



*Edited by Gurminder K. Bhambra,
Kerem Nişancıoğlu and Dalia Gebrial*

Understanding Eurocentrism as a Structural Problem of Undone Science

William Jamal Richardson

One sense in which we can conceptualise the idea of ‘decolonising the university’ is in the decolonisation of the curricula of instruction that are employed in the classrooms and seminars of said university. As a basic unit of the university itself, the classroom is, I argue, one of the key places that the colonial nature of universities, especially in metropolises and settler-colonies, manifests itself. Works such as *The Death of White Sociology*¹ and *White Logic, White Methods*² have highlighted how the ‘imperial unconscious’ of these curricula shapes how undergraduates, graduate students and academics understand and study the world.³ This is one of the reasons why curricula have become a popular target of marginalised students and academics seeking to decolonise the university.

The task of decolonising the curriculum, at least in the social sciences, has taken the form of epistemological critiques of who produces knowledge and what knowledge those people produce. Decoloniality, postcolonialism and other bodies of scholarship have all dissected the ways in which the ideas of the Enlightenment have structured how we think about the modern, the human and legitimate knowledge of the social world.⁴ Although challenging Eurocentric epistemologies in text is an important component of decolonising knowledge systems, less attention is given to how structural and physical factors of the colonial world help create and maintain the same epistemology that scholars are currently struggling to decolonise. Using the framework of undone science, I argue that the struggle to decolonise university knowledge systems is intimately intertwined with addressing forms of physical and economic colonial violence. These forms of violence, including genocide, interpersonal racism in academia and global structures of academic knowledge transmission, serve to ensure that the configurations of people, resources and space that allow for new decolonial knowledges

to emerge never come to exist. Considering these forces, I argue that to effect real decolonisation of our knowledge systems, we have to consider how marginalised communities and decolonial scholars need not only to intervene in epistemic debates but also to intervene politically in the physical spaces in which these debates often take place.

What is undone science?

Most discussions of knowledge production and epistemic cultures focus on describing or analysing questions of how particular pieces of knowledge are produced, used and disseminated among scientific actors and the communities and societies they inhabit. What is not often talked about is all the other possible research projects, proposals, papers and agendas that are not completed or taken up by these same actors. Frickel et al. defined this non-produced knowledge as ‘undone science’, which can be defined as ‘areas of research identified by social movements and other civil society organizations as having potentially broad social benefit that are left unfunded, incomplete, or generally ignored.’⁵ I would add to Frickel et al.’s definition, for the purpose of this chapter, that the ‘identifiers’ can also be other scholars, or members of other communities who encounter scientific institutions. Undone science is understood to be a systematic occurrence that is embedded within relationships of power and influence within and around academia. For every scientific project or research paper that is supported and funded there is another project or paper that is not being funded or given attention by scholars and those that support them, that is, support and funding is a zero-sum game. The concept of undone science also highlights the importance of agenda setting as an overtly political process that determines what science is done and what science is undone. This framework puts an emphasis on how actors both within and outside academia influence which agendas, among a number of alternatives, are taken up or marginalised.

The concept of undone science allows scholars to speak about marginalisation outside of a narrative of simply higher quality projects winning out over lower quality projects and instead focus on the power relationships that determine what quality is and what scientific pursuits are important or not important. These qualities make the concept of undone science valuable to discussions of Eurocentrism in the social sciences. Eurocentrism in the social sciences is not only about how the focus of academic work tends to be on European societal phenomena, but also

about how this focus on European social life leave the social life and thought of other communities and nations understudied, unattended to or, worse, actively suppressed.

Eurocentrism and undone science

Eurocentric critiques have been levied at mainstream sociology and other social sciences primarily by scholars of colour and those coming from the global South.⁶ The most prominent perspective in this space is postcolonial sociology, which argues that sociology is a product of the intersection of science and European imperialism. As mentioned above, one example of this critique is Julian Go's descriptions of the 'imperial unconscious' of sociology that underpins the epistemology of mainstream sociology. Raewyn Connell alternatively describes the field as 'metropolitan sociology'.⁷ A similar critique of sociology comes from Black sociology. Black sociology, as both a political movement within sociology and a theoretical perspective driven by Black scholars during the Civil Rights/Black Power era developed a conceptualisation of sociology based on its relationship to the American racial system. Black sociological writings argued that American sociology is really a 'White sociology' that constitutes the scientific reflection of American racism. This description of American sociology also understood the field as an institution within itself which held an ideology, stratification structure and culture, as well as an epistemology.⁸ Similar descriptions of social science as a white/European space in general come from scholars within the North American indigenous community and other places in the global South.⁹

