

**Professor Sujata Patel**

**30<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

**Webinar Series: Decolonial Research Methods: Resisting Coloniality in Academic Knowledge Production**

**URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MrHXUIWmeTU>**

**Organised by: Dr Leon Moosavi, University of Liverpool, UK**

**Sponsored by: National Centre for Research Methods (UK)**

**Transcribed by: Ms Yuqi Ong**

Good morning and good afternoon and good evening to all of you. I'm very happy that Leon has organized these webinars. I've heard most of them so I feel very honored to be part of this discussion and it's really good that so many people have registered and are willing to listen and are willing to engage and discuss and deliberate on this theme. So thank you once again, Leon, for organizing this.

Before I start discussing what I would like to talk about, I want to say two things, preliminaries. The first is that I'm a historical sociologist and I work in the history of ideas and sociology of knowledge and this is the perspective I bring to the theme of decolonial research methodology. So this should alert all of you who are listening to this webinar that I am going to use the historical methodology to try and understand how do we think, conceptualize, analyze, and assess decolonial research methodology. The second point is more operational, that it's a very long paper that I've written and I find it very difficult to make a summary of this long paper and as a consequence, I'm using the PPTs to sort of shorten and give main points of my argument, but whilst doing so, and whilst putting together this PPT, I realized that it has also gone longer than I had estimated. So do help me to ensure that we can keep it within the 45 minutes cover and also I'm willing to discuss many of these issues with you later in the discussion after the presentation.

So let me start with the following point. Given that research methodology is about using specific procedures and techniques to identify select process and analyze information about any topic, I'm using the historical methodology to comprehend what is decolonial, and what are the methodological issues that the decolonial methodology raises to scholars. Decolonial to me is a generic concept. I know that there is a perspective called decoloniality and I'm distinguishing myself from that perspective by suggesting that we can use, given that the topic of these webinars is decolonial research methodology, we can use decolonial as a generic concept and we must

recognize that it is associated with other perspectives, such as postcolonial, Eurocentrism, colonial modernity, Southern theory, and Indigenous theories, and it has a range of concepts such as 'captive mind', coloniality, colonial difference, extraversion, and subalternity. So given the range of concepts and given the perspectives that are there, I first like to identify what are the common themes among all these perspectives. The first theme is that they always use colonialism and or imperialism as a grid through which the politics of knowledge construction has been assessed by these perspectives. Secondly, in various ways, they all critically dissect dominant or hegemonic academic knowledge produced since the late 19th century in Europe through its university system and which has since defined the disciplines of sociology, social sciences, and humanities more generally though we do find decolonial knowledge now even in terms of sciences. Decolonial perspectives in its generic forms, that is all these arenas which I've just discussed, contain two organically and interrelated parts, and this is important. First, it has a methodology to study the social, based on an ontological, epistemic viewpoint, and second, it has a theory to assess alternate pathways towards modernities based on this ontology/epistemology. And lastly, these theories can be divided into two broad perspectives. These have emerged, one in settler colonialism, and the other one has emerged in non-settler colonialism. And as we go ahead, you will realize that it is the architects of this scholarship itself who have defined what are the differences between the two.

The decolonial may have become popular now, but as a theory of politics of knowledge, it has a very long history. It originates in early 20th century in the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and in and through anti-colonial, or anti-imperialist movements. Some of these anti-colonial movements are transformed into nationalist movements and the decolonial invents itself through nationalism and creates its own methodological problems and issues. Later, it's sponsored by various independent nation-states and once again, it reformulates itself within the nation-states of independent, ex-colonial countries, and thereby creates further methodological issues for discussion. Each of these perspectives have established, and that is one of my contentions, these have established their own cognitive, geographical circuits, creating territories and boundaries for organizing debates and deliberations on the various versions of the decolonial as it has emerged from the early 20th century.

