



Southern theory and world universities

Raewyn Connell

To cite this article: Raewyn Connell (2017) Southern theory and world universities, Higher Education Research & Development, 36:1, 4-15, DOI: [10.1080/07294360.2017.1252311](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1252311)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1252311>



Published online: 09 Dec 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1534



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 22 View citing articles [↗](#)

INVITED ESSAY

Southern theory and world universities

Raewyn Connell

Professor Emerita, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Introduction

Higher education is widely assumed to be a major social good. Governments see it as a means of development, corporations see it as a field of investment and a source of innovation, while the popular demand for higher education continues to grow around the world.

What higher education means in social and cultural terms, however, remains debatable and is increasingly contested. In this essay, I examine the relevance for universities of recent knowledge projects that contest the hegemony of the global North. I discuss the location of such projects in the history of universities and the global economy of knowledge, outline the diversity of knowledge projects, and consider their implications for the university curriculum and the contemporary intellectual workforce.

The transformations of higher education

Advanced knowledge has been accumulated and passed between generations in many different ways. Hunter-gatherer societies have had respected elders who held in memory great funds of practical, ritual and artistic knowledge, and patiently taught this knowledge to younger women and men – a process that continued after the adoption of new technologies such as acrylic painting (Johnson, 2008). Agricultural societies have accumulated craft-related knowledge, and created apprenticeship mechanisms in technosciences such as metallurgy (Childe, 1956; Hountondji, 1994/1997). Urban societies whose economies could support specialized workforces outside direct production have created knowledge institutions in many forms, from the famous library of Hellenistic Alexandria to the literary education system of Confucian China to the religious/legal *madrassa* created in the Saljuq and Mamluk period of Islam.

The modern international higher education system, however, had its main roots in Europe. Mediaeval centres of higher learning in Italy, France and Germany, and later in northern Europe, were mainly religious institutions. Some however were early centres of legal and medical study, while the skills of documentation, composition and argument that all early universities taught produced a clerical and administrative workforce vital to the growing national states of Europe. By the sixteenth century, the international network of universities was an important cultural force, producing European celebrities like the humanist Erasmus, and was even a source of political and religious upheaval – the Reformation being triggered by an obscure university lecturer called Luther.

The universities' religious, humanistic and professional specialties, however, played only a marginal role in generating the next great transformation of the European knowledge system – the natural philosophy of the so-called scientific revolution in the seventeenth century. New institutions such as the Royal Society in London played a leading role, along with a dense network of personal contacts among the gentry and aristocrats who pursued the new sciences – Robert Boyle, for instance, was the younger son of an earl (Shapin, 1994). It was not until the nineteenth century, particularly through the reforms launched by Wilhelm von Humboldt in Prussia, that both natural-science research and seminar-based learning designed to encourage creativity were institutionalized as central features of the university. The German research university then became the favoured model, gradually introduced in Russia, the United States, and elsewhere.

The vast expansion of European empires, from the sixteenth century on, at first had little significance for the universities. Some small institutions were planted in the American colonies as part of the missionary effort by Catholic orders; Protestant settler colonies followed suit, to train ministers for the churches (that's the origin of Harvard). By the early twentieth century, however, public universities were scattered across the colonial world, with curricula copied from the metropole and little research capacity.

Things changed markedly after the great wave of decolonization in the mid twentieth century. In the Arab-speaking world, for instance, there were half a dozen universities in 1939, mostly small and foreign-controlled; by 1960 there were 20 full-scale universities, mostly set up by national governments (Hourani, 1991). The national government in settler-colonial Australia began, in the late 1940s, to pump money into a rapid expansion of what had been a small public university system, deliberately raising its research capacity (Forsyth, 2014).

Encouraged by UNESCO, postcolonial governments around the world came to see universities as tools of national development. They could produce both locally relevant knowledge and a professional workforce. Fifty years later, the national government of capitalist China was similarly pouring a substantial part of its new wealth into a vast expansion of universities, with a focus on technology and natural science.

In the 1980s what was now a global system of public universities came under a different kind of pressure, from the rise of market ideology and neoliberal governments. Neoliberalism everywhere meant a transfer of resources away from public-sector services to the corporate sector and security forces, in which public universities were subjected to a long-term funding squeeze. One result was a mushrooming of new private universities, which in some countries – Brazil being one – now have many more enrolments than public universities.