Postcolonial and Black sociology echo the logic of scholars working in the new political sociology of science (NPSS) perspective that one can't understand the production of knowledge and science independent of its relationship to societal interests and structures of power.¹⁰ What makes these discussions of Eurocentrism interesting is the way in which they extend arguments about 'the relationships embedding scientific knowledge systems within and across economic, legal, political, and civil society institutions' to argue that these scientific perspectives are constructors of whole societies, namely modern Euroamerican society. The history of the social sciences reflects this in the birth of national sociological spaces reflecting the angst and interests of the dominant powers of those societies. European sociology, for instance, was primarily

concerned with the birth and growing pains of 'modernity' and how it was different from their previous 'primitive' state. American sociology on the other hand, especially if you include W.E.B. Du Bois as part of the first wave of American scholars, was primarily concerned with inequality and (racial) difference.¹¹ The national/civilisation-level relationship between Eurocentric scientific enterprise and the societies that produced and are produced by them changes somewhat how we understand a thing such as undone science, as I will go into below.

Undone science as a concept takes on new importance when coupled with these analyses of Eurocentrism. Edward Said argued that Enlightenment thought, which laid the basis for the creation of the social sciences, constructed Europeans as the dialectical opposite of 'Orientals', whereby Europeans produce logic and science while all others produce myths and superstition.¹² This racist conception of European's relationship to the world both justified colonialism and, within academia, determined what people and whose societies were allowed to produce legitimate scientific knowledge. Orientalism and other colonial logics reject whole societies and the possible scientific agendas they may possess as superstition or folk knowledge. This categorical writing off of colonised peoples and their societies as knowledge producers ensures that, at least within Western-defined academic spaces, certain ideas always remain unthought. This move by Western academe to 'unthink' colonised people as knowledge producers is related to what Knorr-Cetina calls 'negative knowledge', which is unknown knowledge that is deemed insignificant and/or dangerous to actors.¹³ Constructing colonised people as non-knowledge producers creates a geography of negative knowledge whereby knowledge that comes from or is influenced by that geography is always already inferior to European-derived knowledge.

An example of undone science and negative knowledge is mainstream sociological accounts of the rise of modernity. Gurinder Bhambra argues that European modernity, and its scientific avatar sociology, are grounded in an understanding of European society as separate and unique among all other societies.¹⁴ She defines Eurocentrism as 'the belief, implicit or otherwise, in the world historical significance of events believed to have developed endogenously within the cultural-geographical sphere of Europe'.¹⁵ What's important here is the agenda-setting power of the idea of modernity as a uniquely European phenomenon. Karl Marx, for instance, developed his stages of history from a European perspective that ignored the historical developments of other societies, while arguing

that these same stages were universal in nature.¹⁶ When he did address non-European societies and their historical development, as he did Asia, he created a category called the 'Asiatic mode of production' that set Asia apart from 'normal' trajectories of class conflict.¹⁷ The agenda-setting power of the European modernity literature and Marxist historical materialism produced conditions in which research on Third World class conflict seemed both useless and/or a threat to orthodox Marxism, an example of negative knowledge.¹⁸ Examples such as Marxist theory show us epistemically how Eurocentrism established itself within the social sciences over time by systematically privileging one research agenda and perspective over all others.

Although scholarship has broadly done an exemplary job exposing the epistemic trajectories that produce Eurocentrism, NPSS opens the door to tracing the physical and structural forces that also contribute to the production of Eurocentrism. This turn towards a not strictly epistemic understanding of how science is conducted is one of the major contributions of science and technology studies as an interdisciplinary field. What it shares with the above-mentioned literature on Eurocentrism is an understanding of science as a social activity that is not strictly driven by logic and methods, but also by the interactions of scientists with each other and with the public. If we can identify Eurocentrism as a structural problem within sociology and the social sciences in general, there should be individuals, groups and institutions that perpetuate the logic across space and time.

To illustrate my point about Eurocentrism as a structural problem I've chose three phenomena that serve to shape intellectual agendas in the university that ultimately become the curricula that students are taught from. These phenomena include generalised colonial violence, racial discrimination in academia, and structures of global knowledge transmission. These phenomena exist outside the bounds of what we call the epistemic, but I argue have profound impacts on it all the same. An important dimension to consider is how it is often institutions and individuals within the university itself who are creating policies, initiatives and decisions that drive all three of these phenomena.

