

GLOBAL SOCIOLOGY – RUSSIAN STYLE

GREGORY SANDSTROM

Abstract. Although the sociological tradition in Russia reaches back to the late 19th century and is historically linked with western European sociological traditions, it is only since the end of the 1980s that contemporary Russian sociology has begun to blossom again and take tangible shape. This article elaborates the characteristic role that Russian sociology has played, now plays, and could possibly play in “globalizing sociology.” An integrative perspective or synthetic approach to knowledge most suitably defines the Russian tradition, placing sociology creatively between the humanities and natural sciences. This is partly due to the cultural and geographic diversity of a nation that crosses borders between east and west. Significant figures in the history of Russian sociology such as Pitirim Sorokin and Maxim Kovalevsky show how both importing and exporting sociological ideas constitute globalization, as well as the importance of traveling outside of one’s home nation to discover the views of other civil societies. The article gives an overview of problems, resources, and recent events in Russian sociology, highlighting lessons from Russia’s experience in the transition to democracy and from state to market. These two transitions pose significant challenges to academic autonomy for professional sociology that are widely shared in the discipline outside the Big Four of the United States, Britain, Germany, and France, further suggesting the potential importance of the Russian experience for globalizing sociology.

Résumé. Bien que la tradition sociologique en Russie ait une histoire remontant à la fin du 19^{ème} siècle et qu’elle soit historiquement liée aux traditions sociologiques d’Europe occidentale, c’est seulement depuis la fin des années 1980 que la sociologie russe contemporaine a commencé à se développer à nouveau et à prendre forme. Cet article traite du rôle caractéristique que la sociologie russe a joué, continue à jouer et pourrait probablement jouer dans le futur en termes de perspectives pour la ‘sociologie globale’. La tradition russe se définit le plus convenablement par une perspective intégrative ou une approche synthétique à la connaissance qui place la sociologie entre les sciences humaines et les sciences naturelles. Ceci est partiellement dû à la diversité culturelle et géographique d’une nation qui a des frontières avec l’Occident et l’Orient. L’étude de figures significatives de l’histoire de la sociologie russe tels Pitirim Sorokin et Maxime Kovalevsky montre comment l’importation et l’exportation des idées sociologiques constituent un élément de mondialisation. Mais, dans une telle étude, il faut galemment s’attarder à l’importance du déplacement en dehors de sa nation

d'origine à fin de découvrir les vues d'autres sociétés civiles. L'article donne une vue d'ensemble des problèmes réels, des ressources et des événements récents dans la sociologie russe. Il insiste également sur leçons de l'expérience de la Russie, un pays qui a connu une transition à la démocratie et au marché. Pour la sociologie professionnelle, ces deux transitions posent des défis significatifs à l'autonomie universitaire qui sont largement partagés dans la discipline en dehors des quatre grands que sont les États-Unis, la Grande-Bretagne, l'Allemagne et la France. L'expérience de la sociologie russe pour la mondialisation de la sociologie est donc potentiellement importante.

INTRODUCTION: RUSSIAN SOCIOLOGY IN TRANSITION

Sociological knowledge in Russia has reached a time when sociologists are ready to articulate Russia's unique contribution to global sociology. During the Soviet period, sociology was banished from universities as a "bourgeois science." Many leading social thinkers, philosophers, writers, scientists, religious and political figures were exiled or sought refuge in foreign countries¹ (e.g., P. Sorokin, N. Berdyaev, S. Bulgakov, N. Timasheff, N. Lossky, A. Peshekhonov). This is a legacy Russian sociology cannot escape. Even so, this conflicted past does not define Russia's present self-understanding or its potential for future input into international sociological discourse.

The Russian sociological tradition suffered a significant historical interruption² and only in the past 20–30 years has it started to recover. In 1974, the first Soviet journal of sociological research was printed, 25 years after the founding of the International Sociological Association (ISA) in 1949. Faculties of sociology were reopened in Russian universities in the late 1980s and early 1990s. By 2005, there were no less than 85 independent sociological research institutes (Brazeivich 2006), with between 15 and 20 sociological journals (Gudkov 2006). This reinvigorated turn to sociology in Russia brought with it a major problem: the lack of a solid basis for professional sociology. Thus, Russia's position is more typical of problems faced by sociology world-wide, anywhere

1. For an short story on these events, see Zolotov (2002).

2. Though sociology was still a relatively new scholarly field in Russia, faculties and departments of sociology were closed starting in 1923. Sociology as an autonomous discipline was effectively forced underground, used only to promote the Soviet Party line until well into the 1960s. Only in the mid-1970s were new ideas entertained outside the Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy and not until the disintegration of Marxist-Leninist ideology through the collapse of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) was sociology fully welcomed again as a respected academic field.

sociology lacks a deep historical tradition. In a context without an adequate basis of professional sociology upon which scholars may draw, the notion of a “public sociology” in Russia is potentially dangerous and vulnerable to pressures from the market and state. This thread will repeat throughout this paper.

The current state of Russian sociology presents both dangers and opportunities; sometimes dismal working conditions and stimulating possibilities of institutional regeneration for the future. Few national traditions can speak of a “lost generation” of scholars (van der Zweerde 2003, Burawoy 2007, personal interview),³ as some Sovietologists now regard the potential for constructing post-Soviet knowledge. Yet the rebuilding of civil society and the rapid pace of sociocultural and economic transformation in the Russian Federation suggest that there are many exciting features for sociologists to investigate as they develop their discipline to contribute to the universe of knowledge.

Russian sociology, or the school(s) of sociology that exist(s) within the Russian tradition, can contribute to sociology’s globalization through its vantage point on the boundaries of “east” and “west,” “north” and “south.” Its geography provides an axial advantage in promoting cross-cultural communication and building relationships between various societies: Russia is the nation-state with the most neighbouring countries in the world. The United States of America is obviously much more geographically isolated in this context than Russia. The city where the first Russian faculty of sociology was opened, St. Petersburg, is nicknamed “the Venice of the North”; the move by Peter the Great to build it as Russia’s then capital city on the western border provided a window to many European traditions. St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Volgograd are also all located in the same time zone as that great and terrible social experiment of reconstruction to the south — Baghdad, Iraq. Indeed, it is the geographical position of the Russian Federation, an archetype of Eurasia perhaps only rivalled by Turkey or Kazakhstan, which secures its relevance across a range of cultural, ethnic, and political forms.