Another result was a steady corporate takeover of the public universities themselves, via several mechanisms: commodification through fees, greater dependence on corporations for research funds, and the rise of a managerial elite within universities using corporate techniques of labour control (Connell, 2014a; Hil, 2012). Corporate research centres, for instance, those of transnational pharmaceutical or finance corporations, now rivalled university researchers in many fields.

Despite the growth of universities beyond the metropole, the bulk of the world's resources for research sit in the global North. The Egyptian social theorist Anouar Abdel-Malek noted this point 40 years ago, and it remains true:

There are two major obstacles: on the one hand, the concentration in the West of the major scientific and cultural instruments, the fruit of empire and of a scientific and technological revolution which considerably emphasised the effects of that concentration; and on the other, the relative weakness of those same instruments on the countries of the tricontinental sphere [i.e. the global south], which accelerates the brain drain. (Abdel-Malek, 1971, p. 25)

This history has given us, in the first quarter of the twenty-first century CE, a world-wide but highly unequal university system, uncomfortably poised between public and private sectors, and between the business of research and the business of credentialing an endless expansion of professions. A Eurocentric curriculum prevails almost everywhere. The language of international business, English, is increasingly the language of instruction in elite universities, even in Germany. The production of organized knowledge is a global project. But its prestigious and influential centres are almost all in the global North, in the elite universities and corporate research institutes of Europe and the United States.

The global economy of knowledge

What is the significance of this history for the *knowledge* that universities produce and teach? A particularly valuable contribution to understanding this problem is made by the Beninese philosopher Paulin Hountondji's (1994/1997) analysis of the post-colonial periphery as a site of knowledge production.

A crucial fact is that the inequalities among university systems in the global North, the metropole, and the very diverse periphery – for short, the global South – are not just quantitative. Underlying the modern system of organized knowledge is a global division of labour that has run through the history of modern science and is still powerful today. The role of the periphery is first to supply data, and later to apply knowledge in the form of technology and method. The role of the metropole, as well as producing data, is to collate and process data, producing theory (including methodology), and developing applications that are later exported to the periphery.

The expansion of European (and later American) empires, over the 450 years or so after 1500 CE, produced a huge dividend of silver, sugar, cotton, oil, slaves, taxes and markets. It also produced a knowledge dividend. Data about geology, oceans, plants and animals, atmosphere, languages, social customs and much more flowed back to the metropole from explorers, merchants, officials and missionaries. This was increasingly intentional and organized.

Captain Cook, who from a European point of view discovered the east coast of Australia – a mere 40,000 years after the Aborigines did – was in the neighbourhood because he had been sent to collect astronomical data at Tahiti and geographical data after that. Wilhelm von Humboldt's more famous brother Alexander (after whom the Humboldt Current is named) spent five years of his life, and much of his family fortune, on a data-dredging expedition to central and south America, making biological and geoscientific observations. He then spent much of the rest of his life and fortune publishing them (Botting, 1973).

As a young gentleman, the great Charles Darwin boarded the British survey ship *Beagle* and several years later came home with notebooks crammed with data that later underpinned the theory of evolution. The same pattern can be seen today in the reports of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (atmospheric science, by the way, was

partly founded by Alexander von Humboldt's expeditions). A large proportion of the vital data in the Panel's reports is collected around the global South but the theories and computational models that organize all the data are produced in the global North.

Within this global division of labour, Hountondji argues, the necessary attitude of intellectuals in the periphery is one of 'extraversion', that is, being oriented to sources of authority outside their own society. This is very familiar in academic practice even in a rich peripheral country like Australia. We travel to Berkeley for advanced training, invite a Yale professor to give our keynote address, teach from US textbooks, read theory from Paris, and try to publish our papers in *Nature* or the *American Economic Review*.