Generalised colonial violence

Implied in discussions of Eurocentrism is its historical relationship to European colonialism. As argued above, much of the grounding that

allowed for Marx's historical materialism and Eurocentric modernity narratives to thrive was the idea that people in the global South had nothing to contribute empirically or intellectually to understanding human social development. This idea of non-European inferiority contributed to justifying colonial invasion and violence. Colonial enterprise, which includes the killing of colonised peoples, destruction of records and texts, and imposition of metropolitan culture ensured that much of the already existing knowledge structures, cultures and intellectual agendas of colonised people were outright destroyed, leaving European epistemologies unchallenged. We can consider the hypothetical for example of what kinds of knowledge systems would have developed in colonised societies/nations had they not been invaded and controlled by European empires. These hypothetical knowledge systems represent the undone science that no longer exists or will exist because the civilisations it hails from have either been pushed onto new 'development' trajectories or, worse, have been eradicated by genocidal violence, something I will be going into next.

The clearest examples of how generalised violence encouraged and ensured the supremacy of Eurocentrism is settler-colonialism in the Western hemisphere. Settler-colonialism can be best defined by its difference from classical colonialism. Where classical or resource colonialism seeks to simply extract resources and/or labour from the dominated nation or people, settler-colonialism is typified by the establishment of a permanent presence that usually involves displacing or eradicating the dominated population. Patrick Wolfe, in his theorisation of settler-colonial logics, coined the idea of the logic of elimination.¹⁹ Wolfe argues that in any settler-colonial society there exists a contradiction whereby the settler seeks to claim sovereignty over the space while dealing with the fact that the original inhabitants of the land still exist, challenging their sovereignty. The logic of elimination is the manifestation of the need to rectify this contradiction by eradicating the indigenous population from the land in various ways. Wolfe states 'elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded) occurrence'.²⁰ The general idea is that any process that leads to the invisibility or disappearance of indigenous peoples is a positive for the settler regime.

When we consider undone science in the context of settler-colonialism, it is easy to see how indigenous knowledge agendas become marginalised. The direct genocide of the vast majority of the indigenous

peoples in North and South America over 500 years destroyed much of the knowledge, scientific or otherwise, held by their communities. Today, one of the manifestations of this genocide is the dying out of indigenous languages worldwide as the survivors of genocide fail to maintain numbers that allow for the transmission of language from one generation to the next.²¹ Another means by which indigenous people were prevented from maintaining their knowledge base, scientific or otherwise, was residential schools. In both Canada and the United States residential schools were established that took indigenous children from their families to be taught how to think and act like white Americans/Canadians.²² These residential schools, aside from having obscenely high mortality rates that further reduced the indigenous populations also ensured that those who survived wouldn't engage in any of their traditional culture or lifeways. The combined physical and cultural genocide of indigenous peoples means that there were few individuals to carry indigenous intellectual agendas and, among those individuals, cultural genocide via assimilationist policies may have stripped them of the potential to produce indigenous knowledges. Similar arguments can be made of African Americans with regard to the impact of chattel slavery on knowledge transmission from one generation to the next.²³

Racism within academia

Since the advent of desegregation in the United States many more scholars of colour have entered the academy as students and scholars. With the inclusion of more people of colour the assumption is that the academic and intellectual agendas ought to reflect the increasing diversity of people in the institution. Unfortunately, as I will discuss below, academia embodies the same kinds of prejudices towards people of colour that exist in broader American society. Interpersonal and institutional racism within academia ensures that scholars of colour don't survive within academia, and don't have the social power to set research agendas or directly challenge their more privileged peers. As with generalised colonial violence, the agenda-setting power of racism in academia is contingent on understanding that eliminating people from institutions also eliminates the intellectual agendas and knowledges embodied within those same people. People of colour in academia must contend with white peers who were socialised into similar racial logics and ideologies to those that led to the colonial violence mentioned

above. This socialisation encourages behaviour that makes scholars of colour, particularly women of colour, feel unwelcomed, unappreciated and marginalised.