In this presentation, I'm going to assess the temporal and spatial spread in three continents from 40s to 70s in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and from 80s onwards in North America, through three perspectives - the Indigenous Indigeneity, dependency, post-colonial, and decolonial. It will

trace how decolonial knowledge in a generic understanding creates circuits which are originated in early-mid 20th century in these Asian, African, and Latin American nation-states, and traces its travel from there to North America in the late 20th century as post-colonial and decolonial perspectives, and the 3 questions I'm asking through these 3 perspectives is, "What theories in the field of sociology of knowledge, and all epistemology have scholars utilize to critique Western colonial assumptions?". Secondly, "What practices of knowledge-making, that is theories, methodologies, and methods, have been extracted and utilized and redesigned to produce a sociological or a social scientific analysis of their regions?". And thirdly, "What has been the nature of the internal critiques that these positions, as I've outlined them, have subsequently generated?".

As I said, there are many perspectives and I'm restricting myself today only to these three perspectives and within the first emergence of decolonial theory in Asia and Africa and Latin America, I'm just, I'm only going to talk today on the Indigenous and Indigeneity perspective, and Asian and African contributions. And I'm not going to talk about how Indigeneity gets reconstituted within nationalism and the problems that methodologically raise, nor the problems that it raises when they become part of the nation-state. But having said so, and I'm willing to discuss this later, I will start with the Indigenous-Indigenous perspective. Its growth is related to a particular event that took place - the Bandung conference in 1955, where 29 Asian and African countries, mainly from non-settler colonial countries, came together to design an international position for themselves outside the First and the Second World. So as a consequence, we have for the first time, the constitution of the Third World, as well as non-alignment as the international relation or a foreign policy for these 29 nations. This generated also a way to think about how to see one's own nation state, and how to perceive development, growth, and change in these nation-states. So a new model of design-for-development, outside the political influence of the First and Second World War, economic models of capitalism and communism, were thought out, framed, presented and designed to ensure that a self-rule from colonial theories of academic colonialism is made possible. In the 60s and 70s thus, these nation-states defined Indigenous and Indigeneity as having 4 attributes. Indigenous, mainly constituting social science concepts in local and regional languages with the use of local resources. Secondly, it may mean research by insiders, natives or citizens, rather than outsiders, which is non-citizens. Thirdly, it may mean determination of research priorities in terms of national priorities. And lastly, it may mean new perspectives and paradigms for social sciences in terms of local, national philosophical and cultural themes and intellectual legacies. It is my contention, that it is the fourth attribute of Indigenous that is most

discussed today. But in almost every country which participated in the Bandung conference, we see various interventions in the first three also in these countries where Indigenous has been presented and it's important that we analyze and assess the contributions made in terms of the first three principles also. But coming back to the fourth principle, that is, the construction of a paradigm based on local philosophical cultural theme and intellectual legacies, there are many scholars who have attempted to put together what is an Indigenous perspective in almost all the scholarship that we find both in Asia and Africa. For those who have come from Malaysia and Singapore, you must be aware of the contribution of Hussein Alatas. But for this moment, I would like to discuss the Nigerian, North African sociologist, Akiwowo Akinsola, and the intellectual resources he used to formulate a new perspective for social sciences from the region's cultural and philosophical principles. In the 1986 World Congress of Sociology, which was held in Delhi, he presented this position and it then got discussed, debated in the Congress as well as it has been discussed and debated in the issues of International Sociology. Akiwowo's project was built on an excavation of tales, myths, and proverbs of the Yoruba people – Yoruba people are about 40 million in Africa today, and they cover the whole North and West African region – and he affirmed that ideas and notions contained in a type of African oral poetry can be extrapolated in the form of propositions for testing in future sociological theories in Africa or in other world societies. The key philosophical principle that he introduced to understand association is *asuwada*, and he looked at Yoruba poems to understand the theory of association. *Asuwada*, for him, implies that although the unit of all social life is individual and individual as a corporeal self needs fellowship of other individuals, this establishes society. There is a lot more that I can say about Akiwowo's work, but because of time constraint, I'm just restricting myself to this much of Akiwowo, but I just want to move ahead to the criticism and appreciation that exists for Akiwowo's work in Africa, across the continent of Africa, and recently the Journal of African Studies has published an entire issue on Akiwowo's contribution to creating Indigenous knowledge in context with the politics of knowledge of an imposition of Western knowledge on African understanding of themselves, as their own autonomous, social, individual actors. The critique that has emerged, of Akiwowo relates to this whole question of whether folk culture can be used to construct a sociological theory of a people and this is a large question because I am sure this is something which anthropologists, ethnographers, as well as sociologists, have always debated methodologically. Sociological concepts have always been constituted from commonsensical notions and cultural particularities. But we need to ask, "What are the methods to examine the lived truth of Indigenous concepts and theories constituted from such evidence. Can myth and magic give us these concepts, or do we search for other lived truths?". There are other

