



Syed Farid Alatas

Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences

Introduction

The literature in the social sciences and humanities of the last 200 years and that of the last 50 years in particular has deplored the state of knowledge in the arts in the Third World, highlighting various problems that can all be subsumed under concepts, expressions and movements such as the critique of colonialism (Césaire, 1955; Memmi, 1957), academic imperialism (Alatas, S. H., 1969, 2000), decolonization (of knowledge) (Fanon, 1961), critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970), imitation and the captive mind (Alatas, S. H., 1972, 1974), deschooling (Illich, 1973), academic dependency (Altbach, 1977; Garreau, 1985; Alatas, S. F., 1999, 2000a), Orientalism (Said, 1979, 1993) and Eurocentrism (Amin, 1979; Wallerstein, 1996). These problems were seen to be part of the larger context of relations between the former western colonial powers and the ex-colonies, including those societies that were vicariously colonized. The recognition and assessment of these problems led to various calls for the indigenization of the social sciences (Fahim, 1970; Fahim and Helmer, 1980; Atal, 1981), deschooling (Illich, 1973), endogenous intellectual creativity (Alatas, S. H., 1978), an autonomous social science tradition (Alatas, S. H., 1979), postcolonizing knowledge (Prakash, 1990, 1992; Chakrabarty, 1992), globalization, decolonization and nationalization of the social sciences. All these may be collectively referred to as calls for alternative discourses in the social sciences (Alatas, S. F., 2000b).

In this article, I discuss one of these problems: that is, academic dependency and the related question of the global division of labour in the social sciences. I conclude by way of suggesting measures that may work towards academic dependency reversal.

The Definition of Academic Dependency

Any attempt to define academic dependency would benefit from a prior discussion of a related idea, intellectual or academic imperialism. Academic imperialism is a phenomenon that is analogous to political and economic imperialism. Generally, imperialism or empire-ism is understood as the policy and practice of the political and economic domination of colonial by more advanced nations since the 16th century through military conquest and subjugation. Defined in this way, imperialism is equivalent to colonialism.

To the extent that the control and management of the colonized required the cultivation and application of various disciplines such as history, linguistics, geography, economics, sociology and anthropology in the colonies, we may refer to the academe as imperialistic. In fact it is possible to cite numerous examples from the last 500 years of scholars who directly or indirectly researched and taught for the imperialist cause. One of the most notorious examples is one of the most expensive social science research projects ever conceived, that is, Project Camelot with a grant of up to about US\$6 million. Project Camelot was the creation of the Special Operations Research Office (SORO), attached to the American University in Washington, DC, but financed by the US Department of Defense (Horowitz, 1967: 4, 17). On 4 December 1964 the Office of the Director of SORO released a document describing the project. This is worth quoting at length:

Project CAMELOT is a study whose objective is to determine the feasibility of developing a general social systems model, which would make it possible to predict and influence politically significant aspects of social change in the developing nations of the world. Somewhat more specifically, its objectives are:

First, to devise procedures for assessing the potential for internal war within national societies;

Second, to identify with increased degrees of confidence those actions which a government might take to relieve conditions which are assessed as giving rise to a potential for internal war; and

Finally, to assess the feasibility of prescribing the characteristics of a system for obtaining and using the essential information needed for doing the above two things.

The project is conceived as a three to four-year effort to be funded at around one and one-half million dollars annually. It is supported by the Army and the Department of Defense, and will be conducted with the cooperation of other agencies of the government. A large amount of primary data collection in the field is planned as well as the extensive utilization of already available data on social, economic and political functions. At this writing, it seems probable that the geographic orientation of the research will be toward Latin American countries. Present plans call for a field office in that region.

By way of background: Project CAMELOT is an outgrowth of the interplay of many factors and forces. Among these is the assignment in recent years of much additional emphasis to the US Army's role in the over-all U.S. policy of encouraging steady growth and change in the less developed countries in the

world. The many programs of the U.S. Government directed toward this objective are often grouped under the sometimes misleading label of counterinsurgency (some pronounceable term standing for insurgency prophylaxis would be better) . . .