One of the base mechanisms of racial exclusion within academia is via hiring. Lauren Rivera's concept of cultural matching is a concept that embodies much of what happens on the job market and in other kinds of evaluations of scholars of colour. Cultural matching refers to the ideas that evaluators often increase their opinion of interviewees when they share hobbies, institutional memberships or cultural habits.²⁴ Scholars of colour, especially those who come from low-income communities, often lack the same kinds of networks and relationships that their white and middle-class counterparts may have. The result is that people of colour in any professional setting are less advocated for than their white counterparts and therefore less likely to get hired.

Another mechanism of marginalisation is the culture of silence and politeness within academia. Scholars of colour are often scared of challenging their white counterparts on racist or exclusionary activity because of a norm of collegiality that exists within many academic spaces. As Christine Stanley observed when trying to recruit scholars of colour to discuss biases in journal review processes:

As a result, there are many faculty members of color who remain fearful about publicly sharing their narratives concerning their academic lives on university campuses. Many declined to participate in this study for several reasons. Some said that their narratives were too painful to share, while others expressed that they could be targeted because they were among a few or the only ones in their departments. Still others in the junior faculty ranks declined because they felt that their untenured status would be at risk. A continued sanction on silence and politeness, with the result that the master narrative norms are not troubled, obscures open and frank dialogue about diversity issues and, in particular, about racism in the editorial-review process.²⁵

This silencing of scholars of colour due to fear of marginalisation is a theme that is nearly universal within narratives of marginalisation.²⁶ As Stanley noted, this silence enables other forms of marginalisation to go unnamed and unchallenged.

Lastly, we can look at graduate training as another place where scholars of colour are marginalised with two major results: their assimilation into

mainstream (i.e. Eurocentric) patterns of behaviour and scholarship or being filtered out of academia all together for refusing to assimilate. Relationship with faculty and other students are a primary mechanism by which graduate students are shaped. One scholar, describing their political science education, noted that fellow students would question her with ‘How is your work political?’²⁷ Alternatively, we can see how African women graduate students are denied professional courtesy as advanced graduate students and faculty alike.²⁸ These two examples are indicative of situations where scholars of colour are forced to alter their behaviour or research agendas to fit into the mainstream culture of their departments or disciplines, or see themselves in a position where they may be pushed out or denied tenure and other accolades.

What we see through this mechanism is how routine racism (and misogyny) within academia can lead to the marginalisation of scholars of colour. What is important to note here is that, as students and scholars are pushed to the margins or pushed out, the knowledge that they have or intend to produce is marginalised along with them. When considering undone science, we can easily see how racism within academia would ensure that one does not have the power or influence to change the trajectory of fields, departments, or committees.

Structures of global knowledge transmission

The last major mechanism that prevents marginalised people from shaping academic agenda and research trajectories is the relationship between scholars of colour, especially those in the global South, and academic institutions and norms in the global North. This mechanism is primarily driven by the inertia of the legacy of Eurocentrism in the social sciences manifesting itself in academia today. Scholars studying these dynamics are primarily concerned with the ways in which former colonial powers influence the research and structure of academic spaces in the global South.

The central framework that discusses this North–South academic relationship is work on what is called academic dependency or, alternatively, intellectual imperialism. Academic dependency is the dependence of academic spaces in the global South on the resources of global northern institutions for academic and financial support, while intellectual imperialism is defined as the colonisation of the intellectual life of a colonised people by European social thought.²⁹ Scholars in this space saw academic

dependency as a kind of neocolonial form of intellectual imperialism. The most fleshed out of these theories is seen in the work of Syed Farid Alatas. In his work on academic dependency he identified mechanisms that impacted the way research in the global South was conducted.³⁰ He identifies four major ways in which the global South is dependent on the global North academically: (1) dependence on ideas and the media of ideas; (2) dependence on the technology of education; (3) dependence on aid for research as well as teaching; (4) dependence on investment in education.

Dependence on ideas and media of ideas is a reference to both the domination of already existing Eurocentric ideas within the social sciences and the domination of journal publication outlets by global North nations and academics. In sociology, for example, the top two journals, the *American Journal of Sociology* and the *American Sociological Review* are both United States-based journals, one of which is owned by the American Sociological Association. Alatas argues that the dominance of these outlets and the ideas they contain creates a situation where Western scholars have well-established publishers and distributors while the global South largely imports foreign journals from these publishers instead of having their own publishing houses and journals. Due to the realities of publishing in academic journals, the expectations of the type of language used as well as the style of writing and selection of article topics, are shaped in the global South on the model of those in the global North.

