



ATHENA

CRITICAL INQUIRIES IN LAW, PHILOSOPHY AND GLOBALIZATION

Call for Inputs:

Globalization and Multidisciplinary Approaches to Research in the Humanities, Legal and Socio-Political Studies: Problems and Prospects

Proposed and edited by Gustavo Gozzi and Luigi Sammartino.

State of the Art:

In a global context, where economics, politics, technology and the values of International Community have created a multi-faceted world, what emerges is that knowledge of social phenomena is also approached differently.

On the one hand, if the phenomena above are in a constant state of flux and always offer new food for thought, on the other hand, we can see that a transformation in the way of conducting analysis and scientific research on them is almost a necessary condition for a full understanding of them. Cyclically, the legal and social humanities are faced with this turning point, this moment of reconsideration. This is even more so in an era in which academic research seems to be strictly dependent on the provision of public funds, for which research projects must have an increasingly less abstract and progressively concrete perspective (Peat and Rose, 2023; Butz Pedersen, 2016).

In these three areas (Humanities, Legal and Socio-Political Sciences), the methodology and the way of conducting research have traditionally been founded and built on a strict inductive application, based on abstract approaches, on the theoretical interpretation of phenomena and the elaboration of thought according to collected data. In some cases, methodological sub-categories have been produced, being typical of the specific field of study or parameterised to the research topic.

In different ways, the three areas first addressed the discourse of globalisation and then that of methodological renewal or transformation. In the area of the legal sciences, there is a general influence by the two features we mentioned, especially in the fields of International Law and Comparative Law (Civitarese Matteucci, 2014, 128); moreover, from a theoretical point of view, two globalisations have been noted (Kennedy 2003), through which the legal science, as the study of norms, has noted progressively politicised, although not completely, development of law; moreover, some problems on multidisciplinary arose, for example with reference to the method and theory of historiography in International Law (with particular reference to its periodization, as well as the question of Eurocentrism: Kemmerer, 2014; Koskenniemi, 2011), together with the contribution and methodology of TWAIL, which considers international law from the perspective of the Global South (Anghie, 2005); furthermore, a progressive influence by non-doctrinal (Peat and Rose, 2023) and

non-methodological (Boer, 2023; Deplano, 2021; Deplano, Gentile, Lonardo, 2019) methods has been observed and studied.

In the humanities (namely historical and philosophical studies), globalisation has been characterised above all by the influence of technology and the radical mutation of the social sphere and thought, as in the case of the relationship with artificial intelligence and the ethics of social networks (Yanitsky, 2017); but more than that, globalisation has allowed for a rethinking of the method regarding the use of certain languages and the impact that different types of cultures and subcultures have had on this field of knowledge, leading to the so-called *globalised parochialism*, typically in those fields that seek to take distance from global phenomena to the point of remaining focused on themselves (Wolters, 2013).

Within the socio-political sciences, globalisation has always generated a holistic and perforce multidisciplinary view of the social phenomena that influences political choices; the multidisciplinary approach, in this case, was necessary concerning the composite nature of the interests at stake in the choices of the executive and the legislator (Janaki, 2021).

This has also led to a radical rethinking of the contribution by these areas of study to society and institutions. This has inevitably generated a different relationship in the study of globalisation phenomena. On the one hand, we have had the transition from an *intra-* to an *interdisciplinary* approach (Muchlinsky, 2003, 225 ff.), where it remains to be understood if the latter must be conceived as '*interdisciplinarity*' or the interaction between different disciplinary perspectives, or if it is a '*transdisciplinarity*' exercised by jurists, historians and other scholars who transcend the limits of their disciplines (Kemmerer, 2014, 289). On the other hand, the confrontation with globalisation has also produced convergent (Morosini, 2005) and revisionist (Muchlinsky, 2003, 229 ff.) approaches in their way of conducting research, in which the conception of certain cornerstones of their theories were radically rethought in the light of the incidence of phenomena that could not be linked to a single dimension or perspective. This has given rise to several innovative approaches that put different perspectives on the same level, as in the case of the Internet and artificial intelligence, the incidence of sustainability, renewed environmental protection, the importance of science as a factor around which society can revolve (Van Gestel, Micklitz and Poiars Maduro, 2012, 11), but also has led to confronting with aspects that were previously typical of some of these areas, such as sovereignty, the concept of power, global governance (Civitarese Matteucci, 2014) and migrations.

Considerations have also been generated on the way research methodology is taught, examining not only different approaches to the subject (Zinkina, Korotayev and Andreev, 2013), but also the setting of different research questions, the structuring of the problem, and the consideration and evaluation of the theoretical and practical issues that underpin such a way, to the point of prompting various schools to evaluate the teaching of the methodology of their subject or to develop several *vademecum* that were also an elaborate form of critique of the approach followed by others (as in the case of Lieblich, 2021 and his guide to research in International Law).