Another major factor is the recognition at the highest levels of the defense establishment of the fact that relatively little is known, with a high degree of surety, about the social processes which must be understood in order to deal effectively with problems of insurgency . . .

Project CAMELOT will be a multidisciplinary effort. It will be conducted both within the SORO organization and in close collaboration with universities and other research institutions within the United States and overseas.¹

The project was terminated before it ever took off, in less than a year after the above memorandum was posted to a select list of scholars worldwide (Horowitz, 1967: 4). One of the scholars invited to join the project was Johan Galtung. He was invited to participate in a June 1965 conference that aimed to draw up a preliminary research design for the study of the potential for internal wars and the role of government action. The basis of this proposed conference was the 4 December memorandum. Galtung's reply of 22 April stated that he could not participate in Project Camelot for a number of reasons, one of them being the 'imperialist features' of the research design (Horowitz, 1967: 12–13). Numerous other examples can be cited here but the point is that social scientists may get involved in research that directly serves the imperialistic or hegemonic interests of a power.

There is also another sense in which we may understand academic imperialism. In addition to considering the role of social scientific research and scholarship in the service of political and economic imperialism, we may also think of it as analogous to political and economic imperialism, that is, the 'domination of one people by another in their world of thinking' (Alatas, S. H., 2000: 24). In other words, academic imperialism is a phenomenon analogous to political economic imperialism. There are imperialistic relations in the world of the social sciences that parallel those in the world of international political economy.

Academic imperialism in this sense began in the colonial period with the setting up and direct control of schools, universities and publishing houses by the colonial powers in the colonies. It is for this reason that it is accurate to say that the 'political and economic structure of imperialism generated a parallel structure in the way of thinking of the subjugated people' (Alatas, S. H., 2000: 24).² These parallels include the six main traits of exploitation, tutelage, conformity, secondary role of dominated intellectuals and scholars, rationalization of the civilizing mission, and the inferior talent of scholars from the home country specializing in studies of the colony (Alatas, S. H., 2000: 24–7).

Today, academic imperialism is more indirect than direct. If, under political economic imperialism the colonial powers had direct control over

the political systems, production and marketing of goods of the colonies, today that control is indirect via international law, the power of major commercial banks, the threat of military intervention by the superpowers, and covert and clandestine operations by various governments of advanced nations. Similarly, it can be said that in the postcolonial period what we have is academic neo-imperialism or academic neo-colonialism as the West's monopolistic control of and influence over the nature and flows of social scientific knowledge remain intact even though political independence has been achieved.

By the West I am referring specifically to what we may call the contemporary social science powers, which are the United States, Great Britain and France. These are defined as countries which (1) generate large outputs of social science research in the form of scientific papers in peer-reviewed journal, books, and working and research papers; (2) have a global reach of the ideas and information contained in these works; (3) have the ability to influence the social sciences of countries due to the consumption of the works originating in the powers; and (4) command a great deal of recognition, respect and prestige both at home and abroad.

If we go a little way back in history we could possibly consider Germany and Spain as social science powers, the former to the extent that it influenced sociology in Europe and North America from the 19th century up until the Second World War, and the latter to the extent that it dominated social thought in Latin America during the colonial period.

Today, however, the global influence of German sociology is much diminished with the exception of those works that are successfully 'marketed' globally as a result of having been translated into English, and read and taught in the US and Great Britain. It is important to make a distinction between the global dominance of certain authors on the one hand, and the global dominance of entire schools of thought or theoretical perspectives in sociology on the other hand. The lesser global influence of German sociology is in this latter sense. In the case of Latin America today, it is influenced more by French, German and American sociology than by Spanish ideas.

If in the colonial past, academic imperialism was maintained via colonial power, today academic neo-colonialism is maintained via the condition of academic dependency. The West's monopolistic control of and influence over the social sciences in much of the Third World are not determined in the first instance by force via colonial power but rather by the dependence of Third World scholars and intellectuals on western social science in a variety of ways.