This pattern is empirically demonstrable. It is named 'academic dependency' by Alatas (2006) and 'quasi-globalization' in my study of Australian intellectual workers (Connell, 2011, see chapter 6). Keim (2011) has shown quantitatively the dominance of Northern institutions in globally recognized social science while Murphy and Zhu (2012) do the same for management studies. Keim has fascinating data on the limited presence of southern intellectuals in a particular Northern research centre. Fran Collyer (2012) develops a method of contextual citation analysis that shows the unequal location of Australian, UK and US sociologists in a hierarchical world structure. Hanafi (2011) shows the stratification of intellectual production in the Middle East, with intellectual workers compartmentalized by language and type of institution and research.

Extraversion, in turn, is reinforced by patterns of travel. It is prestigious for an intellectual worker in the periphery to have a degree, especially an advanced degree, from an elite university in the metropole. In a country like Australia, sabbaticals were designed to let university teachers go back to the metropole to get up to date and form useful connections, and most sabbaticals are still used that way. It is highly desirable to travel to a laboratory in Germany, a department in Chicago, a library in Oxford.

Here is an illustration from an interview from my research with intellectual workers (Connell, 2011). A medical researcher in Australia is discussing attempts to mobilize an elite network in his field, based on time he spent in the United States:

I knew just about everybody who was a leading [worker in this field] in America before I left, and with many have become good friends. And we set up this project, this think-tank which I'm going off to in a couple of weeks, we're having our seventh meeting. And what I enjoy most about that is that we get some of the top people in the field together, mainly Americans, but we have a couple, one from Sweden, one from England, one from Denmark, but it's mainly Americans. And what we do is we map out a series of questions that need to be answered, and then we say 'Jack, you do this', 'John, you do this'. We'll meet again next March and report back.

Academics from the global North travel the other way: to give keynote lectures, to conduct fieldwork, to coordinate the data collection projects they have designed and won funding for.

These practices are now powerfully reinforced by neoliberal governance of universities. University managers have become preoccupied with their institution's competitive position in international 'league tables', which are centred on the global North and use the criteria of excellence that prevail in elite universities in the US. Because competitive ranking is an important marketing strategy in the global trade in students and student fees, even hard-headed politicians have become involved, at least in rhetoric. In 2012,

the Prime Minister of Australia declared it was a national objective to get 10 Australian universities into the top 100 in the world rankings. Curiously, no new funding followed.

The intellectual consequences of extraversion have been noted before. An antipodean literary critic wrote of the ‘cultural cringe’ that infected Australian cultural life (Phillips, 1950). A south-west Asian novelist and social critic invented a word in Farsi, *Gharbzadegi* – roughly, ‘Westoxication’ or being ‘struck by the West’ – to name the situation in neo-colonial Iran (Al-e Ahmad, 1962/1982). And a south-east Asian sociologist has spoken of ‘academic dependency’ in the periphery (Alatas, 2003).

In contemporary academic life, the effects are no less profound. To publish in metropolitan journals, one must write in metropolitan genres, cite metropolitan literature, become part of a metropolitan discourse. For a social scientist, this means either describing one’s own society *as if it were the metropole*, suppressing its specific history; or describing it in the mode of comparison, placing its specificity within metropolitan frameworks. In the latter case one becomes – as Hountondji describes the social scientist in Africa – a native informant to the Northern intellectual world.

Challenges to the Eurocentric knowledge system

Of course these pressures are debated and resisted. There are several currents of resistance.

Within the academic system, a familiar strategy of resistance to metropolitan hegemony is to emphasize distinctive national traditions or styles of intellectual work. This approach has been prominent in the International Sociological Association recently, assembling the stories of many national sociologies (Burawoy, Chang, & Hsieh, 2010; Patel, 2010). A notable example that goes into great detail is the recent volume *Doing sociology in India* (Patel, 2011).

A more general strategy, arising outside academic institutions, is the search for indigenous knowledge systems. As I noted at the start, the pre-colonial world had diverse knowledge systems and institutions. Some of this heritage has survived colonization, and can be valorized. This search has been particularly vigorous in Africa (Odora Hoppers, 2002). Like the national-traditions approach, a valorization of indigenous knowledge implies the ‘epistemological pluralism’ debated in a recent publication by CLACSO (Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales, Latin American Council of Social Sciences) (Olivé et al., 2009).