Russian sociology today does not retain the trappings of imperialistic sociological (or socialistic) tendencies. It is influenced by sociology in the US, but maintains its sociological roots through its links to the French and German traditions. One example of this common tradition is the Russian word *uchyeoni*, which refers to both “scientists” and “scholars,” thus according equal weight to natural science, social science, and humanitarian scholarship, instead of polarizing natural science against social science and humanities as in the Anglo-Saxon tradition. English sociology, most commonly expressed in the British and American (i.e.,

3. Personal Interview, St. Petersburg, 19-09-07.

US) traditions, has already made deep inroads into Russian scholarship; for example, the transfer of Parsonian concepts in the Soviet epoch and the acceptance of A. Giddens' "globalization" narrative. Yet the future of Russian sociology will be forged by reconnecting contemporary debates and theory with Russian sociologists of the past, including émigrés, some of whose works were not translated into Russian by order of the Soviet authorities. A professional sociology based principally on Russian sources has yet to be constructed.

A fundamental question for Russian sociology is: does anyone outside Russia want to hear what it has to say? Do people want to know what Russians have learned from one of the grandest social experiments of the 20th century? Three examples of what outsiders can learn from Russia's experience easily come to mind:

1. the difference between philosophically interpreting the world and actually changing the world (i.e., socially and politically) in a significant way;
2. the central importance of "work" and "labour" as sociological categories that identify and unite people across a wide spectrum of social networks and communities;
3. a thorough diagnosis of capitalism's excesses warning against hegemonic and decadent economic (cf. Sensate) models which alienate and divide rather than unifying people around the world.

Russia's 20th century history of visionary, often volatile, collective social restructuring, and the investment of human work with a respect that confronts the phenomenon of dollar-a-day wage-labourers in the third world, offers many lessons for sociologists concerning alienation and oppression, unification (e.g., today's United Russia party), and the synthesizing of capitalistic and social-democratic systems. Both Russia's noteworthy mistakes and successes provide fruitful sociological insights.

If the trend of unidirectionally importing sociological ideas and data from abroad continues in Russia, without simultaneously exporting their sociology to the rest of the world, then Russia may be stuck with a globalization process that does not enable its voice to be heard by the non-Russian speaking world. I challenge this perspective by focussing on the symbolic capital of Russian sociology and addressing the frontiers of a new sociological imagination (Fuller 2006) in Russia.

BUILDING UP TO GLOBAL SOCIOLOGY IN RUSSIA: A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

At the beginning of the 20th century, prior to the revolutions, Russian sociology was well-established among the leading European traditions

(Kukushkinoi 2004). Russian sociologists participated in dialogue with the mainstream sociological contributors in France, Germany, England, and the United States, henceforth labelled the “Big Four.” Russian thinkers enthusiastically played their role in promoting sociological thought, to the extent that in the 1910s and early 1920s, sociology was included in high school curricula because it was deemed especially relevant to the development of the Russian nation (Brazevich 2006). A Russian Higher School of Social Science was established in Paris (1901–1905) following the 1900 Paris World Fair, led by M.M. Kovalevsky, I.I. Mechnikov, and E.V. de Roberty, with attendees including sociologists N.I. Kareev, Y.S. Gambarova, N.I. Bukharin, and G.V. Plexanov; even V.I. Lenin visited.

Today sociology is resurfacing as Russia moves beyond the legacy of Soviet socialism, Marxist-Leninist-Stalinist thought, and the Communist Party into a new era of managed democratic sociopolitical and academic life. My task here is to show how Russian sociologists have contributed historically to the development of methods, theories, and models that can be shared with sociologists world-wide today. Thus, I will now briefly describe some features of Russia’s sociological history.

The first sociology faculty in Russia opened in 1920, under the directorship of Pitirim A. Sorokin (1889–1968). This followed the opening of a sociobiological institute in 1919. Lectures in sociology were first delivered in the Psycho-Neurological Institute (1908) and in the Faculty of Law (1910) at St. Petersburg State University by such figures as Nikolai I. Kareev (1850–1931) and Maxim M. Kovalevsky (1851–1916). Russian sociology thus, from its inception, shared space with various “other” spheres of knowledge, bringing together thinkers focussed on natural sciences, psychology, politics, and law. Even the renowned Russian philosopher Sergei Bulgakov (1871–1944) applied his ideas to the social realm, as did Nikolai Berdyaev (1874–1948), who wrote about *The Destiny of Mankind* (1931) and *The Fate of Humanity in the Contemporary World* (1934). Scholars such as Nikolai K. Mikhailovsky (1842–1904), Evgeny V. de Roberty (1845–1915), and Lev I. Petrazhitzky (1867–1931), though they are forgotten in today’s global discourses of sociology, added noteworthy contributions in their time.

Pitirim Sorokin is the leading light in the Russian sociological tradition, though he was expelled from his motherland in 1922 on the famous “philosopher’s ship.” Initially stopping in Prague,⁴ he ended up in Minnesota, US (1924) and finally at Harvard University (1930), to lead their new department of sociology. Sorokin’s *Social and Cultural Dynamics*

4. Czechoslovakia offered refuge to Russians exiled by the Soviet authorities, thus Prague was the first destination for Sorokin, as well as the Russian-French sociologist G. Gurvitch, N. Timasheff, and others.

(V. 1–4, 1937–1942) is a monument of empirical social scientific research that crosses boundaries between broad social theorizing, data gathering on a large scale, and integrating the two with a critical and realistic approach to social systems and structure.⁵ Partly due to his later denigration of certain features of American sociology, especially the fetishisms of “quantophrenia” and “testomania,” Sorokin was somewhat marginalized by mainstream US sociologists, who instead followed Parsons,⁶ C.W. Mills, R. Park, and others. Nevertheless, his contribution to understanding Russian and world sociology, social stratification and social mobility, revolution, war and morality, methods of sociological analysis, and in his later life, creative altruism and the psychosocial dimensions of human love, ensure his position among the most significant sociologists of the 20th century.⁷ His division of cultural super-systems into Ideational, Idealistic, and Sensate⁸ is a testament to his contribution to the sociology of knowledge, wherein ideas and the social background that produces them are compared.⁹ As a Russian-American sociologist, Sorokin’s intercultural, macro-oriented ideas still hold appeal beyond the Cold War