Academic dependency theory is a dependency theory of the global state of the social sciences. It originated in Brazil in the 1950s, with its proponents recommending that Latin American social scientists cut their ties with the

social science powers of the West and instead develop autonomous or indigenized social sciences (Garreau, 1985: 114–15). According to academic dependency theory, the social sciences in intellectually dependent societies are dependent on institutions and ideas of western social science such that research agendas, the definition of problems areas, methods of research and standards of excellence are determined by or borrowed from the West. While the phenomenon has been identified, there have been few works that attempt to delineate the structure of academic dependency, notable exceptions being those of Altbach (1975, 1977) and Garreau (1985, 1988, 1991). The aim in this section is to do just that. As the parallel with economic dependency theory is clear, it would be logical to attempt a definition of academic dependency by beginning with a definition of economic dependency. The oft-quoted definition of economic dependency as given by Theotonio Dos Santos is as follows:

By dependence we mean a situation in which the economy of certain countries is conditioned by the development and expansion of another economy to which the former is subjected. The relation of interdependence between two or more economies, and between these and world trade, assumes the form of dependence when some countries (the dominant ones) can expand and can be self-sustaining, while other countries (the dependent ones) can do this only as a reflection of that expansion, which can have either a positive or a negative effect on their immediate development. (Dos Santos, 1970)³

If we consider the parallels between economic dependency and academic dependency we may define the latter as a condition in which the social sciences of certain countries are conditioned by the development and growth of the social sciences of other countries to which the former is subjected. The relations of interdependence between two or more social science communities, and between these and global transactions in the social sciences, assumes the form of dependency when some social science communities (those located in the social science powers) can expand according to certain criteria of development and progress, while other social science communities (those in the Third World, for example) can only do this as a reflection of that expansion, which can have mixed effects (positive and negative) on their development according to the same criteria. There is a psychological dimension to this dependency whereby the dependent scholar is more a passive recipient of research agenda, methods and ideas from the social science powers. This is due to a 'shared sense of . . . intellectual inferiority against the West'.⁴

There is, therefore, a centre–periphery continuum in the social sciences that corresponds roughly to the North–South divide (Lengyel, 1986: 105). Von Gizycki defines the centre as 'constituted by the fact that works produced there command more attention and acknowledgement than works produced elsewhere. A center is a place from which influence radiates' (von Gizycki, 1973: 474, cited in Lengyel, 1986: 105). While von Gizycki was

making this statement with respect to the international social science community of the 19th century, it continues to apply to the situation today. Kuwayama refers to a similar idea of the world system of anthropology in which 'the centre of gravity for acquisition of knowledge about a people is located elsewhere' (Kuwayama, 1997: 54).

The mode of conditioning and subjection of the social sciences in academically dominated countries depends on the dimensions of academic dependency that are operating. In two earlier publications (Alatas, S. F., 1999: 167–70; 2000a: 84–9) I listed the dimensions of academic dependency and provided empirical examples of each. These dimensions can be listed as follows:⁵

- 1 Dependence on ideas;
- 2 Dependence on the media of ideas;
- 3 Dependence on the technology of education;
- 4 Dependence on aid for research as well as teaching;
- 5 Dependence on investment in education;
- 6 Dependence of Third World social scientists on demand in the West for their skills.

The first dimension refers to the dependence on the various levels of social scientific activity, that is, metatheory, theory, empirical social science and applied social science. In both teaching and research knowledge at all these levels overwhelmingly originates from the US and the UK and, in the case of the former French colonies, France. There is hardly any original metatheoretical or theoretical analysis emerging from the Third World. While there is a significant amount of empirical work generated in the Third World much of this takes its cues from research in the West in terms of research agenda, theoretical perspectives and methods. This is the most important dimension of academic dependency. The other dimensions discussed later facilitate in one way or another the flow of ideas from the social science powers, but are in and of themselves meaningless without this first dimension.