Complementary to the indigenous knowledge strategy is the post-colonial critique of European thought. This became well known through the work of Edward Saïd, especially his famous book *Orientalism* (1978). More recent developments are the attempt to ‘provincialise Europe’ in thinking about history (Chakrabarty, 2000), and Bhabra’s (2014) work on ‘connected sociologies’, along with books such as *Postkoloniale soziologie* (Reuter & Villa, 2010) and *Decolonizing European sociology* (Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Boatcă, & Costa, 2010), which apply this critique in proposing new paths for the social sciences. The de-colonial project addressing (and questioning) Latin America involves a potent synthesis of philosophical critique of Eurocentric knowledge, and validation of indigenous knowledges as alternatives (Lugones, 2009; Mignolo, 2005; Santos, 2014).

What I have called ‘Southern theory’ (Connell, 2007) is not exactly an indigenous knowledge project, nor primarily a critique of Eurocentrism. The difference is made clear in work published in the famous Indian periodical *Subaltern Studies*. The historians

who wrote the early issues of this journal were deeply concerned with the ideas of colonized people, but did not try to reconstruct or assert indigenous understanding from before colonization. They were concerned with the colonial situation itself, and made highly creative use of documents generated by the colonial regime to reconstruct ideas and practices of subaltern groups among the colonized (Guha & Spivak, 1988). It is worth remembering that Al-Afghani (1881/1968), one of the most powerful critics of British imperialism in the nineteenth century, was also an advocate of modern science and technology and a critic of obscurantism among Muslim intellectuals.

Knowledge generated *in the colonial encounter*, and in the postcolonial experience of the colonized societies, is central to the idea of Southern theory. A classic example is provided by Solomon Tshekisho Plaatje's *Native life in South Africa* (1916/1982). Neither an ethnographic description nor an orientalist reconstruction, this was a political activist's documentation of the effects of the new Dominion government's 1913 Natives' Land Act. This Act drove indigenous families off the land to make space for white commercial farmers and create a landless workforce. Plaatje travelled around the country – with his bicycle – interviewing families who had been expelled from their lands and gathering the documentary evidence of the white regime's racism and implacability.

Hau'ofa's *We are the ocean* (2008) is a more recent illustration. Hau'ofa offers a sharp sociological analysis of the formation of a post-colonial society in the island states of the south Pacific, with modernizing elites increasingly linked to the international economy, grouped around institutions like the military, banks and aid agencies. Hau'ofa notes how indigenous cultures now tend to be confined to the poor and marginalized. From this background, he has developed a highly original, multifaceted art and literary practice intended to express local realities in the new circumstances. Also in the Pacific region is the striking work on methodology by Smith (2012) in Aotearoa New Zealand. Criticizing the colonial structure of knowledge in most research about Maori communities and race issues, Smith draws on Maori knowledge projects, as well as research models from other parts of the world, to propose more democratic knowledge practices for the future.

The sheer wealth of conceptual, methodological and theoretical thinking that comes from the colonized world – and is generally ignored in the mainstream economy of knowledge – is the central point being made in texts like *Southern theory* (Connell, 2007) and Farid Alatas' *Alternative discourses in Asian social science* (2006). The powerful thinkers discussed in these texts are of much more than local interest.

These challenges are increasingly being debated (e.g., Go, 2013; Rosa, 2014). Though I do not have space to discuss criticisms in detail, three are common and need thought. One is the argument that postcolonial, decolonial or Southern theory perspectives depend on a binary analysis of the world (North/South, etc.) that has been made obsolete by social and economic change. Certainly some of the rhetoric around indigenous knowledge (e.g., 'African values' versus 'Western values') invites that criticism. But on my reading, serious postcolonial scholarship actually offers a *more* plural and diverse picture of the world than mainstream scholarship, not less; and texts like Jean and John Comaroff's *Theory from the south* (2011) make a central point of societal change and cultural transformation.