-
5. “[A]s yet, the only thorough and consistent effort to integrate all specialized nomothetic cultural sciences into a general theory of culture is that of Sorokin. . . . [H]is basic concept is that of system. Although this concept has been used by specialists. . . yet nobody before him extended it to all categories of cultural phenomena” (Znaniecki 1952:377).
 6. A rivalry developed between Sorokin and Parsons, the latter joining the sociology department under Sorokin at Harvard. “I can convincingly show that, excepting for a multitude of logically poor and empirically useless paradigms and neologisms, there is absolutely nothing new in the sound part of Parsons’ propositions,” wrote Sorokin (1956:15). “They have all been developed more scientifically and formulated more precisely by many previous sociologists, psychologists and philosophers.”
 7. “Pitirim A. Sorokin was a titanic figure in sociology and a prominent public intellectual of the mid-20th century” (Jaworski 1997:278); “Pitirim Sorokin is undoubtedly one of the important figures in the history of sociology” (Peters 1971:338).
 8. “Sorokin’s philosophy of history appeared to be a prophecy of doom for the Western world. Contemporary Europe and America were in the declining phase of “sensate” culture, which was marked primarily by hedonism and a materialistic view of reality. Sorokin protested, however, that he was not pessimistic concerning the future of Western civilization. The next phase was to be a newly invigorated “idealistic” culture combining the best of the “sensate” and those of the subsequent “ideational” culture, which would be defined by its view of reality as nonmaterial and eternal, and in which hedonism would be replaced by spirituality.” (Skotheim 1971:1125)
 9. “We are living and acting at one of the epoch-making turning points of human history, when one fundamental form of culture and society — sensate — is declining and a different form is emerging. . . . It must be clear that the whole mentality of human society — what is regarded as true or false, knowledge or ignorance; the nature of education and the curricula of the schools — all this differs according to the dominant system of truth accepted by a given culture or society.” (Sorokin 1941:22, 85)

situation, in which we are now seeking new means of global social diplomacy and conflict resolution. It may be that the re-entry of Russian sociology onto the stage of legitimate global sociology will bring with it a reinvigoration of research into the work of Sorokin and his inventive civilization discourse.¹⁰

Sorokin's position in the global sociological canon bridges Russian and American sociologies, or Eurasian and western thought more generally. He received his training in the fundamentals of sociological knowledge in Eastern Europe and later embraced the quantitative turn toward empirical research in American sociology. Later in his life he sought a return to his Russian roots via supra-empirical studies, in his works on altruism and creative love. Sorokin's career illuminates both the similarities and differences between Russian and American sociologies, something that can provide a platform for distinguishing a unique Russian approach to sociology.

One way that Russian sociology differs from the Big Four traditions is its reception of Darwinian (and neo-Darwinian) evolutionary ideas. Russian sociology generally accepted the contribution to natural scientific knowledge made by Charles Darwin, something that has become increasingly important as contemporary sociologists engage recent innovations in the biological sciences (Fuller 2006; Turner 1996; Duster and Garrett 1984). At the same time, however, Russian social scientists rejected Thomas Malthus's contribution to Darwin's work and the conflict-oriented approach to political economy that followed from it. Instead, Russian sociologists embraced the idea of "mutual aid," originally coined (1878) by Russian naturalist-zoologist Karl F. Kessler (1815–1881) and then elaborated by historian-geographer Peter A. Kropotkin (1842–1921), whose work became well-known to English speakers, especially as it intertwined with social-anarchist thought. The Russian tradition offers a half-way point between either accepting sociological evolutionism as a law-like generalization describing human social change or as a universal ideology that relies on the excesses of scientism to define our imaginative place in the cosmos. Many Russian thinkers have been more cosmological and mystical than scientific or technological in their thinking, as is clearly evident in the tradition of Russian literature (e.g., Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Gogol, Akhmatova). Thus, "non-Malthusian evolution" suggests that Russian sociology has maintained enough independence of thought and meaning from the Anglo-Saxon acceptance of universal evolutionism to serve as a suitable comparison for other

10. Sorokin was the founding president of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations.

sociological traditions to establish safe and productive distance from the Big Four as well.

It may be, therefore, that ground is currently being prepared for the emergence of a truly professional Russian sociology in the 21st century. This development would facilitate a more comprehensive and coherent contribution to global sociology by Russian sociologists.

PREPARING THE GROUND FOR RUSSIA'S VERSION OF GLOBAL SOCIOLOGY

A true global sociology includes dialogue not only *about* eastern and western, northern and southern societies but also *between* people who live in eastern and western, northern and southern societies. It therefore includes the sociological imaginations and knowledge traditions of scholars and scientists from eastern and western, northern and southern societies travelling to meet one another. The Russian sociological tradition has historically been willing to discuss the distinctiveness of western and non-western sociology, as in the case of Kovalevsky (1913). This raises the question of how a positive contribution to science can be made today that is not merely "non-western."

It was the legacy of Kovalevsky to mentor thinkers such as Sorokin and Konstantin M. Taxtarev (1871–1925), who were ultimately forced to travel west. Taxtarev organized the Russian Sociological Society in the name of M.M. Kovalevsky (1916)¹¹ and was one of the first Russians to recognize the importance of empirical social-statistical research. Pavel F. Lilenfeld (1829–1903) had already travelled extensively through Europe, wrote texts in several European languages, and became President of the International Sociological Institute in 1897. Likewise, Peter L. Lavrov (1823–1900), whom Kareev called "the first Russian sociologist," was exiled for revolutionary activity and fled to Paris. Kovalevsky lived in Europe (Berlin, Paris, and London) for 17 years, then returned to Russia to teach at Moscow State University for ten years before being elected to the first parliament (*Duma*) in 1905. These scholars indicate that early Russian sociologists were not averse to travelling and living abroad in order to gain knowledge that they could then apply to their home nation's local situation. These travels enabled a type of limited "global sociology" in action.

In order to move beyond sociology with a predominantly western (some people read: American) focus, other sociological traditions should be consulted that do not fit into typically western sociological precon-

11. Only in 2006 was the annual Kovalevsky Reading re-established; the Kovalevsky Society in St. Petersburg now is rapidly increasing its membership.

ceptions. This condition is met when scholars from non-western countries engage in dialogue and research with scholars from western countries (one of the missions of the International Sociological Association — ISA), each travelling to the others' home locales to analyze through immersion and invite the "outsider" perspectives of visitors into one's home country. In this way, common ground can be found for interaction between eastern and western, northern and southern traditions.