methodological queries that have emerged in the discussion of Akiwowo, “Why only Yoruba poems? Why not use concepts of other groups and other peoples in Africa? Are their translations and interpretations correct? What about competing translations and interpretations? Additionally, these are evolving oral traditions, so they have evolved over time and then which ones become significant, given the fact that concepts itself change, meanings itself change?”. So what principles will allow us to resolve, debate and resolve these scientific issues, is the queries that various scholars within Africa have raised. And lastly, can we disassociate our concepts from these meanings and construct an endogenous science against an Indigenous science? To construct endogenous knowledge, it has been argued, it is important to move from translation to formulation.

And this brings me to the intervention by Paulin Hountondji, a Beninian philosopher, African philosopher, who makes a distinction between endogenous, which he thinks is scientific knowledge, and Indigenous, which is ideological knowledge. And this distinction is based on two principles. The first is that he argues that the concept of Indigenous has emerged within the binary of West versus the East and is part of a colonial knowledge. I must add here, that there is a fascinating biography that had just come out, a year back actually, on Hountondji, which gives an extensive idea of his work and I would urge everyone to read that. So Hountondji says that this whole distinction of Indigenous that is African and non-Indigenous which is West, has emerged from within the binary of the West versus the East, and is also therefore part of colonial knowledge. Should we then use Indigenous, which is actually a representation of the African, in the context of the binary too, as our own perspective, to reconstruct the sociology of Africa? And because it is constituted as the ‘Other’ of the West, it has not been able to, according to Hountondji, develop cultures of science in order to interrogate its own philosophical traditions, and create thereby, an internal dialogue with these kinds of knowledge. Hountondji accepts, and this is the second point about endogenous which is significant, that some Western ideas, concepts, or theories may have relevance to local contexts. Others may not. So, “What kinds of knowledge have been adapted and assimilated? And what have not been?” is a question all social scientists have to ask. He therefore asks readers to query why African knowledges, that is their local knowledges, did not develop new cultures of scientific traditions that can be accepted as truths or as science. And the answer to this lies in his conception of extraversion, that is externally produced knowledge. African knowledges, he argues, are steeped in extraversion and they lack the autonomy to develop scientific practices to reproduce themselves. Hountondji identifies many attributes that define extraversion, he's got 7 or 9 of them, depending on which article we look at,

but I have highlighted 3 or 4 of them for our discussion. The first is the autonomy to produce and publish books and journals. The second is the autonomy to have independent publishing house, to house, thirdly, libraries and archives. And fourthly, development of research, specializations topics, and questions. Thus, Hountondji argues that today, if Africa doesn't have scientific cultures, it is because of extraversion and science and today's science and its political economy promotes academic tourists circuits with diasporic scholars circulating between the core and the periphery. The only alternative, he argues, is to break the binary of the colonial and the Indigenous. What I would like to suggest is, that from the point in 1940s and 50s, when the politics of knowledge production got entangled with how to produce alternative knowledge, we have come, with Hountondji, with a new perspective on circulation of knowledge, how knowledge which circulates creates dependencies. So we have seen this transition in the Indigenous, endogenous debate that took place in Africa. And I leave it to that and we can have a discussion later.