A second common criticism is that the bodies of thought discussed are not epistemologically comparable. 'Western science' is simply science, science is universal, and what is being called alternative knowledge is at best cultural belief, at worst superstition. The

debacle over AIDS prevention and treatment in South Africa under the Mbeki government, which had tried to mobilize indigenous healing practices in response to the epidemic, called out this criticism in stark terms (Cullinan & Thom, 2009). Yet when we think of the scale of climate change denialism and anti-evolutionism in the United States, it is difficult to think of science as inherent in European-derived culture, any more than a rejection of science is inherent elsewhere. The interplay between colonizing knowledge systems and local technosciences, as shown by west African researchers in the important book *Endogenous knowledge* (Hountondji, 1994/1997), is far more complex. Social epistemology shows the colonizing natural sciences themselves are far from homogeneous (Harding, 2008). There is an important problem area here, but no clear-cut reason to reject plurality.

Thirdly, there is a criticism that formulations of Southern theory, indigenous knowledge or postcolonial perspectives are likely to privilege the perspectives of local elites, rather than represent whole societies. There is force in this criticism. Hountondji's early work (1976/1983) brilliantly showed how the indigenous-knowledge genre of 'African philosophy' was a literary construct that seriously misrepresented the realities of life and thought among the colonized. My own work in *Southern theory*, focused on complex texts, could not possibly be representative for colonized societies where literacy was available only to a minority. But this is a major obstacle only if we feel obliged to assume, in Hountondji's tart phrase, 'primitive unanimity' among colonized communities. A sociology-of-knowledge perspective on Southern theory will pose the question of the social context of new knowledge formations and their relation to other and perhaps more widespread cultural formations. That is, I think, one of the directions that research in this field should now go.

Producing knowledge and producing knowledge producers: the questions for universities

Let us now bring these lines of thought together and consider what they mean for the university-based knowledge project. Contemporary universities are powerful institutions, interlinked on a global scale; but they embed a narrow knowledge system that reflects and reproduces social inequalities on a global scale. The current neoliberal regime of university finance, management and labour control is probably making the knowledge system even narrower, and certainly making the institutional system more hierarchical.

Like most important educational questions, this one centres on curriculum. What would be the curriculum in a higher education system dedicated to supporting, rather than preventing, Southern projects of knowledge?

Assuming that a university, or an institution like it, is a relevant organizational framework, this is now an entirely practical question. In the early 1970s, the Iranian sociologist and theologian Shariati (1986) formulated an imaginative teaching and research agenda for the Islamic institute Hosseiniyeh Ershad. Smith's (2012) work on methodology, already mentioned, comes out of a larger, collective process of building Maori research and education in Aotearoa New Zealand. Discussions of postcolonial perspectives in relation to the school curriculum are under way (e.g., Hickling-Hudson, 2009). Non-Western conceptualizations may not just be an object of study in universities but may be a tool in advanced research training (Singh, 2011). The marginalization of knowledges

is linked to the hierarchies of inclusion and exclusion in the student body of university systems like Australia's (Gale, 2012).

It is clear from such examples that much more is involved than insertion of a little new content into a metropole-dominated curriculum. As Epstein and Morrell (2012) show for the case of gender studies in education, the terrain of knowledge has to be re-thought from a different starting-point, the perspectives and groups excluded or subordinated by global structures of privilege.

The basis of such a curriculum is the principle of curricular justice. I have tried to define this principle through Australian experience in education for children in poverty (Connell, 1993). If distributive justice is an arrangement of resources that prioritizes the interests of the least advantaged, then a just curriculum would be a curriculum – a whole curriculum, not an enclave in a curriculum – that prioritizes the interests of the least advantaged groups of students. This is in strong contrast to the contemporary mainstream curriculum in Australia's (and most countries') schools, which prioritizes the interests of the most privileged.

A just curriculum does not mean a curriculum that automatically reflects the currently existing *culture* of the least advantaged. All curriculum-making requires a critique of culture and a reflective selection from a vast range of possible knowledge. The least advantaged groups in society may have adapted to a destructive situation in destructive ways: the issue of rape and domestic violence comes to mind. Even if local culture and knowledge systems are in good shape, complex issues arise about getting access to socially powerful forms of knowledge for marginalized students.

These issues cannot be decided in advance, and certainly cannot be decided by outside authorities – let alone by global market forces. Reform to achieve curricular justice only makes sense if there is a democratic process of deliberation and decision-making in education, involving both community power and scope for initiative by teachers. This, it should be noted, is the opposite of what neoliberal managerialism is producing in universities, as governments tie universities to market forces and managers tighten controls over university staff. Curricular justice will require social struggle in and around the institutions.