From a hemispherical perspective, diversifying sociology's research domain seems justified. In practice, however, the variety of sociologies on the world stage makes creating a single, unified, global sociology rather daunting, especially given the expansive, hegemonic position of professional American sociology (Burawoy 2005b). The notion that a person must live in, or at least travel through, a variety of sociocultural settings to gain global knowledge about humanity makes analyzing distinct societies from a global perspective uniquely intimidating. Does it take a globally minded person or even a "global citizen"¹² to engage in topics suitable for global sociology? Can an individual sociologist hope to contribute to globalizing sociology without first defining his or her views of the national sociology or sociologies in which education and training first took place? Reflecting on questions raised by Canada's role in global civil society has been central to my ongoing efforts to understand and compare Russian sociological knowledge gained from immersion in the national tradition of Russian sociology.¹³

If all humanity is considered as a single type of "society," then this society inevitably assumes global proportions as human beings are spread throughout the earthly globe. This approach runs the risk, however, of devaluing international discourse and the importance of respective nation-states in the discourse of globalization. Taking an objective, natural scientific view of global society instead of a subjective, human social scientific view also denies the hermeneutic approach provided by critically reflexive sociology. Human beings simply cannot "get outside" of themselves (i.e., ourselves) to see "what it means to be human" from

12. For example, a person with multiple passports.

13. A sociology graduate of the University of British Columbia, I first came to Russia in 2000 to study the Russian language and learn about Russian culture, returning in 2004 to pursue a doctoral degree. As a dissertation project, I selected the sociology of science, since it was Robert K. Merton, a student of P. Sorokin, who began the sub-discipline in the United States. The return of the sociology of science in the post-Soviet period is markedly different than the "science of science" (*naukovedeniye*) that left Russia with the dissidents/exiles in the 1910s and 1920s. A comparative dissertation on Russian and Canadian sociologies of science is on track for completion in 2009, funded by a scholarship from the Canadian Bureau of International Education and the Russian Ministry of Education and Science.

a non-human perspective.¹⁴ Moving toward the concept of “global humanity,” on the other hand, at least returns all citizens to the centre of concern, including those who feel devalued, de-centred, or dislocated by sociological discourse in predominantly “developed” nations that pushes their views to the periphery or somehow “others” it.¹⁵

A nation-state and its accompanying civil society can be seen as “globalizing” from the inside, but at the same time as “non-globalizing” — not exporting its talents, theories, perspectives, goods and services, products, etc. to the rest of the world. This phenomenon can be expressed as one-way traffic where globalization and localization are intertwined, but not balanced. Russia is a case where much more sociological knowledge has been coming into the country from abroad (i.e., translations from English, French, German, etc. into Russian) than has been going out onto the world stage (i.e., translations from Russian into other languages).¹⁶ We can therefore say that a “closed society” (Popper 1944) is one that is more “globalized” on the inside than on the outside, without referring to Russia as either more or less “closed” than other non-western nations. A country is likewise an “open” society when it shares its knowledge stocks with the outside world. Russia is certainly much more open than it was in the Soviet period, but it still needs to promote its sociology abroad if it truly wants to globalize.

Societies that are plugged in to the Internet, for example, to say nothing about computer technology in general, contribute to the discourse of globalizing sociology and are automatically part of a global society as they become connected to the world-wide web. If some Internet sites

14. This is the argument made by Steve Fuller in his *The New Sociological Imagination*, noting that human beings are at the centre of social science (i.e., the anthropic worldview) and cannot be dislocated (i.e., as evolutionary psychologists and sociobiologists with a karmic worldview might like) without dire consequences for understanding our human place on Earth and in the cosmos.

15. “If the work of the city is the remaking or translating of man [sic] into a more suitable form than his nomadic ancestors achieved, then might not our current translation of our entire lives into the spiritual form of information seem to make of the entire globe, and of the human family, a single consciousness?” Marshall McLuhan (1964:67)

16. Sociology is a multilanguage discipline and must continue to highlight the contributions manifested by various language traditions. More Russian people per capita, for example, know English than English-speaking people know Russian. This situation should not hinder dialogue between sociologists; it should rather lead to ways that open up bidirectional discourse. The translation factor and time gap between writing and publication are crucial for access to and reception of sociological ideas by sociologists in diverse traditions. Translation is thus critical for the timing and distribution of sociological knowledge. Globalizing sociology would happen more quickly if sociological texts could spread in literatures, like Russia’s, that are often underexplored in global sociology. English should not be the authoritative language of globalizing sociology.

are regulated and prohibited by certain national service providers, then powerful government instruments of their nation-state are at least partially controlling their partners in globalization, censoring what comes into and goes out of computers within their territory. The issue of “access” thus has an impact on the extent of the electronic age’s globalizing capacities.¹⁷ Russian is, as an aside, currently the eleventh most common language used on the Internet (2007).¹⁸

The topic of trusting dialogue partners and listening to the languages of others is crucially important for global sociological discourse. For example, some western sociologists viewed the Soviet Union, and other countries in the eastern “socialist block,” with suspicion because their societal standards and forms of self-understanding differed from those of western nation-states. It seems possible now to move beyond prejudging societies as either inferior or superior based on concepts that are formulated within one tradition at the cost of others. Such a strategy, however, poses many challenges to our common and uncommon understandings of “citizenship,” “identity” and even the right to “self-expression” in scenes of pluralistic social communication. “What is at stake,” notes Martin Shaw (1999) regarding the globalization of social sciences, “is no less than a reconstitution of the central concepts of social science in global terms.”

To encourage a global division of sociological labour that involves “professional,” “policy,” “critical,” and “public” categories (Burawoy 2005a), sociologists must identify the unique contributions of various sociological traditions given their historical strengths and weakness, their particularities and peculiarities. Societies at different stages, phases, or cycles of social, cultural, political, and economic development on a global scale, require different levels of focus on labour, education, science, family, etc. This requirement should be expressed forthrightly when emphasis is placed on globalizing sociology so that the uniqueness of diverse traditions can provide space for contributions that reflect their own societal conditions. The situated logic of new 21st century sociological imagining is crucially important in bringing together voices from societies whose vision of academic and intellectual thought varies from those commonly presented in Big Four sociological literature.

17. “Electric speed requires organic structuring of the global economy quite as much as early mechanization by print and by road led to the acceptance of national unity” Marshall McLuhan (1964:306).

18. Global Promo: 1) English, 2) Chinese, 3) Japanese, 4) Spanish, 5) German, 6) French, 7) Korean, 8) Portuguese, 9) Italian, 10) Russian (the site notes that Arabic has actually passed Russian for 10th position in the past year (<http://www.globalpromo.ru/info>)).