As I said earlier, there are other ways in which scholars and scholarship has evolved in various parts of the regions of Asia and Africa on Indigenous and Indigeneity, and there are two other knowledge circuits that I can identify. One which got influenced with nationalism and one which got influenced with the nation-state itself. India is one prime example for this, but I'm not going to deal with this right now because particularly, we don't have much time for this. Let me go to the Latin American regional social science. Unlike Indigenous and Indigeneity which spread across the region with different scholars and scholarship emerging in various regions on how to understand Indigenous or Indigeneity, in Latin America, I would like to contend, we see the growth of a Latin American regional social science. The context, of course, is immediate, while Indigenous/Indigeneity emerges in anti-colonialism, Latin American regional social science emerges in anti-imperialist politics against the economic and cultural domination of USA and Europe. And they develop a new intellectual institutional infrastructure from 1940s, 50s, onwards. For example, in Santiago de Chile through CEPAL, and subsequently in the 50s and 60s through institutions like FLASCO, CLAPCS, ELAS, ELACP, and CLASCO. And intellectual collective develops around dependency theories. It is in this context that Aníbal Quijano's work on coloniality of power as an ontological epistemic perspective emerges to justify these developments. I would like to add that Quijano was in Chile, in Santiago when CEPAL was formed and was loosely associated with many, many institutions that were there at that time in Chile, in the 50s and 60s. So I'm not going to look at the contribution of the Latin American regional social science school around the dependency theories, it's much talked about, a lot of people have worked on it, have presented ideas on it. Let me go Quijano's work to understand how a new ontological epistemic

emerges which continues with the work done earlier by Akiwowo, by the other scholars also from Hussein Alatas to Mukherjee in India, to many others. And I would, I'm concentrating on Quijano, just to show the distinctions that Quijano's work has from other theorists in North America. Quijano integrates arguments of the World System approach drawn from Wallerstein with those of Latin American scholars such as Sergio Bagu and Gonzalez Casanova. Casanova is the one who has theorized internal colonialism. His work links to earlier positions on Eurocentrism taken by the historian of science, Martin Bernal, who wrote the full volume, *Black Athena* and the Marxist political economist Samir Amin. Quijano shows a Marxist historical sensibility that presents in a new perspective a history of settler colonialism from 15th to early 16th century through an assessment of the processes of control and subordination of labor in the forms of slavery, servitude and wage labor, or a combination of them, and analyzes how the interconnections between Iberian colonialism and Latin America formed in the 16th to 18th century, a Eurocentric analysis of colonial capital. Within Europe and Eurocentrism, so I would like to distinguish how these connections got together to present two different ways to think of social sciences. Within Europe, Eurocentrism influenced scientific technological developments on one hand, but what's also implicated in many of the theories of universal history and culture, is also the growth of social sciences. And we see, and we can note this in the text, *Open Social Sciences*. In Latin America on the other hand, they experienced some settler colonialism, led to theories that justified an economic process that extracted and transferred value through the control and subordination of forms of labor to capital. In turn, it legitimized a social classification system around the category of race, thereby creating a racial division of labor. It also legitimized the institutions of nation-state, and the notions of democracy in a new way, and thereby presented a Eurocentric theory of modernity. For me, I think individual and collective identities and constituting the sociability of the subject population in Latin America. So Quijano would conclude that Eurocentrism consists of two attributes, the constitution of the binary and the theory of linear history, a peculiar dualistic evolutionary historical perspective. Methodologically, Quijano's interventions are important as against the issues and problems I raised about the ontological-epistemic that the Indigenous theory had presented. The positive parts of Quijano's work implies that it is important to integrate economic, political, cultural, intellectual relationships that produces between the two regions, distinct yet connected cognitive circuits. These circulate within geographical, geographic regions established by colonialism and imperialism. It also implies a theory that emerges from an assessment of social economic context and changes that these induce. And it asks the question, "What is the consequence of that which has been?". It's a historically oriented theory and it uses a Marxist historical methodology to understand what is, and what is the consequence of that which

has been. And one can see this in the contributions he's made, Quijano has made, on the sociology of Latin America, where he suggests, that everyday life, values and norms, institutionalized in family system, in marriage alliances, in economics, in politics, in sexualities, in education, in pedagogies and philosophies, all can be investigated through this perspective. But much more important, in my assessment, Quijano's methodology brings his observations and interpretations of the archival documentation with empirical evidence and actual events, and sees these with objects and things that organize experiences, while integrating these with mechanisms, causes, power and structures that have in turn produced these events. It's a theory of how to do research but, he also argues that there is no methodology or method, which is autonomous from the ideologies of the consequence of that which has been. Thus, methods and methodologies need to be deconstructed and located in the knowledge system of its structuration in order to comprehend its purpose of inquiry into reality and for the production of its knowledge. This implies that the reflexive assessment of the methodology is as equally important as its history of its use, and its philosophical origins need to be explored before they are reused again.