The second dimension refers to dependence on the media of ideas such as books, scientific journals, proceedings of conferences, working papers and electronic publications of various kinds. The degree of academic dependency in this case can be gauged from the structure of ownership and control of publishing houses, journals, working paper series and websites.

Third, there is the technology dimension of the dependency relation in the social sciences. Western embassies, foundations and other non-governmental institutions often set up resource centres in Third World countries equipped with the latest information retrieval systems that are generally absent in local universities and institutions. While such resources are able to provide data and knowledge that would not be otherwise available, the choice of selection would naturally be limited to what is specified by the foreign organization providing these services.

The fourth dimension refers to aid dependence. Foreign funds and technical aid originating from governments, educational institutions and foundations in the US, Great Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Japan routinely find their way to scholars and educational institutions in the Third World. These funds are used to sponsor research, purchase books and other instructional materials, finance the publication of local books and journals, and buy expertise in the form of visiting scholars.

The fifth dimension of academic dependency concerns investment in education. This refers to the direct investment of educational institutions from the West in the Third World. An example would be the various degree programmes offered by North American, British and Australian universities in Asia, sometimes involving joint ventures with local organizations. Without such direct investment, there would be fewer opportunities for tertiary education and fewer teaching jobs available in Asian countries.

The sixth and final dimension of academic dependency under consideration here may also be termed the brain drain. The brain drain can readily be seen to be a dimension of academic dependency in the sense that Third World scholars become dependent on demand for their expertise in the West. The brain drain may not necessarily result in the physical relocation of these scholars in the West. In cases where there is no physical relocation, there is still a brain drain in terms of the using up of mental resources and energy for research projects conceived in the West but which employ Third World personnel as junior research partners.

Here it would be interesting to speculate about how academic dependency may be affected by shifts in the balance of economic power. It is not uncommon in Asia to hear optimistic views to the effect that if Asian economies overtake the West, Asian culture will become more dominant globally. The global hegemony of western culture is a result of two centuries of economic and political domination. It is reasonable to suggest that as Asia gains more economic strength, Asian cultural influence will as well. But, it is doubtful that any Asian nation or Asia as a whole would become dominant in the social sciences on a global scale. The case of Japan is instructive in this regard. Japan is a world economic power but it is not a social science power by any means. While Japanese social science is not dependent on the social science powers in terms of the dependence on the technology of education, aid for research and teaching, investment in education and demand in the West for their skills, there is some degree of dependence on western ideas and media of ideas. At the same time, Japanese social science wields some international influence, not through its ideas but via its provision of funding for research in the Third World through organizations such as the Japan Foundation and Toyota Foundation. But for all its economic might, Japanese social science has not challenged the position of the three reigning social science powers. This is not the place to go into the reasons for this. Nevertheless, the Japanese case shows that economic power alone does not bring

about social scientific dominance. There has to be a conscious effort on the part of social scientists and the administrators of research and teaching institutions to formulate and implement policies designed to help social science communities break out of the current division of labour. The Japanese case illustrates one possible avenue. Generally, the Japanese social science establishment, while very much influenced by western models, does not gauge success according to publications in western periodicals and western languages. There is, in a sense, an opting out of that game. The same is true of the German social sciences. In both cases, great prestige is to be derived from publishing in the national language in nationally recognized periodicals.

It is important to point out that while the social science powers are all western, this is not to suggest that the centre-periphery continuum corresponds to a West/non-West divide, for there are many western social science communities which do not have the features of a social science power and are dependent on the social science powers for ideas. While they may not suffer from the other dimensions of academic dependency, neither do they exert the global influence in the social sciences that is a characteristic of the US, British and French social science communities. This suggests the need for a third category, that of the semi-peripheral social science power. This may be defined as a social science community that is dependent on ideas originating in the social science centres, but which themselves exert some influence on peripheral social science communities by way of the provision of research funds, places in their universities for post-graduate students and post-doctoral fellows from the Third World, the funding of international conferences, and so on. Australia, Japan, the Netherlands and Germany are examples of semi-peripheral social science powers.

The Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences

We have said earlier that academic neo-colonialism is maintained by the condition of academic dependency, which we have detailed in terms of six dimensions. The claim that academic neo-colonialism is an existing phenomenon that defines the relationship between academic communities in the First and Third Worlds suggests that there is a relationship of inequality between the social sciences in the West, on the one hand, and the Third World, on the other. The nature of that inequality can be understood by scrutinizing the global division of labour in the social sciences. This division of labour is historically a direct consequence of academic colonialism and dependency but also in turn functions to perpetuate academic neo-colonialism and dependency. The global division of labour in the social sciences was originally determined by the colonial mode of knowledge production. The subsequent inequalities in relations between First World and Third World social science

communities that define what we are calling academic neo-colonialism and academic dependency are in turn maintained and even exacerbated by specific features of the current global knowledge division of labour. This division of labour has a number of characteristics:

1. The division between theoretical and empirical intellectual labour.
2. The division between other country studies and own country studies.
3. The division between comparative and single case studies.

The evidence to empirically verify that this division of labour is in operation in today's global social science is not difficult to provide. For example, data can be gathered from social science and area study journals, textbooks and encyclopaedias. One can also cite personal and anecdotal evidence.

The first characteristic refers to the phenomenon of social scientists in the social science powers engaging in both theoretical as well as empirical research while their counterparts in the Third World do mainly empirical research. A glance at several issues of a leading theory journal in the discipline of sociology, *Sociological Theory*,⁶ will reveal this. Volume 20 (2002) of that journal carried 20 articles authored by a total of 28 authors. All of them were based in universities in the US, despite the fact that the journal calls for submissions in all areas of social thought and social theory and does not specify any particular theoretical or geographical area of interest. Volume 32 (2002) of the journal, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*,⁷ carried 23 articles, discussions and review essays and the breakdown of authors by country of residence is as follows: 14 of the authors came from the US, Britain and France while other countries such as Canada, Italy, Israel, New Zealand, Spain, Belgium, Germany and South Africa were represented by either one or two authors. Three countries from the social science powers account for more than half of the articles published in this volume. Volume 31 (2002) of *Theory and Society*⁸ published a total of 16 articles. Among the 20 authors of these articles, 15 were based in the US, two in Germany, one in Canada, one in France and one in Singapore.

The second characteristic refers to the fact that scholars in First World countries undertake studies of both their own countries as well as other countries, while scholars in the Third World tend to confine themselves to research on their own countries.

The third characteristic refers to the far greater frequency of comparative work in the West as compared to generally single case studies which almost always coincide with own country studies in the Third World.

The distribution of authors by country of residence in the journal, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*,⁹ will show some trends along the lines of the second and third characteristics described earlier. The 2002 volume of this journal (Vol. 44) carried a total of 19 articles. Out of 34 authors in this volume, 20 were based in the US, four in the UK and one in France,

the rest being in Second and Third World countries. What is striking is that the vast majority of articles written on Second and Third World topics, such as Cuba, Romania, Bangladesh, Ottoman Damascus, China and so on, were authored by people based in one of the social science powers. Furthermore, a study of various issues of this journal would reveal that articles with a comparative perspective tend to be written by scholars based in one of the social science powers.

Area studies journals are too numerous to go over here. But it would be very obvious to anyone who surveyed them that most of the articles on non-western topics are authored either by scholars based in one of the social science powers or by scholars who are nationals of the country being written about.

If we define progress in the social sciences in terms of the development of original concepts, theories, models and methods which are creatively applied to a wide range of historical and comparative empirical situations in the context of research agendas independently drawn up according to certain criteria of relevance, it will be readily understood that this division of labour in the social sciences actually hinders such progress. The division of labour, therefore, functions to perpetuate academic dependency and academic neo-colonialism.¹⁰

The Prospects for Academic Dependency Reversal

There are many problems faced by the social sciences in the Third World. Some of these are management and administration-related problems. Others are of a more intellectual nature and have to do with the history and development of the social sciences in the Third World, as well as certain philosophical and epistemological problems plaguing the social sciences. These problems have been identified in various theoretical studies on the state of the social sciences in developing societies and include Orientalism (Said, 1979, 1993), Eurocentrism (Amin, 1979), the theory of the captive mind (Alatas, S. H., 1972, 1974), rhetorical theories of social science (Alatas, S. F., 1998), pedagogical theories of modernization (Illich, 1973; Al-e Ahmad, n.d.; Freire, 1970), colonial critiques (Fanon, 1961; Césaire, 1955; Memmi, 1957), and, of course, academic dependency theory (Altbach, 1975, 1977; Garreau, 1985, 1988, 1991; Alatas, S. F., 1999, 2000a).