The next three forms of dependence are all more explicitly tied to the realities of global economic inequalities. In all three cases we see a situation where the ability to do scientific work and educate those who can engage in scientific work is hinged upon the support of institutions and governments of the global North. Particularly when it comes to education, many parts of the world inherited the education systems set up by their former colonial masters. In addition, many scholars in the global South go to European or American universities to get advanced training, taking that training and the ideas back to their home nations. Because the money and resources for these educational and scientific endeavours come from the global North, academics in the global North are able to determine what does and doesn't get funding, who gets an education and what knowledge looks like on a global scale. Scholars in the global South who reject this agenda-setting process are likely to be

cut off from networks of scholarship and funding thus ensuring that their work is marginalised.

We see a number of scholars in the global South take up versions of academic dependency theory to critique the development of scientific institutions within their societies or conceptualise how to develop sociological spaces outside these relationships of dependency. Solvay Gerke and Hans-Dieter Evers, for example, looked at how different Southeast Asian nations conceptualised what constituted 'local knowledge', and how that impacted their institutional development over time.³¹ Akinsola Akiwo in his research explored how indigenisation could make space for new forms of sociological thought in Africa and elsewhere in the global South.³² Kang Jun, in focusing on Korean political science, showed how the United States occupation influenced the development of their political science scholarship in a way that marginalises indigenous Korean concepts and experiences.³³ These efforts and others highlight how hard it is for intellectual production in the global South to happen outside of the influence of Western academic and political institutions, but it is a problem that scholars in those regions are actively challenging.

Resisting structural Eurocentrism in the university

As argued earlier in this chapter, the three phenomena I identified that structurally perpetuate Eurocentrism have in common the fact that universities themselves, as institutions, help to create and perpetuate these phenomena. The task of decolonising the university curriculum then requires us, as scholars, activists and marginalised people, to struggle both within the university and outside, acknowledging that the line between the campus and the community is a thin one at best. I will end this article with some recommendations for points where these mechanisms of marginalisation can be disrupted and reversed.

The core mechanism by which we can begin to disrupt these processes of structural Eurocentrism is by ensuring that colonised and marginalised people don't die. It's not often that social scientists talk about death outside of it being a research finding or observation, but it indeed stalks our struggle as scholars to challenge Eurocentric institutions. Eurocentric institutions, including the university, were all midwived into existence by the actual physical deaths of colonised peoples. My academic institution, Northwestern University, was funded into existence with blood money obtained via the genocide of indigenous women and children.³⁴ The

University of Chicago on the other hand was founded on land gifted by a slaveowner who was famous for regularly working his slaves to death.³⁵ Decolonisation means prioritising the survival of colonised peoples above other interests. As scholars and activists, our work can influence policy and social movements that promote the survival of colonised people, ensuring they survive, physically and socially, to possibly join the academy or, if we want to be truly radical, perhaps subvert it all together.

Another place where we can begin to disrupt structural Eurocentrism is in academic institutions such as departments, committees, disciplinary organisations and the like. These institutions provide actors with the power to hire, fire, fund, defund, promote and marginalise scholars and research agendas, and serve as the primary levers of power within academia. Scholars interested in decolonisation need to consider the politics of these institutions in the sense that by controlling or making oneself independent of these institutions we can open space for new knowledge agendas to emerge and have the means to protect and nurture them. These moves may include campaigns for electing officers to national academic organisations or simple informal institutions such as group chats or message boards on social media platforms that provide grounds for collective action and coordination. For scholars in the global South and those colonised through settler-colonies, I would add the necessity for developing independent institutions where possible that don't rely on funding or validation from mainstream academic spaces. Although an incredibly hard objective to pull off, this independence will help to re-establish intellectual sovereignty, which then allows colonised communities to interact with European-derived academic spaces as independent and autonomous entities vs marginalised others.

All the above-mentioned ways of subverting structural Eurocentrism require academics to theorise and organise themselves as explicit political actors vs. thinkers whose work may contribute to one or another political movement or debate. The importance of this distinction is connected to Stanley's work, mentioned when discussing racism in academia.³⁶ Much of the silence Stanley noted is connected to respectability norms that are dominant in Western academe. By respectability norms, otherwise known as professionalism, I mean the ways in which academics are influenced to engage in disagreement and dissension in certain prescribed ways that often allow already dominant and abusive behaviours to continue largely unabated.³⁷ Engaging in scholar-activist behaviours, especially those that are geared towards decolonial ends,

requires us to release ourselves from many of these respectability norms. By doing this we will be able to engage in more substantive action for change within the academy, the university, and in the wider communities the former two impact. Although anti-respectability carries with it the risk of marginalisation, the creation of support systems and institutions among decolonial scholars, students and activists can help protect actors from some forms of marginalisation.

