of symbolic capital in front of (primarily white) global North audiences, who may themselves be suffering liberal guilt about the history of colonialism and the current state of the neo-colonial world.

The point here is that, in global sociology polemics, and by the very logic and terms of the debates themselves, everyone is potentially criticisable, but, given the inequities of the sociological field, some are more likely to be criticised than others (Glenn 2007). Presenting oneself as being in some fundamental way "from" the global South may work as a way of evading some criticism.

The kind of global stardom enjoyed by a figure like Connell, involving both improved institutional position and increased accrual of prestige, is not the same as that enjoyed by figures such as former ISA Presidents Smelser and Sztompka. Their self-assigned role in global sociology debates is to play the outraged defender of "traditional", putatively universalistic, scientific values. This is a role likely to be associated with older white men from the global North. In global sociology debates, such figures are relatively easily dismissed by critics, including Burawoy (2016, 955), as the hegemonic "elites [who] have no doubt about their claim to distinction, being recipients of awards, recognition, publications, invited addresses that confirm their entitlement to superiority".

The global stardom of people in the sorts of positions Connell and Burawoy occupy is of a different order again. It is gained by talking big – and there is not much bigger for human beings to talk about than the realm of the "global" – but not in a universalistic register. That strategy has allowed for the elevation of Burawoy to exactly the kind of globally elite position that he himself has criticised, and it is through that sort of critique that he has thus been elevated. At a lower level of globally-recognised standing are the favoured scholars drawn from across the world, but for symbolic reasons especially the global South, whom the new global stars choose to endow with significance, such as being involved in putatively transnational teaching experiments (Benbehanian and Burawoy 2012). But these people may themselves be drawn from the ranks of scholarly elites in their own countries, a point which, to his credit, Burawoy (2016) seems partly to recognise. There are also those who appoint themselves, or who are defined by influential actors, as spokespersons for particular national or regional fields (Burawoy 2009). These spokespersons may claim to speak for all sociologists in "their" terrain, thereby getting to associate with the bigger global players and possibly gaining some of their prestige through association. They seek to become "obligatory passage points" (Callon 1986) for discussion of sociology in their part of the globe, a stance which may accrue power and prestige for them in their more localised fields.

Similar sorts of points can be made of postcolonial scholarship, including within sociology. From at least the instantiation of the debates provoked by Spivak (1988) onwards, postcolonial studies has involved a lively history of critiques of scholarly privilege. But what may be less palatable to posit is that criticism of postcolonial scholarly positions could be dismissed by claiming that any such criticism is somehow racist, or at least culturally insensitive, especially if it is uttered by those said to be globally hegemonic, especially white males in the global North.

Postcolonial sociology confidently proclaims its sensitive attention to historical processes, beyond Eurocentric imaginings. But it is itself highly limited in terms of its historical scope. Most postcolonial studies writings are literally "post" colonial in that they are concerned with the 500-year long fallout from the expansion of the European empires from circa 1500 CE onwards (Mignolo 1995). That focus on "post-1500" timescales can be criticised from within postcolonial studies, as imposing a Eurocentric timescale on world history (Vazquez, 2009; Pelayo 2015), and calls can be made for applying postcolonial ideas to all times in world history (Childs and Williams 1997). This sometimes results in postcolonial analyses of pre-1500 societies (e.g. Lampert-Weissig 2010), although these studies often are taken as mostly providing background contextualisation of the more central post-1500 developments (Bartlett

1993). The great majority of postcolonial analyses, and the ideas animating and derived from them, concern relations between colonizers and colonized after 1500 CE, in the "modern/colonial capitalist/patriarchal world-system" (Khoury and Khoury 2013).

It is understandable that the various figures, canonical or not, in postcolonial studies, would be focused on this timeframe and this set of issues, because their lives were, or are, so profoundly affected by them (Marrouchi 1997, 16). Postcolonial studies has created a Canon of anti-colonial thinkers from across the world (Mcleod 2007), homogenized them together, in the manner that all Canons do, and then put them posthumously to work for simultaneously intellectual and institutional advancement purposes. Postcolonial sociology seems to take on that Canon rather uncritically, while vigorously criticising the standard sociological Canon. It also reproduces wholesale the post-1500 orientation of postcolonial studies, without enough reflection on, or problematization of, doing such a thing.