Curricular change in the light of Southern theory is, as yet, an undeveloped discussion. We can, however, identify some of the issues that will come up in it. One concerns the curricular implications of the central experiences of colonization itself. These include large-scale societal and personal violence, large-scale loss of land, and the discrediting (and sometimes complete suppression) of local institutions, ways of life, religions and languages.

These issues ramify across the disciplines of the Eurocentric curriculum; they cannot be handled by simply inserting a new specialty of postcolonial studies. Loss of land, for instance, is a major part of colonialism and land issues have continued to be crucial in postcolonial societies (Davy, 2009). Colonial land appropriation reshaped geographies, economies, legal systems, religion, ecosystems, agricultures, nutrition and health practices – at a minimum. Those issues cross half the faculties of a modern university. And Southern perspectives on land and land use can be a means of re-shaping existing disciplines, as Watson (2009) argues for urban planning.

A second issue concerns the relationship of the university as an institution to the different groups in colonial and postcolonial society. The small universities set up in the

colonies were intended for an elite: initially for men, and only from the most privileged strata. Postcolonial history has expanded the role of the university as a development agency, but has failed to make it a socially inclusive institution. Chatterjee (2011) has identified a structural division in modern India between ‘political society’, based on the highly personal ties of rural communities and informal mass urbanism, and ‘civil society’, the formal world of the state, corporations, law and global connection. If such an analysis is broadly right – which is suggested by the scale of the informal economy in the global South, where it is often at least 50% of all economic activity – the culturally exclusionary character of the university curriculum may well harden, not soften, as universities are tied in more closely to global markets.

A third question concerns the generalizability of alternative knowledge frameworks. Some of the knowledge systems being discussed are certainly local in character. But the terrain of Southern theory includes knowledge projects that explore bases for an alternative universalism. Notable instances are projects to revive Islamic science (Ghamari-Tabrizi, 1996), including Islamic traditions in social science (Alatas, 2006), and Gandhian philosophy as the basis for a general perspective on knowledge (Lal, 2002). Such projects do not necessarily imply epistemological pluralism. Rather they require a rationality that is grounded outside Eurocentric traditions.

Any sustained knowledge project requires a workforce. Since the university is the main producer of contemporary societies’ intellectual workforces, it is doubly involved in this issue – both through the conditions it provides for its own workforce, and for the way it educates future professionals and researchers.

Intellectual work is not just a cold cognitive exercise; it requires the engagement of whole human beings. The need for support, including mentoring, is clear in intellectuals’ life stories (e.g., Kartini, 2014; Laslett & Thorne, 1997). Moreover, the work requires material support. In popular myth, intellectuals live on the smell of an oily rag, yet actual knowledge production projects, on a society-wide scale, require funding and institutional resources.

One of the most serious intellectual consequences of neoliberalism is the degrading of conditions for supporting and resourcing the workforce. The privatization of higher education, the standardization of curricula and pedagogy, the intensification of competition, all weaken an autonomous workforce. So does the way that research, across much of the developing world, now depends on aid programmes and NGOs. The result is, as Mkandawire (2005) emphasizes in the case of Africa, a mass of short-term, under-funded research projects on applied problems. These typically depend on methodologies imported from the metropole, are held to orthodoxy by ‘accountability’ mechanisms, and rarely produce conceptual innovation.

As Mkandawire’s argument implies, the institutional and economic bases for a democratic agenda in the production of knowledge need attention. A dispersed knowledge system is required, with many organizational centres, able to pursue autonomous agendas. But having many centres, all with inadequate resources, is no use. We need mechanisms of global public-sector support, to provide society-wide guarantees of education and continuing knowledge production. We also need cultural conditions for global curricular justice. There have to be partners in dialogue, audiences for the work, and intellectual frameworks that open to innovation, rather than close.

From this point of view, the South-South dialogues that have occurred in the last two decades are valuable. They include dialogues on indigenous knowledge, links among global-South knowledge institutions such as the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa and CLACSO in South America, and connections around the World Social Forum. Specific online forums such as www.southernperspectives.net have also been created.