To conclude I would like to reiterate the original conceit of this chapter, which is the idea that to decolonise the university we must target the curriculum which itself is impacted by the long history of Eurocentrism and colonialism. This work is a reminder that what is at stake in struggles to destroy racist monuments, include marginalised people in class syllabuses, or create safe spaces for marginalised peoples is not simply making it easier for marginalised people to get through university. What is really at stake is the protection or undoing of the colonial world itself, within which the university is a core component. Part of these movements is to think beyond the rules, norms and concepts of this existing social order. My hope is that this essay does some of the work of questioning some of the conceptual binds that prevent us from challenging Eurocentrism, university curricula and, ultimately, our modern colonial order itself.

Bibliography

- Abdo-Zubi, N. (1996) *Sociological Thought: Beyond Eurocentric Theory*. Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Akiwowo, A. (1988) 'Universalism and Indigenization in Sociological Theory: Introduction', *International Sociology: Journal of the International Sociological Association* 3(2): 155–60.
- Akiwowo, A. (1989) 'Building National Sociological Tradition in an African Subregion', in N. Genov (ed.) *National Traditions in Sociology*. London: Sage, pp. 151–66.
- Akiwowo, A. (1999) 'Indigenous Sociologies: Extending the Scope of the Argument', *International Sociology: Journal of the International Sociological Association* 14(2): 115–38.
- Alatas, S.F. (2003) 'Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences', *Current Sociology/La Sociologie contemporaine* 51(6): 599–613.
- Alatas, S.H. (2000) 'Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems', *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 28(1): 23–45.
- Alfred, T. and Corntassel, J. (2005) 'Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism', *Government and Opposition* 40(4): 597–614.

- Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), A.-L.H.I. (1969) 'The Ideology of Black Social Science', *The Black Scholar* 1(2): 28–35.
- Beoku-Betts, J.A. (2004) 'African Women Pursuing Graduate Studies in the Sciences: Racism, Gender Bias, and Third World Marginality', *NWSA Journal: A Publication of the National Women's Studies Association* 16(1): 116–35.
- Bhabra, G.K. (2007) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bhabra, G.K. (2011) 'Historical Sociology, Modernity, and Postcolonial Critique', *American Historical Review* 116(3): 653–62.
- Bhabra, G.K., Shilliam, R. and Orrells, D. (2014) 'Contesting Imperial Epistemologies: Introduction', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 27(3): 293–301.
- Boyer, J.W. (2015) *The University of Chicago: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brown, R.N. (2007) 'Persephone's Triumph', *Qualitative Inquiry: QI* 13(5): 650–9.
- Castellano, M.B., Archibald, L. and DeGagné, M. (2008) 'From Truth to Reconciliation', available at: http://speakingmytruth.ca/downloads/AHFvol1/AHF_TRC_vol1.pdf
- Cetina, K.K. (2009) *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Connell, R. (2007) *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Dei, G.J.S. (2000) 'Rethinking the Role of Indigenous Knowledges in the Academy', *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 4(2): 111–32.
- Fogel, J.A. (1988) 'The Debates over the Asiatic Mode of Production in Soviet Russia, China, and Japan', *American Historical Review* 93(1): 56–79.
- Frickel, S. et al. (2010) 'Undone Science: Charting Social Movement and Civil Society Challenges to Research Agenda Setting', *Science, Technology & Human Values* 35(4): 444–73.
- Gerke, S. and Evers, H.-D. (2006) 'Globalizing Local Knowledge: Social Science Research on Southeast Asia, 1970–2000', *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 21(1): 1–21.
- Go, J. (2013) 'For a Postcolonial Sociology', *Theory and Society* 42(1): 25–55.
- Hunter, M. (2002) 'Rethinking Epistemology, Methodology, and Racism: or, Is White Sociology Really Dead?', *Race and Society* 5(2): 119–38.
- In, K.J. (2006) 'Academic Dependency: Western-centrism in Korean Political Science', *Korean Journal* 46(4): 115–35.
- John Evans Study Committee (2014) *Report of the John Evans Study Committee*, Northwestern University, available at: www.northwestern.edu/provost/committees/equity-and-inclusion/study-committee-report.pdf.
- Keskin, T. (2014) 'Sociology of Africa: A Non-Orientalist Approach to African, Africana, and Black Studies', *Critical Sociology* 40(2): 187–202.
- Ladner, J.A. (1973) *The Death of White Sociology: Essays on Race and Culture*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press.
- Magubane, Z. (2016) 'American Sociology's Racial Ontology: Remembering Slavery, Deconstructing Modernity, and Charting the Future of Global Historical Sociology', *Cultural Sociology* 10(3): 369–84.