Postcolonial sociology is indebted to postcolonial studies, and thereby imports its shortcomings into sociology, undermining its own efforts to create a new kind of "global sociology". Postcolonial sociology could have challenged and gone beyond the post-1500 focus (Dirlik 2007) of postcolonial studies, but it has not (yet) done so. It has criticised what it takes to be mainstream Western sociology's disciplinary common-sense, but it has uncritically reproduced what are arguably the two most central pillars of that, namely the twin assumptions that "modernity" is the primary, if not exclusive, focus of sociology (Adams et al 2005), and that "modernity" begins circa 1500 CE (Martin and Beittel 1998). Postcolonial sociology is primarily aimed at a sociology audience, so it is not surprising that it makes some apparently radical moves to attract that audience's attention. But it leaves intact the audience's major assumptions about the primacy and timing of "modernity". The latter is now conceptualised as involving from its beginnings both colonialism and slavery. But it is not clear what postcolonial sociology can say at the theoretical level beyond that (important but limited) statement, especially as it leaves the pre- and post-1500 dividing line of disciplinary common-sense intact.

Sociology need not be so limited. Max Weber – criticised by postcolonial scholars for allegedly dramatic Eurocentric blindness – had already shown 100 years ago that the roots of "modern" European institutions stretch back well into what is conventionally called "antiquity", which was a very wide Eurasian, and certainly not narrowly "European", set of phenomena (Collins 1986). Inspired by Weber, Eisenstadt's (e.g. 1963) work analysed the workings of "ancient empires", in ways which are suggestive of delineating how their influence has continued well into the post-1500 period (Inglis 2010). Thus the "civilizational" paradigm inspired by Eisenstadt's work (Arjomand 2006; Arnason and Hann 2018) cannot be reduced to its "multiple modernities" research programme alone, nor can the latter be dismissed as easily as some postcolonial sociology likes to think.

The biggest problem of postcolonial sociology is, ironically, its unintentional Eurocentrism. By starting in 1500 CE, it makes its frame of reference coterminous with the expansion of Europe, thus ceding the global stage to Europeans once again, but this time cast as villains and not heroes. It also assumes that capitalism "begins" at that point, although Weber had already noted multiple types of capitalism, including pre-modern ones, which go unexplored. Europe is correctly shown to be not self-sufficient after 1500, and its subsequent growth and expansion is shown as non-endogenous. But this rather overlooks the large amount of recent scholarship which shows that so much of European capacity, including the ability to travel oceanic distances and to subjugate people around the world militarily, was derived from Asian sources, both "pre-modern" and "modern" (Frank 1998; Goody 1996, 2009, 2010).

This in turn points to a wider occlusion: that "Europe" before 1500 was a minor and peripheral part of wider Eurasian development (Abu-Lughod 1991). Postcolonial sociology seems so focused on European colonial relations in the Americas, Africa, Australasia and selected parts of Asia (i.e. those which were most directly influenced by European empires), that it seems too oblivious to Eurasia as an analytical object in its own right. Yet world history pre-1500 is hugely influenced by pan- and trans-Eurasian dynamics, including the military and economic power of non-European and pre-modern empires, all of which are relatively unattended to within the postcolonial paradigm (Burbank and Cooper 2010). It might be better to found sociology on a 5000-year historical basis, not a mere 500-year grounding, which is ultimately short-term and highly Eurocentric (Frank and Gills 1993). Despite its talk of connecting diverse phenomena, postcolonial studies, and even more so the sociology derived from it, do so only *geographically* (across the world after 1500), but not *historically* – that is, across the seemingly impermeable, but actually arbitrary, historical dividing-line imposed between "pre-modern" and "modern" times. This is a conceptual division which the postcolonial critique of binary thinking seems strangely unwilling, because perhaps unable, to confront.

The very unfortunate consequence of postcolonial sociology reproducing both postcolonial studies' and wider sociology's assumptions as to "modernity", is that "globalization" is arbitrarily thought to be purely "modern" and initially Atlantic-based (on the common-sense presumption that globalization cannot begin without connecting Western and Eastern hemispheres, so-called "Old" and "New" worlds). But this ignores multiple dynamics of "pre-modern" and Eurasian (proto-) "globalization". As a result, globalization is made coterminous with a post-1500 expanding Europe, which goes against the postcolonial impulse to "decentre" and "provincialize" Europe. As Pieterse (2012) implies, the nearer in time to the present one places the beginnings of globalization, the more Eurocentric one's account will be. By beginning most analyses after 1500, that is precisely what happens within postcolonial studies and postcolonial sociology. Conversely, the further back in time one places globalization's beginnings, to such possible periods as the 12th century CE or the so-called Axial Age (covering much of the first millennium BCE), the cost of imprecision in definitions of globalization is offset by the account becoming ever less Eurocentric and more broadly Eurasia-focused.