These initiatives are still on a small scale. They are, perhaps, important as indications of what is possible. The impact of social movements might generate change on a larger scale. Indigenous people's movements have certainly provided the basis for knowledge projects in New Zealand, Canada, South and Central America, Australia and Africa. Women's movements across the South have provided the basis for multiple feminisms (Bulbeck, 1998; Connell, 2014b), while the World Social Forum, linking social movements across the south, has tried to act as a collective intellectual space.

At the same time, there is cultural and intellectual diversity in the Northern university system. There are significant groups of intellectual workers who have a commitment to internationalism and social justice – hence the existence of journals such as *Third World Quarterly*. The other side of the 'brain drain' that Abdel-Malek mentioned is the presence in the metropole of expatriate intellectuals from the south. Some of them have made formidable contributions in moving beyond Eurocentric knowledge: Edward Saïd, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Amartya Sen and Walter Mignolo are not to be disregarded.

The tasks of any substantial movement for reform include re-making curricula in Northern as well as Southern universities, developing new forms of practical connection among intellectual workers, and finding ways of funding transnational intellectual work that do not carry Northern agenda-setting with them. The ascendancy of neoliberal regimes in the last generation makes this terrain harder to work on – at the same time, multiple possibilities for change now exist.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

- Abdel-Malek, A. (1971). L'avenir de la théorie sociale. *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*, 50, 23–40. Republished in English in Anouar Abdel-Malek, *Civilizations and Social Theory*, London, Macmillan, 1981.
- Al-Afghani, S. J. a.-D. (1881/1968). Refutation of the materialists. In Nikki R. Keddie & Hamid Algar (Trans.), *An Islamic response to imperialism: Political and religious writings of Sayyid Jamal ad-Din 'al-Afghani'* (pp. 130–174). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology*, 51(6), 599–613.
- Alatas, S. F. (2006). *Alternative discourses in Asian social science: Responses to Eurocentrism*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Al-e Ahmad, J. (1962/1982). *Gharbzadegi (Weststruckness)* (J. Green & A. Alizadeh, Trans.). Lexington, KY: Mazda.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2014). *Connected sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Botting, D. (1973). *Humboldt and the cosmos*. London: Sphere.

- Bulbeck, C. (1998). *Re-orienting western feminisms: Women's diversity in a postcolonial world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burawoy, M., Chang, M., & Hsieh, M. F.-y. (Eds.). (2010). *Facing an unequal world: Challenges for a global sociology* (Three volumes). Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (2011). *Lineages of political society: Studies in postcolonial democracy*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Childe, V. G. (1956). *Society and knowledge*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Collyer, F. (2012). Sociology, sociologists and core-periphery reflections. *Journal of Sociology*. doi:10.1177/1440783312448687
- Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. L. (2011). *Theory from the south: Or, how Euro-America is evolving towards Africa*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Connell, R. (1993). *Schools and social justice*. Toronto: Our Schools Ourselves.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, R. (2011). *Confronting equality: Gender, knowledge and global change*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Connell, R. (2014a). Love, fear and learning in the market university. *Australian Universities Review*, 56(2), 56–63.
- Connell, R. (2014b). Rethinking gender from the south. *Feminist Studies*, 40(3), 518–539.
- Cullinan, K., & Thom, A. (Eds.). (2009). *The virus, vitamins and vegetables: The South African HIV/AIDS mystery*. Cape Town: Jacana.
- Davy, B. (2009). The poor and the land: Poverty, property, planning. *TPR*, 80(3), 227–265.
- Epstein, D., & Morrell, R. (2012). Approaching southern theory: Explorations of gender in South African education. *Gender and Education*, 24(5), 469–482.
- Forsyth, H. (2014). *A history of the modern Australian university*. Sydney: New South Books.
- Gale, T. (2012). Towards a southern theory of student equity in Australian higher education: Enlarging the rationale for expansion. *RISE: International Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1(3), 238–262.
- Ghamari-Tabrizi, B. (1996). Is Islamic science possible? *Social Epistemology*, 10(3-4), 317–330.
- Go, J. (2013). Scholarly controversies: Raewyn Connell's *Southern Theory*. In *Political Power and Social Theory*, 25. *Decentering Social Theory*.
- Guha, R., & Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Selected subaltern studies*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gutiérrez Rodríguez, E., Boatcă, M., & Costa, S. (2010). *Decolonizing European sociology: Transdisciplinary approaches*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hanafi, S. (2011). University systems in the Arab East: Publish globally and perish locally vs publish locally and perish globally. *Current Sociology*, 59(3), 291–309.
- Harding, S. (2008). *Sciences from below: Feminisms, postmodernisms, and modernities*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hau'ofa, E. (2008). *We are the ocean*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hickling-Hudson, A. (2009). Southern theory and its dynamics for postcolonial education. In R. S. Coloma (Ed.), *Postcolonial challenges in education* (pp. 365–376). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Hil, R. (2012). *Whackademia: An insider's account of the troubled university*. Sydney: New South Books.
- Hountondji, P. J. (1976/1983). *African philosophy: Myth and reality* (H. Evans & J. Réé, Trans.). London: Hutchinson.
- Hountondji, P. J. (Ed.). (1994/1997). *Endogenous knowledge: Research trails*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Hourani, A. (1991). *A history of the Arab peoples*. New York, NY: MJF Books.
- Johnson, V. (2008). *Lives of the Papunya Tula artists*. Alice Springs: IAD Press.
- Kartini. (2014). *Kartini: The complete writings 1898-1904*. Melbourne: Monash University.
- Keim, W. (2011). Counterhegemonic currents and internationalization of sociology: Theoretical reflections and an empirical example. *International Sociology*, 26(1), 123–145.
- Lal, V. (2002). *Empire of knowledge: Culture and plurality in the global economy*. Pluto: London.