The position of Russian sociology today emphasizes the need for dialogue on the importance of professional sociology to the total disciplinary field. Can public, critical, or policy sociologies flourish without a strong professional base? Does Russian sociology indeed already have a strong professional base through its historical relationships with American, British, French, and German sociologies? Is it possible that Russian sociology even has lessons to teach the Big Four about professional sociology, in light of what it learned during the Soviet period, for example, in bringing theory and practice together? These questions suggest that a basis for discussion with Russian sociology is possible as long as the country's tradition is respected and dignified, if not valued in all cases. In order to help facilitate such a two-way dialogue, we will now look to the current state of Russian sociology as a fragmented field that seeks to mobilize its integrative capacities.

RUSSIA'S FRAGMENTED AND INTEGRATIVE SOCIOLOGIES: THE CHALLENGE OF UNIFICATION

Any attempt at globalizing sociology in Russia will not be based only on the geographical territory of the Russian Federation, but also will cross new borders and boundaries. The notion of integrating sociology amongst globally minded persons includes showing the interconnections between sociology and other disciplines within the contemporary academy. One cannot expect sociology to globalize in the broadest geographical terms if it cannot convince local academics of sociology's integrative capacity as a contemporary social-humanitarian field. Sociology's globalization should therefore coincide with promoting interdisciplinarity in the local academy, reinvigorating sociology's place and position therein.

One of the greatest problems in the field of Russian sociology today is that the discipline is fragmented, with no single school of thought that defines or unifies the field. Since the fall of the Soviet Union and the monopoly of power held by the Communist Party's membership, no longer is it necessary to adhere to Marxist-Leninism as the main theory of social science. In its place, however, world-systems theory, neopositivism, ethnomethodology, symbolic interactionism, structural functionalism, conflict theory, eclecticism, rational-choice theory, feminism, behaviourism and sociobiology are all given space for discussion. The theories of Weber, Durkheim, Simmel, Goffman, Elias, Foucault, Gouldner, Bourdieu, Wallerstein, Sztompka, Castells, Giddens, et al. are entertained despite the contradictions among these diverse theoretical approaches. Without a unifying paradigm, Russian sociology faces the

prospect of further disintegration from its earlier Marxist-Leninist consensus. The sort of uniquely Russian sociology that may be formed in place of the old orthodoxy and new eclecticism is a central dilemma.

Sorokin's integralist¹⁹ goal of synthesizing social science involves collaborations between various disciplines, from psychology and anthropology to history, political economy, and culture studies. As one of his most significant contributions to the field, Sorokin spoke about cultural super-systems that indicated a civilization's position on the global stage. Sorokin felt that modern western culture had reached a peak and that sensate culture was now in the decline. We are currently, he thought, looking forward to an integration of sensate with ideational culture, which will result in a (perhaps lengthy) period of idealistic culture. As Richard Simpson (1953:128) writes,

Sorokin prefers the Idealistic mentality to either of the two polar types, since he finds in it a balance of their best elements and an absence of their excesses and blind spots. In the Idealistic culture mentality we have a healthy cultivation of the whole man; neither his [sic] animal needs nor his capabilities for spiritual striving are neglected.

The integration of sensate and ideational culture will result in a synthesis of cultural super-systems that balances what was excessive in the sensate culture, which in sociology leaned toward empirical, quantitative, materialistic, and mechanistic explanations of society. Thus, all of the professional sociology from the 19th and 20th centuries focusing on sensate variables, according to Sorokin, would have to give way to sociologies that acknowledge the idealistic reality of human social life in the 21st century. This would result in a realistic integration of views that could lead to new syntheses of thought, word, and action.

19. "For a creative renaissance of our disciplines these invalid [Sensate] assumptions must be replaced by what can be called the integralist conception of reality, knowledge, and ways of cognition. The integralist conception views psychosocial reality as a complex manifold in which we can distinguish at least three different aspects: sensory, rational, and supersensory-superrational. The sensory aspect is present in all psychosocial phenomena that can be perceived through our sense organs. The rational aspect is present in all the rational phenomena of the psychosocial universe: in logically and mathematically consistent systems of science, philosophy, religion, ethics, fine arts, up to the rationally motivated and executed activities of an individual or group. The supersensory-superrational aspect of psychosocial reality is manifested by the highest creative activities and created masterpieces of genius in all fields of cultural activity: by the great creative achievement of a genius-scientist, philosopher, founder of religion, great law-giver, great apostle of unselfish love, genius-writer, poet, painter, sculptor, composer, architect, and so one . . . the integralist conception of its knowledge consists of an adequate knowledge not only of the sensory aspect of reality, but also of its rational and supersensory-superrational aspects" P. Sorokin ([1950] 1963:316).

With the advent of philosophy of science and sociology of science (cf. *naukovedeniye* or science studies), sociological perspectives can now be applied to virtually all disciplines in the academy. Thus, to promote an integrative approach to global schools of sociology, a new sociological study of the disciplines that constitute the “unity in diversity” of the contemporary university is needed. This is not a short order. It suggests that revisiting the problem or necessity of “hierarchy” plays a significant role in sociology’s self-understanding and self-contextualizing. It also hints that the appeal of integrative sociological viewpoints will allow and even promote dialogue among academic disciplines and fields of research that are often divided by narrow specialization.

Given the diversity of theoretical and methodological approaches that sociologists can take, it is important to define what is particularly “sociological” about the mission to globalize sociology. Many questions remain: Is it the proper function of sociology to actively promote a more global civil society? Should sociologists act as a type of societal journalist, commenting and reporting on the “realities” of globalization for societies, polities, economies, cultures, technologies, sciences, religions, etc.? What inclusions or exclusions can exist between globalizing societies, cultures, ethnicities, and the long-fought-for sovereignty of nation-states? Even more problematic: might global sociology potentially turn into a lost cause, for example, if at some point global civil society or global humanity places too much pressure on nation-state sovereignties, leading to a capitulation of nation-states and loss of world order? Without turning sociology into a politics-heavy field, sociologists are called to reveal what is social about society and likewise, what is distinctly human about humanity (Fuller 2006).