So, I shift now to North America. From the 70s and 80s onwards we see the slow decline of the Indigenous and Indigeneity projects from Asia and Africa and of dependency in Latin America. Given that both the Third World as a concept and Non-Alignment as a political intervention no longer becomes important in the context of globalization, and the emergence of a bigger Europe and the decline of Eastern Europe and Russia. It is at this moment, post-colonialism emerges in the US and later decolonial, decolonial theory in late 90s, in the US. Post-colonialism grew as an academic project that deconstructed the hegemonic orientation of teaching research and writing of English literature within mainstream American universities. Its key interlocutors were from the diasporic communities of West and South Asia. They brought to bear in the teaching and study of mainstream English literature the sensibilities and memories of anti-colonial movements with the experience of discrimination and prejudice faced by these communities in the US thereby quelling the legitimacy given to the ideology of American exceptionalism by American scholarship. Said's Orientalism was an epistemic critique of the ontology of 'Orient' created and consumed as an imaginary. This perspective built on anti-imperialist Marxists and communist approaches, popular in 60s and 70s in the Arab world. However, Said makes a clean break from its Marxist genealogy, integrating Foucault's structuralist and post-structuralist critique in his assessment of Orientalism. Thus, Orientalism becomes a field of knowledge which needs... which he argues, it should not be seen only as corporate institution, or as a mode of thought based on a particular... but should be seen as a mode of thought, based on a particular epistemology and ontology, which



establish a division between Orient and Occident. Said uses Foucault's concept of power and knowledge to understand how discourse of power becomes resistant to change and transformation because of its linguistic constitution. Therefore, therefore Said, and for those who are post-colonialists from the literary perspective, there's no phenomena outside of language. For language is self-referential.

Since 90s, postcolonialism gets a new group associated with it. And that is, the Subaltern Studies scholars who had migrated to the US. And in addition to the field of language and literature, now the discipline of history is associated also with post-colonialism. If Said used literary texts to analyze the West's project of domination of the Orient, the Subalterns used... it's argued that the recovery of the subaltern subject was only possible by deconstructing the historical documents in the archive for the interrogation of relationship between power and knowledge is only possible through the subaltern postcolonial perspective. Therefore, for both these groups, doing post-coloniality is doing politics against colonialism and imperialism. Post-colonialism becomes not only a theory of knowledge, but a theoretical practice and one can do it as a scholar. One does not need to think of oneself outside scholarship to do this. This is a methodology that can transform knowledge from static discipline competence to an active intervention. The postcolonial project is not only about constituting and legitimizing, it's not about constituting and legitimizing new political modernities, which was the project of Indigeneity and Indigenous, as well as Latin American regional social science. Its project remains ontological position to reject Western knowledge through its deconstruction of literature and languages and documents in the archives. There is no engagement here with the relationship of processes and structures with literature or with the way events, processes, and systems engage with the documents in the archive. And thus post-colonialism has evoked many criticism. That it's too simplistic, that there are many differences and the Orient is constituted in one universal argument, that it has had the scholarship in this orientation has perceived every text as a narrative of power, rather than being one of those constituting a corpus. Secondly, postcolonialism theoretical architecture is a formation of an epistemic difference between West and East and the use of the binary of we, they, or I, Other, that has made the West, the creation of all fields that organized contemporary orientalism. But much more important has been the social scientific intervention and its critique. This relates to its anti-foundationalist position. If the two descriptions of the real world are rejected, how do we study it? And this is a tension that continues to be there in the next decolonial perspective that I'm going to next speak on.