What can be made evident for all these areas is the search for truth through method, but the way to reach this truth no longer seems to be linked to a pure method based solely on a single academic knowledge. There is also the possibility to evolve through the influence (direct or indirect) of other fields of academic knowledge, even distant from each other but united by the study of the same phenomenon from different perspectives (Van Gestel, Micklitz and Poiars Maduro, 2012; Pandey, 2011). This also seems to have affected the methodology of conducting research in the academic field in practice, especially for fields such as these, which has led to the inclusion of approaches and

methodologies different from those typically found in the field and defined as “non-doctrinal” (Peat and Rose, 2023).

Basic Proposal:

The intent of this editorial proposal is to reason about the relationship between globalisation and scientific research in the legal sciences, social sciences and humanities, trying to understand how much research methodologies have been influenced by the globalisation and whether adaptations of them are considered.

To this end, the various scholars involved will be asked three main questions, according to the methodology specific to their field of knowledge and experience:

- 1) Has globalisation affected the methods of doing research in your field of knowledge?
- 2) How much do you think it has contributed to the development of a multidisciplinary approach?
- 3) Do you think that the multidisciplinary approach can influence the research methodology in your field of knowledge *pro futuro*? How and to what extent?

Scholars willing to participate in the debate are invited to submit by 15 September 2025 a 1000-words abstract on a proposed perspective on the topic. They must send it in a mail to athena@unibo.it (and in cc gustavo.gozzi@unibo.it and luigi.sammartino2@unibo.it).

Outcomes of the selection process will be delivered by 7 October 2025.

Final papers must be submitted to the Review by February 2026. They will be published in vol. 6 (2026), no. 1 in May-June 2026.

Consulted Bibliography:

Anghie A. (2005). *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge University Press).

Boer L. J. M. (2023). *International legal scholarship and the making of a ‘scientific self’*, in *Leiden Journal of International Law*, vol. 36, 457.

Budtz Pedersen D. (2016). Integrating social sciences and humanities in interdisciplinary research, in *Palgrave Communications*, 2, no. 16036, <https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2016.36>.

Civitarese Matteucci S. (2014). Some Remarks on Methodology in Legal Studies in the Light of the Challenges That Globalization Poses to Legal Doctrine, in *Revista Catalana de Dret Públic*, vol. 48, p. 119.

Deplano R. (ed., 2021). *Research Methods in International Law. A Handbook* (Edward Elgar Publishing).

Deplano R., Gentile G., Lonardo L. (ed., 2019). *Pluralising International Legal Scholarship: The Promise and Perils of Non-Doctrinal Research Methods* (Edward Elgar Publishing).

Janaki V. (2021), Multidisciplinary Research in the Social Sciences: Breaking new grounds, in *Mind and Society*, Vol. 10, No. III & IV, p. 134.

- Kemmerer A. (2014). Towards a Global History of International Law? Editor's Note, in *European Journal of International Law*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 287.
- Kennedy D. (2003). Two Globalization of Law & (and) Legal Thought: 1850-1968, in *Suffolk University Law Review*, vol. 36, p. 631.
- Koskenniemi M. (2011). Histories of International Law: Dealing with Eurocentrism, in *Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 19, 152.
- Liebllich E. (2021). How to do Research in International Law? A Basic Guide for Beginners, in *Harvard International Law Journal Online*, vol. 62, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3704776.
- Morosini F. (2005). Globalization & Law: Beyond Traditional Methodology of Comparative Legal Studies and an Example from Private International Law, in *Cardozo Journal of International and Comparative Law*, vol. 13, p. 541.
- Muchlinsky P. T. (2003). Globalization and Legal Research, in *The International Lawyer*, vol. 37, no. 1, p. 221.
- Pandey P.K. (2011). Problems and Prospects in Multidisciplinary Approach in Legal Research, in *Indian Journal of Humanities*, vol. 1, no. 4, p. 46.
- Peat D. and Rose C. (2023). The Changing Landscape of International Law Scholarship. Do Funding Bodies Influence What We Research?, in *Grotius Centre Working Paper Series*, 2023/102-PIL, 20 October, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4613528.
- Van Gestel R., Micklitz H.-W. and Poiares Maduro M. (2012). Methodology in the new Legal World, in *EUI Working Papers*, 2012/13, https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/22016/LAW_2012-_13_VanGestelMicklitzMaduro.pdf.
- Wolters G. (2013). European Humanities in Times of Globalized Parochialism, in *Bollettino della Società Filosofica Italiana*, N.S. 208, p. 3.
- Yanitzky O. (2017). Current Globalization: A Challenge For The Humanities, in *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, Vol. 4, No. 12, p. 131.
- Zinkina J., Korotayev A. and Andreev A. I. (2013). Measuring globalisation: Existing methods and their implications for teaching Global Studies and forecasting, in *Campus-Wide Information System*, vol. 30, no. 5, p. 321.