- Maia, J.M. (2014) 'History of Sociology and the Quest for Intellectual Autonomy in the Global South: The Cases of Alberto Guerreiro Ramos and Syed Hussein Alatas', *Current Sociology/La Sociologie contemporaine* 62(7): 1097–1115.
- Manigault-Bryant, J.A. (2014) 'The "Image of Africa" in *Africana Sociology*', *Critical Sociology* 40(2): 203–15.
- Marx, K. and Others (1972) *The Marx Engels Reader*, New York: Norton.
- Morris, A. (2015) *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Muhs, G.G.Y. et al. (2012) *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Patterson, O. (1982) *Slavery and Social Death*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Quijano, A. and Ennis, M. (2000) 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America', *Nepantla: Views from South* 1(3): 533–80.
- Rivera, L.A. (2012) 'Hiring as Cultural Matching', *American Sociological Review* 77(6): 999–1022.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Scott, F. and Kelly, M. (2006) *The New Political Sociology of Science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sexton, J. (2016) 'The Vel of Slavery: Tracking the Figure of the Unsovereign', *Critical Sociology* 42(4–5): 583–97.
- Stanley, C.A. (2007) 'When Counter Narratives Meet Master Narratives in the Journal Editorial-Review Process', *Educational Researcher* 36(1): 14–24.
- Ward Randolph, A. and Weems, M.E. (2010) 'Speak Truth and Shame the Devil: An Ethnodrama in Response to Racism in the Academy', *Qualitative Inquiry: QI*, 16(5): 310–13.
- Wolfe, P. (2006) 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4): 387–409.
- Wright, E. and Calhoun, T.C. (2006) 'Jim Crow Sociology: Toward an Understanding of the Origin and Principles of Black Sociology via the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory', *Sociological Focus* 39(1): 1–18.
- Zuberi, T. and Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008) *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*. Plymouth: Rowman and Littlefield.

Notes

All urls last accessed 10 January 2017.

1. Ladner, J.A. (1973) *The Death of White Sociology: Essays on Race and Culture*. Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press.
2. Zuberi, T. and Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008) *White Logic, White Methods: Racism and Methodology*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
3. Go, J. (2013) 'For a Postcolonial Sociology', *Theory and Society* 42(1): 25–55.
4. Quijano, A. and Ennis, M. (2000) 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America', *Nepantla: Views from South* 1(3): 533–80; Bhabra, G. (2007) *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