This is especially so in terms of the eastern and central parts of Eurasia. Postcolonial scholarship remains rather quiet about the long history of China, and often seems to deal with it in an unintentionally Eurocentric way – i.e. only when Western empires touch upon it after 1500. But the long, intertwining histories of Chinese empire-building, and China's role in contributing to pre-modern Eurasian globalization, as well as its often subterranean but powerful place in the history of the construction of "European" modernity, go mostly unremarked by the postcolonial scholarly gaze. One may well wonder as to what contemporary Chinese sociologists would make of postcolonial sociology's seemingly Eurocentric dispositions in this regard (Xu et al 2019).

Conclusion

Postcolonial sociology has obvious political relevance in a period of global protests about racism and the prominence of the Black Lives Matter movement. But intellectually speaking, it is riven with blind-spots and limitations, as are the types of sociology it criticises. In this sense, it just as problematic and debatable as a basis to mount any future "global sociology" on as are Southern Theory, indigenized sociologies, or abstract universalism(s).

To play and thrive within the game of "global sociology" today is to become a kind of *sociological master of the world*. This is to become someone that the putatively global field of

sociology recognises as a speaker endowed with the legitimacy to pronounce with authority, not just on how sociology is, but how it should and must be. There exist multiple potential benefits to be won through pontifications as to the merits of one's own vision of "global sociology", the de-merits of rival visions, and the alleged parochialisms of those rivals who are deemed insufficiently "global", unlike oneself.

Conversely, although the "global sociology" game thrives on critiques of other people's versions of "global sociology", it is unlikely than anyone operating within professional sociology today would be likely to gain much by arguing against "global sociology", either as a general idea, or as a state of affairs that is desirable. "For Parochial Sociology", or some similar slogan, is hardly a positive and convincing rallying-cry for manifestoes meant to be taken seriously across the world, nor is it a way to gain prestige and power in what most other players like to call the field of "global sociology". To assume that "global sociology" is both necessary and desirable, and to seek to convince others of the benefits of one's own version of it, is today the only game in town worth playing – or so it seems.

References

Abé, C. (2008) *La Globalisation De la Sociologie En Situation Africaine: Entre Resistances et Dynamiques De Structuration*, in «Canadian Journal of Sociology», 33,3,pp.575-606.

Abend, G. (2006) *Styles of Sociological Thought: Sociologies, Epistemologies, and the Mexican and U.S. Quests for Truth*, in «Sociological Theory», 24,1,pp.1-41.

Abu-Lughod, J. (1991) *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Adams, J., E.S. Clemens, A.S. Orloff (2005) *Introduction: Social theory, modernity, and the three waves of historical Sociology*, in J. Adams, E.S. Clemens, A.S. Orloff, eds (2005), pp.1-73.

Adams, J., E.S. Clemens, A.S. Orloff, eds (2005) *Remaking modernity*, Durham, Duke University Press.

Akiwowo, A.A. (1986) *Contributions to the Sociology of Knowledge from an African Oral Poetry*, in «International Sociology», 1,4,pp.343–58.

Alatas, S.H. (1974) *The Captive Mind and Creative Development*, in «International Social Science Journal», 36,4,pp.691-9.

Alatas, S.F. (2003) *Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences*, «Current Sociology», 51,6,pp.599-613.

-(2006a) *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Science: Responses to Eurocentrism*, New Delhi, Sage.

-(2006b) *A Khaldunian Exemplar for a Historical Sociology for the South*, in «Current Sociology», 54,3,pp.397-411.

Albrow, M. (1987) *Sociology for One World*, in «International Sociology» 2,1,pp.1–12.

Amin, S. (1989) *Eurocentrism*, New York, Monthly Review Press.

Archer, M.S. (1991) *Sociology for One World: Unity and Diversity*, in «International Sociology» 6,2,pp.131-47.

