

EMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN

Dominykas Vasiliauskas

Researcher

Vilnius

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6865808>

Published Date: 20-July-2022

1. INTRODUCTION

In the beginning, intellectuals were known as philosophers, who meditated and reflected on nature and based on this, human beings received as a certain inheritance the social science that was defined as the search for truths.

The vision of science was based on a Newtonian model, thus giving a vision defined as theological since it is based on truths and statements that were impossible to test. In addition to being built on the assumption that there is a fundamental distinction between humans and nature.

"At first those who tried to establish the legitimacy and priority of the scientific search for the laws of nature did not make a major distinction between science and philosophy." This was because for them these two served to search for a truth but as the experimental began to take on importance for the vision of science, philosophy was similar to theology since they did not verify their theories and this begins to make a difference. .

Based on all this, knowledge was classified into categories, but even in the eighteenth century, these did not have specific definitions and everything was unfinished, but the discipline structure of the social sciences was formally recognized in the main universities.

And it is in this nineteenth century that philosophy and science are separated, acquiring a hierarchical flavor.

All these movements were "in search of promoting "objective" knowledge of "reality" based on empirical discoveries (the opposite of "speculation"). They tried to "learn" the truth, not invent it or intuit it".

2. INTERNATIONALIZATION

And as mentioned above, in the 19th century, the institutionalization that took place mainly in Great Britain, France, the Germanys, the Italys and the United States was achieved. And these places were the ones involved in their entirety because the universities and scholars who had the international prestige and the numerical weight to concentrate on these sites; An example of this is that if we look at the works of the 19th century, we can safely say that it would be from one of these sites.

But after hard work "the institutional structures of the social sciences seemed to be fully installed and clearly delineated for the first time after the 2nd World War, the practices of social scientists will begin to change".

However, when questioning ourselves about what is the current state of the Social Sciences according to Emmanuel Wallerstein? We can take up what he tells us with great determination: "We are not at a time when the existing disciplinary structure has collapsed. We are at a time when it has been questioned and rival structures are trying to emerge.

For example, the way in which the structures came to be was through the search for a universalism, not a particularism, that is, something that governed everything as an absolute law, but it is not possible for the institutionalized structure in the 19th century to remain in perpetuity. , since everything has changed since the evolution of thought and social rules.

And that is why today they try to open the horizons and leave the Social Sciences in a constant debate, however, thanks to the fact that their foundations were constituted by years of study and assessment to form their structure effectively, that it is difficult to seek to change something well founded and to do so there must be equally strong bases.

Although it does not always focus on its science, but rather, they get involved at convenience, that is: "In respect of the Social Sciences they do not differ from the physical and biological ones", and sometimes for the sciences in their need to discover initial conditions, they inquire into last.

"To this extent, then, the historical explanation is part of all scientific explanation and the previous separation that we made between them was due to reasons of convenience, not incompatibility."

And perhaps because of this, it seeks to open the Social Sciences, but what does Wallerstein mean by the term "open the social sciences"? He refers to the direct confrontation of the question of the existence of these separate kingdoms, with what is they would completely reopen which would lead to new formulations taking root and thereby clarifying the intellectual bases for the restructuring of the disciplines.

"But this task of restructuring the Social Sciences must be the result of the interaction of scholars from all climates and from all perspectives, and that this global interaction be real and not mere formal courtesy that conceals the imposition of the opinions of a segment of the world's scientists.

Since the main interest is to encourage collective discussion to obtain more valid knowledge. As long as its importance is given to the sciences.

It must be remembered that in any social circumstance there are a limited number of ways to deal with a clash of values. One is geographic segregation... Another more active way is to get out... A third way of facing individual or cultural difference is through dialogue. Here in principle, a clash of values can work with itself positively - it can be a means of increasing communication and self-understanding... Finally, a clash of values can be resolved through the use of force or violence... In today's globalizing society that we live today, two of those four options have suffered a drastic reduction "although it depends on us which option to take."

Human beings are always in search of answers and truths, which tells us that they are always immersed in great questions that lead them to debate to find the most consistent answer, and with respect to the subject matter, it is not the exception for what are the main issues? of debate in the Social Sciences?. Despite having an infinity of issues to deal with, "Much of the debate on the political position of the Social Sciences has been developed in recent years, on the subject of whether they have or can have a paradigm."

3. OBJECTIVITY

Another topic of great importance is the question of objectivity, since it has always been central in the methodological debates of the Social Sciences since its inception. And it is that this topic is a bit complicated since the tendencies of the researcher when compiling and interpreting data. It was thought that it distorted the information and no longer had the same validity, which is why they questioned how it can be objective?

The tension between the universal and the particular in the Social Sciences is also an object of debate, since it is seen as having immediate political implications. Within this topic, many have questioned universalist principles in particular cases and has led to a great variety of particularisms, although what is sought is a process to reach a more renewed pluralistic universalism.

But without further redounding in all of the above, what are the scope and risks of Wallerstein's position? The fact that knowledge is a social construction also means that we can obtain more valid knowledge. Leading to build structures that are pluralistic and universal.

I think that this would be more than anything the scope that would be obtained, since when making a construction of the Social Sciences, except that it fulfills the main function of the disciplines, which is as its name says: to discipline the mind and channel the energy of scholars.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Although about the risks is what you can lose because you still can not ensure that the new infrastructures by resulting in coherent alternative pools of knowledge, because some of the old paradigms will never work or will collapse.

In addition to the current disciplinary divisions being debated, there is the problem of resources and what "we can expect is that working social scientists will take a candid look at current structures and try to align their revised intellectual perceptions of a division of useful work with the organizational framework that they necessarily build. If active social scientists do not do it, surely the administrators of knowledge institutions will do it for them".

But there would always be risks, although it should not be forgotten that everything is in search of improvement and therefore it is important that the problems that exist are clearly discussed in an open and intelligent manner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] ABNIKI, H. (2019). The Ratio of Globalization and Justice in the Political Thought of Anthony Giddens and Emmanuel Wallerstein.
- [2] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Aristide Briand: Cooperation as the Motor of Europe. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 65-74). Springer, Cham.
- [3] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Immanuel Kant: The Idea of Progress and European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 29-38). Springer, Cham.
- [4] Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Winston Churchill: Cooperation and British Support to the European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 175-194). Springer, Cham.
- [5] Valente, C., D'alessandro, C., & Ramiro Troitiño, D. (2022). Altiero Spinelli: Federalism in the European Integration. In *The European Union and its Political Leaders* (pp. 141-158). Springer, Cham.
- [6] Wallerstein, E. (1960). La recherche d'une identité nationale en Afrique Occidentale. *Présence Africaine*, (34/35), 79-91.
- [7] Wallerstein, E. (1989). 1968: revolución en el sistema-mundo. Tesis e interrogantes. *Estudios Sociológicos*, 7(20), 229-249.
- [8] Wallerstein, E. (2005). La reelección de Bush y sus implicancias para Estados Unidos y el mundo. *OSAL*.