What are the prospects for academic dependency reversal? The problem is structural and the partial dismantling of this structure requires concerted action on the part of social scientists all over the world. Before this can be done, however, some more basic problems need to be addressed:

1. The social sciences should not be regarded merely as factors that contribute to economic growth. This would result in greater support for

those areas in the social sciences that were deemed more practical. The overriding concern should be with a broader conception of development that understands the role of the social sciences in bringing about development in this wider sense.

2. Social science communities in the Third World, particularly those with more resources, should consider various means of attracting a critical mass of post-doctoral students and researchers with high qualifications such as PhDs so that they may carry out their research work there. Various incentives would have to be thought of to achieve this.
3. The development of a vibrant and creative social science community cannot take place without a well-developed tertiary education sector. There should be serious efforts to rationalize and upgrade universities in a number of areas including the following: (a) international benchmarking of research output and facilities; (b) competitive remuneration packages to stem the tide of the brain drain and to attract local scientists working abroad; (c) expansion of research facilities, especially libraries and scientific equipment, etc.

Assuming that the necessity of these aspects is recognized, what can be done to block developments in the direction of academic dependency? A few suggestions can be made here.

First of all, there has to be more serious theoretical and empirical research on the problems of academic dependency and academic colonialism. This research needs to be communicated to students and academicians via teaching, publications and international conferences. Beyond this, it is vital that the public is also made conscious of the problem. However, there have been few works that deal with the problem of delineating the structure of academic dependency in both the social science powers as well as academically dependent social science communities. This is partly due to that very structure of academic dependency in force. Many conceptual and practical problems that are peculiar to the social sciences in developing societies such as academic dependency, the problem of relevance, the problem of mental captivity and others have not become regular features of social science research in the developing world mainly because the social scientists there tend to take their cues from the social science powers in the drawing up of their research agenda. They do this in ways consistent with the global division of labour outlined earlier.

Second, beyond just talking about the problem, social scientists should consider measures to deal with each dimension of academic dependency. For example, the dependence on ideas from the social science powers can be lessened by efforts to write classical sociological theory textbooks that feature not only European thinkers such as Marx, Weber and Durkheim but also non-European contemporaries such as Sarkar¹¹ and Rizal.¹²

Third, these efforts can be significantly aided by greater interaction

among the social scientists of the Third World. This cannot be left to chance. While there are ample opportunities for scholars from the Third World to meet each other, they tend to gravitate to the West for conferences and research opportunities. It is necessary, therefore, to form regional associations. For example, there is a need for an Asian sociological association. Such a regional association could consciously strive to organize events that bring together scholars from all over the world with similar concerns about academic dependency and focus on research and activism around this theme.

Education in the humanities and social sciences in developing societies should not be downplayed. It must be realized that those civilizations which made seminal contributions to the sciences such as the Chinese, Indians and Muslims had a strong foundation in philosophy and theology which function to develop the creative instinct. To the extent that the arts and humanities may play this role today, quality education in these areas must be provided too.

Notes

Earlier versions of this article were presented at the XXVIII All India Sociological Conference, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, 18–20 December 2002, and at the International Seminar, 'Equity, Equality and Diversity in Globalised Societies', Faculty of Political and Social Science, National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), Mexico City, 8–10 April 2003. I would like to thank the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, National University of Singapore, for funding my trips to these conferences.