Arjomand, S.A. (2006) *Civilizations in Dispute: Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions; Axial Civilizations and World History*, in «International Sociology», 21,3,pp.393–9.

-(2008) *Southern Theory: An Illusion*, review of Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science by Raewyn Connell, in «European Journal of Sociology», 49,3, pp.546-9.

Armer, J.M. (1987) *Provincialism and Internationalism in Contemporary American Sociology*, in «International Sociology», 2,pp.315-24.

Arnason, J.P., C. Hann (2018) *Anthropology and Civilizational Analysis: Eurasian Explorations*, Albany, SUNY Press.

Back, L (2009) *Global Attentiveness and the Sociological Ear*, in «Sociological Research Online», 14,4,4. http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/4714.html

Bartlett, R. (1993) *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 950-1350*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Beck, U. (2000) *The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity*, in «British Journal of Sociology», 51,1,pp.79.

Behbehanian, L., M. Burawoy (2012) *A Pedagogy for the Global*, in «Contexts», 11,1,pp.80-3.

Bendix, R. (1967) *Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered*, «Comparative Studies in Society and History», 9, 3,pp.292-346.

Bhambra, G.K. (2007a) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.

-(2007b) *Sociology and Postcolonialism: Another 'Missing' Revolution?*, in «Sociology», 41,5,pp.871-84.

-(2010) *Sociology after postcolonialism: Provincialized cosmopolitanism and connected sociologies*, in E.G. Rodríguez M. Boatcà, S. Costa, eds (2010),pp.33-47.

-(2011) *Historical Sociology, Modernity, and Postcolonial Critique*, in «The American Historical Review», 116, 3,pp.653-62.

-(2016) *Postcolonial Reflections on Sociology*, in «Sociology», 50, 5,pp.960-6.

Boatcã, M., S. Costa, E. Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (2010) *Introduction: Decolonizing European Sociology: Different Paths Towards a Pending Project*, in M. Boatcã, S. Costa, E. Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, eds (2010),pp.1-12.

Boatcã, M., S. Costa, E. Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, eds (2010) *Decolonizing European Sociology: Transdisciplinary Approaches*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Bortohici, J.H., R.S. Jansen (2013) *Toward a Postcolonial Sociology: The View from Latin America*, «Political Power and Social Theory», 24,pp.199-229.

Bourdieu, P. (1976) *Les Conditions Sociales de la Production Sociologique: Sociologie Coloniale et Décolonisation de la Sociologie*, in H, Moniot, ed (1976),pp. 416-27.

-(1988) *Homo Academicus,* Cambridge, Polity

Breckenridge, C.A., P. van der Veer, eds (1993) *Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament: Perspectives on South Asia*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

Burawoy, M. (2005) *2004 ASA Presidential Address: For Public Sociology*, in «American Sociological Review», 70,1,pp.4-28.

-(2008) *Rejoinder: For a Subaltern Global Sociology?*, «Current Sociology», 56,3, pp.435-44.

-(2009) *Challenges for a global sociology*, in «Contexts», 8,4, pp.36-41.

-(2010) *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for a Global Sociology*, in M. Burawoy, M. Chang, M.F. Hsieh, eds (2010),pp.1-25.

-(2016) *The Promise of Sociology*, in «Sociology», 50,5,pp.949-59.

Burawoy, M., M. Chang, M.F. Hsieh, eds (2010) *Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for a Global Sociology: Volume One: Introduction, Latin America and Africa*, Taipei, Institute of Sociology at Academia Sinica.

Burbank, J., F. Cooper (2010) *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Callon, M. (1986) *Elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay*, in J. Law, ed (1986),pp.196-233.

Castro-Go 'mez, S. (200 7). The Missing Chapter of Empire: Postmodern Reorganization of Coloniality and Post-Fordist Capitalism, in « »Cultural Studies 21(2-3):428-448.

Chakrabarty, D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Chan, S., J. Wiener, eds (1999) *International History and the Twentieth Century*, London, IB Tauris.

Childs, P., P. Williams (1997) *An Introduction to Postcolonial Theory*, New York, Prentice Hall.

Collins, R. (1986) *Max Weber: A Skeleton Key,* Newbury Park, Sage.

Comaroff, J., J. Comaroff (2012) *Theory from the South, Or, How Euro-America is Evolving Towards Africa,* London, Routledge.