The ideological and historical links between western sociology and the (neoliberal) democratic tradition virtually guarantee that sociology can be used as a political instrument or in shaping global politics. The downside is that it can potentially be used against individual civil society detractors who are dissuaded by the “science” of sociology; on the positive side, sociology can be employed as it was originally envisioned — for the improvement of social systems, structures, and institutions. As a significant contributor to social scientific knowledge with empirical rigour, sociology is poised to reassert its place today as a relevant tool for both public and private usage. Russian sociology, for example, supplies a special view on the continuing crisis of the Korean Peninsula, whereby one can inquire whether or not a totalitarian political regime has any merit or legitimacy in today’s united-global-political landscape. The divergent understanding between Korean peoples of the North and South can be studied and potentially resolved only through participation

by the forces that took part in separating them in the late 1940s and early 1950s: the United States (i.e., Washington) and Russia (i.e., Moscow, the heart of the former Soviet Union). The sort of global-political dialogue that can result from globalizing sociology is encouraging for its potential public benefit, only if it is built on responsible professional sociological knowledge.

This is not to say that Russian sociology does not face serious challenges. Russian society is burdened by prejudices and discriminations based on race, gender inequalities, and various social problems, such as alcoholism and the spread of HIV and AIDS. Likewise, a tendency toward theoretical social philosophy and even theological sociology (e.g., V.I. Dobryenkov)²⁰ are common features of the diverse landscape of the Russian sociological tradition. But the possibilities enabled by first noticing and then investigating the uniqueness of Russian sociology far outweigh the costs of leaving it out of globalizing sociology.

From a balanced ideological viewpoint, sociology cannot legitimately claim possession of either the left or the right side of the political spectrum. Its flexibility to investigate actual changes and historical developments in human-social existence suggests that it has a larger role to play in public life than professional isolation or mere academic theory with no connection to public-social realities. The future of sociology in Russia, amidst an academic climate that favours studies in management, international relations, psychology, journalism, and business administration will reveal the importance of balance between theory, methodology, empirical research, and policymaking. The return to popularity, and perhaps respectability, of a discipline once shunned in Russia will send a signal to sociological traditions elsewhere around the world that have been oppressed, marginalized, or even exiled; dignity may be found in pursuing legitimate scholarly work that, in the end, assists people in understanding themselves and their relations to the societies in which they live. This possibility, however, may be more idealistic than achievable in a nation-state with a strong political authority and an intense commitment to market principles (Burawoy 2007, personal interview).

The strong government authority in Russia and the weak autonomy of the academy have led to the alternative visions of two groups²¹ of sociologists in Russia, the so-called Chekist trend (Gorshkov 2005)

20. V.I. Dobrenkov is the current Dean of the Faculty of Sociology at Moscow State University, advocate of an orthodox Christian sociology in line with the Kremlin's domestic and external policies in light of the Russian Orthodox Church's social perspectives. He is also the main target of attack for student protesters at Moscow State University's sociology faculty.

21. Thanks to Elena Zdravomyslova for pointing out these two groups.

and the reformists. The first group insists that sociology should play an active role in setting an agenda for state policies, that is, in creating a national idea or purpose around which Russian citizens can gravitate. In this model, public sociologists function as state ideologists, echoing the Soviet era in which social surveys were bent toward reifying the party line. The second group is reformist, critical of statism, supportive of democratic principles and intent on improving the level of professional sociology along with increased intellectual autonomy from the political apparatus. The latter group identifies actual social problems and looks for solutions to balance Russian society and lessen tension between competing power interests. One way, then, to visualize the break between the two camps is that of defeatists on one hand and naïve optimists on the other. Between these poles we can conceive of space where empirical numerical data can be collected by autonomous sociological institutes that will provide value aside from the instrumental use of politicking. They may also provide Russian civil society and individuals with valuable local and reflexive knowledge about itself/themselves. By strengthening professional sociology in Russia, greater room for reflexivity may be created, something which is desperately needed in these early years of post-Soviet Russian sociology.

Sociology should not be limited to the public interest polls and marketing research which the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion, headed by Yuri Levada in Moscow, was designed to produce. This is the sociological approach that Sorokin criticized using the concept of “quantophrenia.” Sociology, in addition to collecting data about citizens, should also provide its national society with a means of gaining knowledge and understanding about itself (Zdravomyslova, 2007). Reflexive social-humanitarian knowledge that does not sacrifice professionalism should thus be a goal in the field, one that will create a style of sociological self-understanding that enables Russian students of sociology to better understand their place in society, without necessarily leading them into a professional scientific-academic career.²² Integrative knowledge for sociology that combines public understanding with private experiences may hold great appeal to Russia’s youth, a generation waiting to choose between expressing their voices and exiting to better conditions elsewhere.

22. This connects with the idea that sociology should be done not just for sociologists, but also for other people who are interested in looking at the world with “human society” as a crucial concept for self-understanding.

CONCLUSION: GLOBALIZING SOCIOLOGY IN RUSSIA

A 21st century Russian contribution to globalizing sociology consists in promoting an integration of viewpoints among various sociological traditions with its own. By enabling dialogue between powerful peoples and powerless peoples via the lesson of Russia's rapid ascent to and slower descent from global-political power, the Russian Federation's 20th century experience is most instructive when viewed with a sociological imagination. The result will be a sociology that does not depend upon conformity to the Big Four traditions. Instead, Russian sociology can bring into communicative contact viewpoints from various nations, cultures, and localities with widely differing perspectives. In this way, a cooperative, mutual-aid style of pluralistically minded sociology can be fashioned, rather than a competition-based sociology founded on unilateral Americo- or Eurocentrism.

The tradition of Russian sociology makes it different from the Big Four's sociological canon, although it has depended heavily on, and interacted deeply and widely with, that canon. Russian sociology must therefore draw upon its own uniqueness, such as V.A. Yadov's (2006) notions of sociology as a "poly-paradigm science"²³ and sociological metaparadigms, which represent flexible styles of thinking across the Big Four's borders and boundaries. Even with the late emergence of Russian sociology as an academic discipline, what nation-state, given its geopolitical position and the historical experiment of Soviet socialism, is in a better situation to promote globalizing sociology today than Russia?

Globalizing sociology suggests the need to "step outside the box" of national sociological knowledge into a model of global civil society. This will empower non-western countries to display the respective treasures of their national sociological traditions, as greater or lesser but nevertheless still significant contributions to global discourse.²⁴ In this

23. Similar to G. Ritzer's view of sociology as a "multi-discipline paradigm," yet both more limited and more expansive given the particular roots of Russian sociology in psychology, law, neurology, philosophy, and theology, rather than in economics, political science, journalism, and statistics in the American case, as well as the lesser interdisciplinarity of contemporary Russian academia and lesser social diversity compared to North America and western Europe.