- 1 The complete text is printed in Horowitz (1967: 47–9).
- 2 This theme was first discussed by Syed Hussein Alatas in a lecture to the History Society, National University of Singapore, in 1969. See Alatas, S. H. (1969).
- 3 This is taken from Dos Santos's original Spanish. See Dos Santos (1968: 6).
- 4 This point was made by Lie (1996) for Japan but applies to other social science communities as well.
- 5 This centre–periphery continuum or structure of academic dependency applies equally to the humanities, particularly those areas concerned with the theoretical or conceptual study of literature and the arts as opposed to the generation of literature and art per se. What is being said here about academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences applies to the sciences as well. For a strong case made in this regard, see Rahman (1983).
- 6 Published by Blackwell Publishing for the American Sociological Association.
- 7 Published by Sage Publications.
- 8 Published by Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 9 Published by Cambridge University Press.
- 10 If such data were to be gathered from periodicals published in the Third World similar results would be obtained.

- 11 Benoy Kumar Sarkar (1887–1949) systematically critiqued various dimensions of Orientalist Indology. Writing in the early part of the 20th century, Sarkar was well ahead of his time when he censured Asian thinkers for having fallen ‘victim to the fallacious sociological methods and messages of the modern West, to which the postulate of an alleged distinction between the Orient and the Occident is the first principle of science’ (Sarkar, 1985: 19).
- 12 Jose Rizal (1861–96), Filipino thinker and reformer, was a very early critic of the state of knowledge in Southeast Asia. Among his numerous works is his annotated re-edition of Antonio de Morga’s *Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, which first appeared in 1609. Prior to producing this work Morga served eight years in the Philippines as Lieutenant Governor General and Captain General as well as a justice of the Supreme Court of Manila (Audiencia Real de Manila) (de Morga, 1962: xxx). Rizal believed that Spanish colonization had virtually wiped out the precolonial past from the memory of Filipinos and presented his annotated re-edition in order to correct false reports and slanderous statements to be found in most Spanish works on the Philippines (Rizal, 1962: vii).

References

- ALATAS, Syed Farid (1998) ‘The Rhetorics of Social Science in Developing Societies’, CAS Research Papers Series No 1. Singapore: Centre for Advanced Studies, National University of Singapore.
- ALATAS, Syed Farid (1999) ‘Colonization of the Social Sciences and the Structure of Academic Dependency’, *Replika* (Budapest) 38: 163–79 (in Hungarian).
- ALATAS, Syed Farid (2000a) ‘Academic Dependency in the Social Sciences: Reflections on India and Malaysia’, *American Studies International* 38(2): 80–96.
- ALATAS, Syed Farid (2000b) ‘An Introduction to the Idea of Alternative Discourses’, *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 28(1): 1–12.
- ALATAS, Syed Hussein (1969) ‘Academic Imperialism’, Lecture delivered to the History Society, University of Singapore, 26 September.
- ALATAS, Syed Hussein (1972) ‘The Captive Mind in Development Studies’, *International Social Science Journal* 34(1): 9–25.
- ALATAS, Syed Hussein (1974) ‘The Captive Mind and Creative Development’, *International Social Science Journal* 36(4): 691–9.
- ALATAS, Syed Hussein (1978) ‘Social Aspects of Endogenous Intellectual Creativity: The Problem of Obstacles – Guidelines for Research’, Working Paper for Project on Socio-Cultural Development Alternatives in a Changing World, United Nations University, pp. 1–9.
- ALATAS, Syed Hussein (1979) ‘Towards an Asian Social Science Tradition’, *New Quest* 17: 265–9.
- ALATAS, Syed Hussein (2000) ‘Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits and Problems’, *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science* 28(1): 23–45.
- AL-E AHMAD, Jalal (n.d.) *Gharbzadegi* (Weststruckness). Tehran: Ravaq Press.
- ALTBACH, Philip G. (1975) ‘Literary Colonialism: Books in the Third World’, *Harvard Educational Review* 45: 226–36.