- Laslett, B., & Thorne, B. (Ed.). (1997). *Feminist sociology: Life histories of a movement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lugones, M. (2009). Heterosexuality and the colonial/modern gender system. *Hypatia*, 22, 186–219.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2005). *The idea of Latin America*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mkandawire, T. (Ed.). (2005). *African intellectuals: Rethinking politics, language, gender and development*. Dakar: CODESRIA/Zed Books.
- Murphy, J., & Zhu, J. (2012). Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals. *Organization*, 19(6), 915–927.
- Odora Hoppers, C. A. (Ed.). (2002). *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation*. Claremont: New Africa Books.
- Olivé, L., Santos, B. de S., De la Torre, C. S., Antezana, L. H., Romero, W. N., Tapia, L., ... Suárez, H. J. (2009). *Pluralismo epistemológico*. La Paz: Muela del Diablo/Comuna/CLACSO/CIDES-UMSA.
- Patel, S. (Ed.). (2010). *International handbook of diverse sociological traditions*. London: Sage.
- Patel, S. (Ed.). (2011). *Doing sociology in India: Genealogies, locations, and practices*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, A. (1950). The cultural cringe. *Meanjin: A Literary Magazine*, 9(4), 299–302.
- Plaatje, S. T. (1916/1982). *Native life in South Africa: Before and since the European war and the Boer rebellion* (new edition). Braamfontein: Ravan Press.
- Reuter, J., & Villa, P.-I. (Ed.). (2010). *Postkoloniale Soziologie: Empirische Befunde, theoretische Anschlüsse, politische Intervention*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Rosa, M. C. (2014). Theories of the south: Limits and perspectives of an emergent movement in social sciences. *Current Sociology*. doi:10.1177/0011392114522171
- Saïd, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Santos, B. d. S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Shapin, S. (1994). *A social history of truth: Civility and science in seventeenth-century England*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shariati, A. (1986). *What is to be done? The enlightened thinkers and an Islamic renaissance* (F. Rajaei, Ed.). Houston: Institute for Research and Islamic Studies.
- Singh, M. (2011). Learning from China to internationalise Australian research education: Pedagogies of intellectual equality and ‘optimal ignorance’ of ERA journal rankings. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 48(4), 355–365.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.
- Watson, V. (2009). Seeing from the south: Refocusing urban planning on the globe’s central urban issues. *Urban Studies*, 46(11), 2259–2275.