5. Frickel, S. et al. (2010) 'Undone Science: Charting Social Movement and Civil Society Challenges to Research Agenda Setting', *Science, Technology & Human Values* 35(4): 444–73.
6. Maia, J.M. (2014) 'History of Sociology and the Quest for Intellectual Autonomy in the Global South: The Cases of Alberto Guerreiro Ramos and Syed Hussein Alatas', *Current Sociology/La Sociologie contemporaine* 62(7): 1097–115.
7. Connell, R. (2007) *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
8. Alkalimat (Gerald McWorter), A.-L.H.I. (1969) 'The Ideology of Black Social Science', *The Black Scholar* 1(2): 28–35; Hunter, M. (2002) 'Rethinking Epistemology, Methodology, and Racism: or, Is White Sociology Really Dead?', *Race and Society* 5(2): 119–38; Ladner 1973 op. cit.; Wright, E. and Calhoun, T.C. (2006) 'Jim Crow Sociology: Toward an Understanding of the Origin and Principles of Black Sociology via the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory', *Sociological Focus* 39(1): 1–18.
9. Akiwowo, A. (1999) 'Indigenous Sociologies: Extending the Scope of the Argument', *International Sociology: Journal of the International Sociological Association* 14(2): 115–38; Keskin, T. (2014) 'Sociology of Africa: A Non-Orientalist Approach to African, Africana, and Black studies', *Critical Sociology* 40(2): 187–202; Manigault-Bryant, J.A. (2014) 'The "Image of Africa" in Africana Sociology', *Critical Sociology* 40(2): 203–15; Dei, G.J.S. (2000) 'Rethinking the Role of Indigenous Knowledges in the Academy', *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 4(2): 111–32.
10. Scott, F. and Kelly, M. (2006) *The New Political Sociology of Science*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
11. Magubane, Z. (2016) 'American Sociology's Racial Ontology: Remembering Slavery, Deconstructing Modernity, and Charting the Future of Global Historical Sociology', *Cultural Sociology* 10(3): 369–84; Morris, A. (2015) *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*. Oakland: University of California Press.
12. Said, E. (1979) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
13. Cetina, K.K. (2009) *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
14. Bhabra, G.K. (2011) 'Historical Sociology, Modernity, and Postcolonial Critique', *American Historical Review* 116(3): 653–62.
15. Bhabra 2007 op. cit., p. 5.
16. Marx, K. and others (1972) *The Marx–Engels reader*. New York: Norton.
17. Fogel, J.A. (1988) 'The Debates over the Asiatic Mode of Production in Soviet Russia, China, and Japan', *American Historical Review* 93(1): 56–79.
18. Abdo-Zubi, N. (1996) *Sociological Thought: Beyond Eurocentric Theory*. Ontario: Canadian Scholars' Press; Bhabra, G.K., Shilliam, R. and Orrells, D. (2014) 'Contesting Imperial Epistemologies: Introduction', *Journal of Historical Sociology* 27(3): 293–301.
19. Wolfe, P. (2006) 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4): 387–409.
20. Ibid.

21. Alfred, T. and Corntassel, J. (2005) 'Being Indigenous: Resurgences against Contemporary Colonialism', *Government and Opposition* 40(4): 597–614.
22. Castellano, M.B., Archibald, L. and DeGagné, M. (2008) 'From Truth to Reconciliation', available at: http://speakingmytruth.ca/downloads/AHFvol1/AHF_TRC_vol1.pdf
23. Patterson, O. (1982) *Slavery and Social Death*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; Sexton, J. (2016) 'The Vel of Slavery: Tracking the Figure of the Unsovereign', *Critical Sociology* 42(4–5): 583–97.
24. Rivera, L.A. (2012) 'Hiring as Cultural Matching', *American Sociological Review* 77(6): 999–1022.
25. Stanley, C.A. (2007) 'When Counter Narratives Meet Master Narratives in the Journal Editorial-Review Process', *Educational Researcher* 36(1): 14–24.
26. Ward Randolph, A. and Weems, M.E. (2010) 'Speak Truth and Shame the Devil: An Ethnodrama in Response to Racism in the Academy', *Qualitative Inquiry: QI*, 16(5): 310–13.
27. Brown, R.N. (2007) Persephone's Triumph. *Qualitative Inquiry: QI*, 13(5): 650–59.
28. Beoku-Betts, J.A. (2004) 'African Women Pursuing Graduate Studies in the Sciences: Racism, Gender Bias, and Third World Marginality', *NWSA Journal: A Publication of the National Women's Studies Association* 16(1): 116–35.
29. Alatas, S.H. (2000) 'Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems', *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 28(1): 23–45.
30. Alatas, S.F. (2003) 'Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences', *Current Sociology/La Sociologie contemporaine* 51(6): 599–613.
31. Gerke, S. and Evers, H.-D. (2006) 'Globalizing Local Knowledge: Social Science Research on Southeast Asia, 1970–2000', *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 21(1): 1–21.
32. Akiwowo, A. (1989) 'Building National Sociological Tradition in an African Subregion', in N. Genov (ed.) *National Traditions in Sociology*. London: Sage, pp. 151–66; Akiwowo, A. (1988) 'Universalism and Indigenization in Sociological Theory: Introduction', *International Sociology: Journal of the International Sociological Association* 3(2): 155–60.
33. In, K.J. (2006) 'Academic Dependency: Western-centrism in Korean Political Science', *Korean Journal* 46(4): 115–35.
34. John Evans Study Committee (2014) *Report of the John Evans Study Committee*, Northwestern University, available at: www.northwestern.edu/provost/committees/equity-and-inclusion/study-committee-report.pdf. Last accessed 10/31/2017
35. Boyer, J.W. (2015) *The University of Chicago: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
36. Stanley 2007 op. cit.
37. Muhs, G.G. et al. (2012) *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