Connell, R.W. (1990) *Notes on American Sociology and American Power*, in H. Gans, ed (1990),pp.265-27.

(1997) *Why is Classical Theory Classical?*, in «The American Journal of Sociology», 102,6,pp.1511-57.

Connell, R. (2006). *Northern Theory: The Political Geography of General Social Theory*, in «Theory and Society», 35,2,pp.237-64.

-(2007) *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

-(2010) *Periphery and Metropole in the History of Sociology*, in «Sociologisk Forskning», 47,1,pp.72-86.

-(2014) *Using Southern Theory: Decolonizing Social Thought in Theory, Research and Application*, in «Planning Theory», 13, 2,pp.210-23.

-(2015) *Australia in the Global Dynamics of Social Science: De-centring Europe and de-Mythologising the 'Asian Century'*, in C. Johnson, V. Mackie, T. Morris-Suzuki, eds (2015).

Della Faille, D., N. McLaughlin (2008) *Sociology's Global Challenge*, in «The Canadian Journal of Sociology», 33,3,pp.485-95.

Denzin, N.K., Y.S. Lincoln, L.T. Smith, eds (2008) *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Dirlik, A. (2007) *Global Modernity: Modernity in the Age of Global Capitalism*, London: Paradigm Publishers.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1963) *The Political Systems of Empires*, London, Free Press.

Fanon, F. (2004 [1961]) *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York, Grove.

Foley, D. (2003) *Indigenous Epistemology and Indigenous Standpoint Theory*, «Social Alternatives», 22,1,pp.44–52.

Frank, A.G. (1998) *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

Frank, A.G., B.K. Gills, eds (1993) *The World System: Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?*, New York, Routledge.

Gandhi, L. (1998) *Postcolonial Theory*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Gans, H., ed (1990) *Sociology in America*, Newbury Park, Sage.

Gareau, F.H. (1987) *Expansion and Increasing Diversification of the Universe of Social Science*, in «International Social Science Journal», 114,595-606.

-(1988) *Another Type of Third World Dependency: The Social Sciences*, in «International Sociology», 3,171-78.

-(1991) *Internationalization of Sociology: The Unfinished Agenda*, in «Current Sociology», 39,1,pp.1-19.

Glenn, E.N. (2007) *Whose Public Sociology? The Subaltern Speaks, but Who Is Listening?*, in D. Clawson, R. Zussman, J. Misra, N. Gerstel, R. Stokes, D.L. Anderton, M. Burawoy, eds (2007).

Go, J. (2013a) *For a Postcolonial Sociology*, in «Theory and Society», 42,1,pp.25-55.

-(2013b) *Postcolonial Sociology*, Bingley, Emerald.

Goody, J. (1996) *The East in the West*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

(2009) *The Eurasian Miracle*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

(2010) *Renaissances: The One or the Many?*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007) *The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political-Economy Paradigms*, in «Cultural Studies», 21,2-3,pp.211-23.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E., M. Boatcă, S. Costa, eds (2010) *Decolonizing European sociology: Transdisciplinary approaches*, Farnham, Ashgate.

Harding, S. (2008) *Sciences from below: Feminisms, Postcolonialities, and Modernities*, Durham, Duke University Press.

Hickling-Hudson, A. (2009) *"Southern Theory" and Its Dynamics for Postcolonial Education*, in «Counterpoints», 369,pp.365-75.

Holmwood, J. (2009) *The Challenge of Global Social Inquiry*, in «Sociological Research Online» 14,4, pp.13. http://www.socresonline.org.Uk/14/4/13.html

Inglis, D. (2010) *Civilizations or Globalization(s)? Intellectual Rapprochements and Historical World-Visions*, «European Journal of Social Theory», 13,1,pp.135-152.

Hountondji, P.J. (1983[1976]) *African Philosophy: Myth and Reality*, London, Hutchinson.

Jacobs, R.N., E. Townsley (2008) *On the Communicative Geography of Global Sociology*, in «The Canadian Journal of Sociology», 33,3,pp.497-520.

Keim, W. (2011) *Counterhegemonic Currents and Internationalization of Sociology*, in «International Sociology», 26,1,pp.123-45.

Keim, W., E. Çelik, C. Ersche, V. Wöhrer, eds (2014) *Global Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences*, Farnham, Ashgate.