24. "I consider the vast region of the Pacific as the territorial center and the Americas, India, China, Japan, and Russia as the leading players in the coming drama of the emerging Integral or Ideational culture. If Europe is united it will have a leading role, but in no way as important a role as it has had in the last five centuries. If Europe is not unified, it will simply become one of the 'provincial' theatres where nothing of great importance in the cosmic drama will be presented" (Sorokin [1950] 1963:298)

way the domination of the western sociological intelligentsia will face the practical everyday needs of global citizens, including the inequalities and barriers to free movement and creative human potentiality. We can then ask: Is sociological knowledge in the west comparable with, connected to, or somehow simply incompatible with, the social realities of life outside the western world? Does the promotion of an American model of the democratic ideal have any chance to succeed in nation-states that possess historical, cultural, and even religious traditions that in one way or another inherently contradict it? Answering these questions will give us clues to understand the contemporary prospects of globalizing sociology.

What might a Canadian view of Russian sociology look like? The first Canadian Chair of Sociology was established at McGill University in 1922, with the appointment of C. Dawson, just two years after Russia's first Faculty of Sociology at St. Petersburg State University in 1920, under Sorokin. Since this time, the sociological pathways in Canada and Russia have differed significantly. In Russia, a practical program of authoritarian-socialism was enforced that tested the theoretical limits of sociology; in Canada a democratic-capitalism persisted wherein sociology leaned heavily on American professionalization and disciplinary traditions. These past differences aside, however, one may note today a fascinating similarity between the identity crisis in Canadian sociology (J.P. Warren 2006; McLaughlin 2006; 2005; J. Johnston 2005; B. Curtis and L. Weir 2005, 2002; M. White 2005; R. Brym 2003) and Russia's fragmented sociological identity. Both traditions are in the process of defining what distinguishes their contribution to knowledge from other traditions, e.g., the Big Four, which have heavily influenced their past and present. In today's globalizing social world, however, it makes sense to define a home-grown professional sociology that showcases its own uniqueness through the experiences of one particular national tradition, while remaining open to international dialogue and influence.

Russian sociologists today still suffer from low professional prestige in the domestic academy, so that the temptation to become state ideologists as clients serving their employers is a significant risk (Zdravomyslova 2007). While some sociologists (e.g., M. Gorshkov, director of the Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences) embrace Burawoy's notion of "public sociology" as a "mirror in which society looks everyday before going to work" (Zdravomyslova 2007), others are more reluctant to accept such an icon-making vision in the face of a thin public. For a civil society that is weak and underdeveloped, the prospects for building a strong professional sociology are much more difficult and important than the possibilities of producing a type of public sociology

that verges on social activism. Professional sociological leadership is first needed in Russia that will challenge the status quo of neo-Soviet sociologism.

The issue of institutionalizing sociology within the context of a fragile higher educational system with little institutional autonomy has been reflected most strikingly in Russia with the recent “student revolt” at Moscow State University. A movement of sociology students at the largest university in Russia has focussed on improving the quality of teaching and independence of sociological thought. They have spoken out against ultranationalist ideology and asked for an improvement in the standards of working and studying conditions. A petition signed in the spring of 2007 was endorsed by numerous members of the international sociological community.²⁵ These actions led to an investigation by an independent commission organized by Russia’s Public Chamber, in which 13 sociologists participated. The results of this investigation supported the students’ commitment to responsible citizenship and applauded their dedication to improved educational standards and the professionalization of sociology in Russia.

The notion of “Orthodox Christian Sociology” is also present in the Moscow revolt, which draws the international community’s attention to the importance not only of religious influences on private life, but also the language that is chosen for public engagement. If we obscure or downplay the relevance of spiritual issues under the weight of material facts, and thus undermine reflexive knowledge in the pursuit of instrumental knowledge, then a clash of civilizations is more probable through a lack of communicative coherency and holism. There is undeniably a Marxist-Leninist legacy in Russia today. But it is one that simply cannot outweigh the trend toward spirituality within the Russian nation as it exists in an officially postatheist political climate. With a multiconfessional Constitutional mandate, the diversity of ethnicities and cultural traditions in the vast territory of the Russian Federation serve as a microcosm for interconfessional dialogue, one that sees global sociology well-placed communicatively on centre stage.

A public defence of professional sociology seems necessary in Russia today. This would raise sociology’s academic profile, with its unique and significant contribution for the social-humanitarian sciences. Such a move could also provide Russian citizens with a tool that promotes reflexive knowledge, allowing them to situate and distinguish the rotten ideology of the past from the noteworthy scientific research that was conducted in the Soviet Union free from ideological controls or consequences. In this sense, diversification of Russian sociologies further

25. See supportive letters and more information at: www.od-group.org

away from the monolithic-dogmatic Marxist-Leninism of Russia's past is an encouraging development in the contemporary sociological landscape.

In promoting a reflexive, integrative sociology that draws upon both natural sciences and the humanities, Russian sociology today offers contributions toward synthesizing eastern and western, if not northern and southern views. Experiences of the past 15 years in Russia's transition to democracy and what they suggest for civil society supply knowledge that few, if any, other societies on Earth have. Although professional sociology is fragmented and academic autonomy is weak in Russia, the place for a new form of public sociology can potentially be discovered and expressed, if not in neutral terms, then in terms that are tolerant and inclusive of the diverse voices present in Russian civil society.

Globalizing sociology thus cannot consist of (re-)turning sociology into a single language discipline. Sociology should realize its connection as much with philology, anthropology, psychology and communication studies as it does with genetics or biology (Fuller 2006) if it is serious in its bid to reach out to people from various cultures and societies with respective contributions to global-social understanding. These contributions need not cater to an oppressive or reductionist western stereotype, for example, one that says sociology is simply biology's handmaiden. The transformative potential of sociology is a sovereign power of its own, to be respected as such. The Russian contribution to sociology echoes this message for the world, with both sides now seemingly ready to speak and listen.