- ALTBACH, Philip G. (1977) 'Servitude of the Mind? Education, Dependency, and Neocolonialism', *Teachers College Record* 79(2): 187-204.
- AMIN, Samir (1979) *Eurocentrism*. London: Zed Books.
- ATAL, Yogesh (1981) 'The Call For Indigenization', *International Social Science Journal* 43(1): 189-97.
- CÉSAIRE, Aimé (1955) *Discours sur le colonialisme*. Paris : Editions Présence Africaine.
- CHAKRABARTY, Dipesh (1992) 'Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?', *Representations* 37: 1-26.
- DE MORGHA, Antonio (1962) *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands by Dr Antonio de Morga, Published in Mexico in 1609, Recently Brought to Light and Annotated by José Rizal, Preceded by a Prologue by Dr Ferdinand Blumentritt, Writings of José Rizal Volume VI*. Manila: National Historical Institute. (Orig. pub. 1890.)
- DOS SANTOS, Theotonio (1968) 'La crisis de la teoría del desarrollo y las relaciones de dependencia en América Latina', *Boletín del CESO* 3.
- DOS SANTOS, Theotonio (1970) 'The Structure of Dependence', *American Economic Review* 60.
- FAHIM, Hussein (1970) 'Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries', *Current Anthropology* 20(2): 397.
- FAHIM, Hussein and HELMER, Katherine (1980) 'Indigenous Anthropology in Non-Western Countries: A Further Elaboration', *Current Anthropology* 21(5): 644-50.
- FANON, Frantz (1961) *Les Damnés de la terre*. Paris: François Maspero éditeur.
- FREIRE, Paulo (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- GARREAU, Frederick H. (1985) 'The Multinational Version of Social Science with Emphasis Upon the Discipline of Sociology', *Current Sociology* 33(3): 1-169.
- GARREAU, Frederick H. (1988) 'Another Type of Third World Dependency: The Social Sciences', *International Sociology* 3(2): 171-8.
- GARREAU, Frederick H. (1991) *The Political Economy of the Social Sciences*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- HOROWITZ, Irving Louis, ed. (1967) *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship Between Social Science and Practical Politics*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- ILLICH, Ivan D. (1973) *Deschooling Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- KUWAYAMA, Takami (1997) 'Native Anthropologists: With Special Reference to Japanese Studies Inside and Outside Japan', *Japan Anthropology Workshop Newsletter* 26-7 September: 52-6.
- LENGYEL, Peter (1986) *International Social Science: The UNESCO Experience*. New Brunswick, NJ and Oxford: Transaction Books.
- LIE, John (1996) 'Sociology of Contemporary Japan', Trend Report, *Current Sociology* 44(1): 1-101.
- MEMMI, Albert (1957) *Portrait du Colonisé précédé du Portrait du Colonisateur*. Paris: Editions Buchet/Chastel.
- PRAKASH, Gyan (1990) 'Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 32(2): 383-408.
- PRAKASH, Gyan (1992) 'Postcolonialism and Indian Historiography', *Social Text* 10(31-2): 8-19.

- RAHMAN, Abdur (1983) *Intellectual Colonisation: Science and Technology in West-East Relations*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- RIZAL, José (1962) 'To the Filipinos', in *Historical Events of the Philippine Islands by Dr Antonio de Morga, Published in Mexico in 1609, Recently Brought to Light and Annotated by José Rizal, Preceded by a Prologue by Dr Ferdinand Blumentritt, Writings of José Rizal Volume VI*. Manila: National Historical Institute. (Orig. pub. 1890.)
- SAID, Edward (1979) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- SAID, Edward (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- SARKAR, Benoy Kumar (1985) *The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. (Orig. pub. 1937.)
- VON GIZYCKI, Rainald (1973) 'Centre and Periphery in the International Scientific Community: Germany, France and Great Britain in the 19th Century', *Minerva* 11(4): 474-94.
- WALLERSTEIN, Immanuel (1996) 'Eurocentrism and its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science', paper presented at the East Asian Regional Colloquium on The Future of Sociology in East Asia, jointly organized by the Korean Sociological Association and the International Sociological Association, 22-3 November.