Kemple, T., R. Mawani (2009) *The Sociological Imagination and its Imperial Shadows*, in «Theory, Culture & Society» 26,7-8,pp.228-49.

Khoury, S., L. Khoury (2013) *Geopolitics of Knowledge: Constructing an Indigenous Sociology from the South*, in «International Review of Modern Sociology», 39,1,pp.1-28.

Kim, H. (2019) *Decolonization and the Ontological Turn of Sociology Source*, in «Journal of Asian Sociology», 48,4,pp.443-54.

Kuper, A. (1988) *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion*, London, Routledge.

Lampert-Weissig, L. (2010) *Medieval Literature and Postcolonial Studies*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Lamy, P. (1976) *The Globalization of American Sociology: Excellence or Imperialism?*, in «The American Sociologist», 11,pp.104-114.

Law, J., ed (1986) *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?,* London, Routledge.

Lee, R.L.M. (1994) *Global Sociology or "Ghettoized" Knowledges? The Paradox of Sociological Universalization in the Third World*, in «The American Sociologist», 25,2,pp.59-72.

Levine, D.J. (1995) *Visions of the Sociological Tradition*, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

Lundström, C. (2009) *Book Review*: Southern Theory. The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science by Raewyn Connell, in «Acta Sociologica», 52,1,pp.85-7.

Magubane, Z. (2013) *Common Skies and Divided Horizons? Sociology, Race, and Postcolonial Studies*, in «Political Power and Social Theory», 24,pp.81-116.

Makinde, M.A. (1988) *Asuwada Principle: An Analysis of Akiwowo's Contributions to the Sociology of Knowledge*, in «International Sociology», 3,4,pp.61-76.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007) *On the Coloniality of Being: Contributions Development of a Concept*, in «Cultural Studies», 212,2-3,pp.240-70.

Manza, J., M. Sauder, N. Wright (2010) *Producing Textbook Sociology*, in «European Journal of Sociology», 51,2,pp.271-304.

Marrouchi, M. (1997) *Decolonizing the Terrain of Western Theoretical Productions*, in «College Literature», 24,2,pp.1-34.

Martin, W.G., M. Beittel (1998) *Toward a Global Sociology? Evaluating Current Conceptions, Methods, and Practices*, in «The Sociological Quarterly», 39,1,pp.139-61.

McLennan, G. (2003) *Sociology, Eurocentrism and Postcolonial Theory*, in «European Journal of Social Theory», 6,1,pp.69-86.

McLeod, J., ed (2007) *The Routledge Companion to Postcolonial Studies*, Milton Park, Routledge.

Michalski, J. (2008) *Scientific Discovery in Deep Social Space: Sociology without Borders*, in «The Canadian Journal of Sociology», 33,3,pp.521-54.

Mignolo, W.D. (1995) *The Darker Side of the Renaissance*, University of Michigan Press.

Mišina, D. (2015) *Who Now Needs Sociology? Transdisciplinarity Vs. Tradition*, in «The Canadian Journal of Sociology», 40,4,pp.527-46.

Moore, W.E. (1966) *Global Sociology: The World as a Singular System*, in «American Journal of Sociology», 71,5,pp.475-82.

Mugbane, B., J.C. Paris (1985) *On the Political Relevance of Anthropology*, in «Dialectical Anthropology», 9,pp.91-104.

Mukherjee, R. (1977) *Trends in Indian Sociology*, in «Current Sociology», 25,pp.1-193.

Muyiwa. S.A. (1988) *In Defense of Indigenization in Sociological Theories*, in «International Sociology», 3,pp.189-99.

Nelson, C., L. Grossberg, eds (1988) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago, University of Illinois Press.

Oommen, T.K. (1991) *Internationalization of Sociology: A View from Developing Countries*, in «Current Sociology», 39,1,pp.67-83.

Oromaner, M.J. (1970) *Comparison of Influentials in Contemporary American and British Sociology: A Study in the Internationalization of Sociology*, in «The British Journal of Sociology», 21,3,pp.324-32.

Park, M. (2019) *What Can Sociology Do for East Asia, and Vice Versa?*, in «Journal of Asian Sociology», 48,2,pp.169-78.

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

Pelayo, E.Z. (2015) *Nominal Openness and Epistemic Endogamy in 'Global' and 'Provincialized' Sociologies*, in «Sociology», 49,3,pp. 539-55.