REFERENCES

- Berdyaev, Nikolai (1931 [1937]). *The Destiny of Man*, Trans. by N. Duddington, London: G. Bles; New York: Scribner's.
- Berdyaev, Nikolai (1934 [1935, 1938]). *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*. Trans. by Donald A. Lowrie, 2nd ed. Milwaukee, WI: C. Morehouse; London: S.C.M. Press.
- Brazevich, S.S. 2006. Foundational stages and directions of the development of sociology in Russia. St. Petersburg State University (Russian).
- Brym, Robert. 2003. The decline of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 28(3):411–416.
- Bukharin, N.I. 1925. *Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology*. New York: International Publishers.
- Burawoy, Michael. 2005a. The critical turn to public sociology. *Critical Sociology* 31(3):313–326.

- 2005b. For public sociology. *American Sociological Review* 70(February):4–28.
- Cohen, Robin and Paul Kennedy. 2000. *Global Sociology*. London: Macmillan.
- Curtis, Bruce and Lorna Weir. 2002. The succession question in English Canadian sociology. *Society/Société* 26:3.
- 2005. Crisis talk: Comments on McLaughlin's "Canada's impossible science." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30(4):503–511.
- Danilov, A.N. 1998. Globalism, regionalism and the contemporary transformation process. *Sociological Research, Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Sociology* 9, Moscow (Russian).
- Duster, Troy and Karen Garrett, eds. 1984. *Cultural Perspectives on Biological Knowledge*. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Fedotova, V.G. 2000. How is sociology possible in Russia and other non-western countries?" *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology* 3, St. Petersburg (Russian).
- Fuller, Steve. 2006. *The New Sociological Imagination*. London: Sage.
- Gingras, Yves and Jean-Philippe Warren. 2006. A British connexion? A quantitative analysis of the changing relations between American, British and Canadian sociologists. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 31(4):509–522.
- Gorshkov, M.K. 2005. Stenographed discussion at the seminar "Inequality in Civic and Political Perspectives." Moscow: The Mikhail Gorbachev Foundation, 26-10-05. http://www.gorby.ru/rubrs.asp?rubr_id=560&art_id=24809
- Gudkov, L. 2006. On the situation in social sciences in Russia. *Independent Philosophical Journal* 77 (Russian) <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2006/77/gu23.html>.
- Held, David, ed. 2000. *A Globalizing World? Culture, Politics, Economics*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Jaworski Gary. 1997. *The American Journal of Sociology* 103(1):
- Johnston, Barry. 2003. Toward an integral social science: A history of science approach. *Catholic Social Science Review*.
- (1998). *Pitirim A. Sorokin: On the Practice of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Heritage of Sociology Series.
- (1996). *Pitirim A. Sorokin: An Intellectual Biography*. University Press of Kansas.
- (1990). Integralism and the reconstruction of society: The idea of ultimate reality and meaning in the work of Pitirim A. Sorokin. *Ultimate Reality and Meaning* 13(2):96–108.
- Johnston, Josée. 2005. The "second shift" of Canadian sociology: Setting sociological standards in a global era. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30(4):513–527.

- Kovalevsky, Maxim M. 1913. Sociology in the West and in Russia. *New Ideas in Sociology*. St. Petersburg; *The Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology* 4(3).
- Kukushkinoi, Y.I. 2004. *The Development of Sociology in Russia*. Moscow: Higher School (Russian).
- McLaughlin, Neil. 2006. Whither the future of Canadian sociology? Thoughts on moving forward. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 31(1).
- McLaughlin, Neil. 2005. Canada's impossible science: Historical and institutional origins of the coming crisis in anglo-Canadian Sociology. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 30(1):1-40.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Toronto: Signet.
- Peters, Michael J. 1971. Review of *Values in Human Society: The Contributions of Pitirim A. Sorokin to Sociology* by F.R. Cowell. *The British Journal of Sociology* 22(3):338.
- Popper, Karl. 1945. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. London: Routledge.
- Shaw, Martin. 1999. The global revolution and the twenty-first century: From international relations to global politics. Pp. x-x in Steven Chan and Jarrod Wiener, eds., *International History and the Twentieth Century*. London: IB Taurus.
- Simpson, Richard L. 1953. Pitirim Sorokin and his sociology. *Social Forces* 32(2):120-131.
- Skotheim, Robert Allen. 1971. Review of *Values in Human Society: The Contributions of Pitirim A. Sorokin to Sociology* by F.R. Cowell. *The American Historical Review* 76(4): 1125.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1965. Sociology of today, yesterday and tomorrow. ASA Presidential Speech, *American Sociological Review* 30(6):833-843.
- 1956. *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology*. Chicago: Henry Regenry.
- [1950] 1963. *Modern Historical and Social Philosophies*. New York: Dover.
- 1941. *The Crisis of our Age*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- (1937-42). *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Vols. 1-4. New York: American Book Company.
- 1931. Sociology as a science. *Social Forces* 10(1):21-27.
- 1927. Russian sociology in the twentieth century. *American Journal of Sociology* 31:57-69.
- Timasheff, Nikolai. 1955. *Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth*. New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Turner, John H. 1996. The evolution of emotions in humans: A Darwinian-Durkheimian analysis. *Journal For the Theory of Social Behaviour* 26(1):1-33

- Van der Zweerde, Evert. 2003. Soviet philosophy revisited – Why Joseph Bochen-ski was right while being wrong. *Studies in East European Thought* 55: 315–342.
- White, Melanie. 2005. On the recent apocalyptic tone adopted in Canadian soci-ology. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 30(4):537–544.
- Yadov, V. 2006. *Contemporary Theoretical Sociology as a Conceptual Research Base for Russia's Transformation*. St. Petersburg: Intersocis.
- Zdravomyslova, Elena. 2007. 'Make way for professional sociology!' or public sociology in the Russian context. (Unpublished).
- Znaniecki, F. 1952. *Cultural Sciences*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Zolotov Jr., Andrei. 2002. Shipping away a generation of intellectuals. *St. Peters-burg Times*, Aug. 27 (www.sptimes.ru).

Gregory Sandstrom is currently a PhD candidate in sociology at St. Petersburg State University, Russia, having completed an MA at the Vrije Universiteit in the Netherlands and a BA at the University of British Columbia and Wilfred Laurier University. His dissertation on the sociology of science, a comparison of Russian and Canadian social-humanitarian thought, will be finished in early 2009. He has published "Development of the concept of evolution in Russia and Canada," in *Sociological Epistemology and Methodology in the 21st Century*, St. Petersburg: Asterion, 2006 (in Russian), and "The calling to modernize Russian higher edu-cation: A Weberian re-Enchantment?" in *Max Weber, Problems of Rationality and Russia*, Helsinki: Kikimora Publications, forthcoming 2008.