Phillips, B. (2001) *Beyond Sociology's Tower of Babel*, New York, de Gruyter.

Pieterse, J.N. (2012) *Periodizing Globalization*, in «Histories of Globalization», 6,2,Article 1.

Portes, A. (1976) *On the Sociology of National Development: Theories and Issues*, in «American Journal of Sociology», 82,pp.55-85.

Robertson, R. (1987), *Globalization and Societal Modernization: A Note on Japan and Japanese Religion*, in «Sociological Analysis», 41,5,pp.35-42.

Rodríguez, E.G., M. Boatcà, S. Costa, eds (2010) *Decolonizing European Sociology: Trans-disciplinary Approaches*, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Rousseau, N., ed (1999) *Internationalizing Sociology in the Age of Globalization*, Washington, DC, American Sociological Association.

Sandstrom, G. (2008) *Global Sociology – Russian Style*, in «The Canadian Journal of Sociology», 33,3,pp.607-30.

Said, E. (2003) *Always on Top*, in «London Review of Books», 25,6.

Santos, B.d.S (2016) *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*, London, Routledge.

Scott, J. (2019) *British Social Theory*, London, Sage.

Seidman, S. (2013) *The Colonial Unconscious of Classical Sociology*, in «Political Power and Social Theory», 24,pp.35-54.

Seth, S. (2009) *Historical Sociology and Postcolonial Theory: Two Strategies for Challenging Eurocentrism*, in «International Political Sociology», 3,3,pp.334-8.

Singham, A.W., N.L. Singham (1973) *Cultural Domination and Political Subordination: Notes Towards a Theory of the Caribbean Political System*, in «Comparative Studies in Society and History», 15,pp.258-88.

Smelser, N.J. (1991) *Internationalization of Social Science Knowledge*, in «American Behavioral Scientist» 35,1,pp.65-91.

Smith, H.E. (1990) *Sociology and the Study of Non-Western Societies*, in «The American Sociologist», 21,2,pp.150-63.

Smith, L. T. (2012) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, London, Zed

Sohoni, D., M. Petrovic (2010) *Teaching a Global Sociology: Suggestions for Globalizing the U.S. Curriculum*, in «Teaching Sociology», 38,4,pp.287-300.

Spivak, G.C. (1988) *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, in C. Nelson, L. Grossberg, eds (1988), pp.271–316.

Stavenhagen, R. (1971) *Decolonizing Applied Social Sciences*, in «Human Organization», 30,4,pp.333-44.

Steinmetz, G. ed (2013) *Sociology and Empire: The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline*, Durham, Duke University Press.

-(2014) *The Sociology of Empires, Colonies, and Postcolonialism*, in «Annual Review of Sociology», 40,pp.77-103.

Subrahmanyam, S. (2005) *Explorations in Connected Histories: Mughals and Franks*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sztompka, P. (1988) *Conceptual Frameworks in Comparative Inquiry: Divergent or Convergent?*, in «International Sociology», 3,3,pp.207-18.

-(2011) *Review: Another Sociological Utopia*, in «Contemporary Sociology», 40,4,pp.388-96.

Tiryakian, E.A. (1986) *Sociology's Great Leap Forward: The Challenge of Internationalization*, in «International Sociology», 1,2,pp.155-71

Turner, B.S. (1990) *The Two Faces of Sociology: Global or National?*, in M. Featherstone, ed (1990), pp.343-58.

Urry, J. (2000) *Sociology Beyond Societies*, London, Routledge.

Vazquez, R. (2009) *Modernity, Coloniality and Visibility: The Politics of Time*, in «Sociological Research Online», 14,4,7, http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/4/7.html

Young, R.J.C. (2001) *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell.

-(2012) *Postcolonial Remains*, in «New Literary History», 43,1,pp.19-42.

Xu, B., L. Qian, W. Guo (2019) *The Cultural Sociology of China: Trajectory and Dynamics of a Burgeoning Field*, in «Cultural Sociology», 13,4,pp.387–410.

---

[1] Alternative accounts of social scientific "Southern-ness" are offered by Santos (2016) and Comaroff and Comaroff (2012).

[2] But for Bourdieu's own contribution to the "de-colonization" of sociology, see Bourdieu (1976).