It is in the early 1990s that Latin American scholars in the USA got together and made a group called the post-colonial Latin American Studies program. This group argued, borrowing from the post-colonialists, Subalternists, as well as Orientalists, that Eurocentrism emerges to cloak the organic linkages between coloniality and modernity. By 1998, this group... so by the end of 90s, they realized that they had little in common with post-colonialists and rechristened themselves as 'decoloniality/modernity group' and remains dependent on Quijano's theory of coloniality to present itself in this fashion. They argued that the post-colonialists made a critique of British colonialism, which was established in 18th and 19th century. This being a second phase of modernity, post-colonialism does not have a language to critique the colonizer from the episteme of the colonized, therefore that is from an exterior position. On the other hand, decoloniality is an attempt to find an epistemic voice outside modernity, that's the argument, with which to formulate new universes that have not inherited such totalitarian orientations. Thus, decoloniality is a new episteme that comprehends the historical process necessary for the creation of original sets of concepts. It is contended that a voice will be found among the Indigenous groups, that is the original inhabitants, and I would like to stress here that Indigenous in settler-colonialism is used differently from non-settler colonial. So going forward, within the regions of Caribbean Mesoamerica and the Andes, the decolonialists draw on a variety of thinkers who have critiqued settler-colonialism to create this new epistemology. These range from Latin America, such as Dussel, in addition Quijano, and others in Africa and the Caribbean such as Fanon, Cesaire, James, whose concepts have been integrated with perspectives, such as dependency theories, liberation theology, and ideas popularized by some Latin American social movements. This approach has developed many concepts, and most of you must have heard about it in the last webinars so I leave it, at this moment. Though presented as a radical project, as an inquiry in the broader systems of thought which make possible non-Eurocentric thinking, it has faced many criticisms from Latin American historians and social scientists. And the questions are, some of the questions I'm presenting here, but there are detailed ones which you may like to look at at some point. "Does coloniality have an ontological relevance given the sweep of capitalist modernity in Latin America? Do all forms of colonialism have similar implications? Do all countries have similar racial division of labor? Given that decolonial perspective is now used to examine forms of genocide in Rwanda, Armenia, Cambodia, in the Palestine, this begs the question of whether settler colonialism has now emerged in a new avatar, and whether it has similar knowledge implications?". The decolonials have increasingly used the methodologies of postmodern, modernism, post-structuralism and deconstruction in their search for alternative epistemic voice, and in understanding of difference in narratives of Indigeneity, racism, and

ethnicity. There's a complete absence, unfortunately, of political economy, and the discussion of economic development in decoloniality. Given the lack of engagement with social science methods and methodologies used either by mainstream social sciences and new historical and sociological work based on quantitative methods that we see today, as well as those used by feminists and subaltern studies groups, the decolonials retained many of the criticisms that postcolonialists have faced as elaborated about, particularly its anti-foundationalism, a commitment to study the real world, but not having methods to do so.

So, let me come to my conclusion. Before I do that, please allow me to accept that I have a bias here. I am a sociologist, a historical sociologist, as I mentioned, and for me, it's very important to have evidence to be able to present my ideas, and what I have tried to show, that from within the traditions I come from, regarding evidence, these are some of the issues and problems I find in assessing and examining decolonial perspective. So what I presented attempts to understand the history of these academic and popular projects associated with anti-colonial, anti-imperialist political movements that have raised issues of politics of knowledge construction in the West. As I've argued there are many perspectives and many concepts, and each of them have different ways that interrogates hegemonic knowledges, and develops new research agendas and conceptualizes new ways of thinking, recasting the old and creating new methodologies and presents new paradigms. To formulate these interventions, scholars have mapped out ontological and epistemic standpoints. And I have narrated the various twists and turns of the project, as it progressed from its inception in the 1940s and 50s as an Indigenous-Indigeneity perspective in Asia and Africa and the dependency perspective in Latin America to the subaltern post-colonial and the decolonial across Asia, Africa, Latin America to North America. I've charted the processes that have institutionalized these subaltern circuits of knowledge production to form alternate non-hegemonic forms of thinking. These have been sustained because of their intimate connections with anti-colonial and anti-imperialists movements, but also with ideas related to nationalism, Left and radical viewpoints, political commitments of individuals and collectives of scholars, the politics of newly independent nation-states, but also because of the growth of educational infrastructure that has organized the production and circulation of this knowledge. Within universities, within research institutes, in journals and books, in publication houses and professional associations, it has mapped and provided original perspectives, these becoming incubators for the growth of emerging scholarship. It has affirmed the thesis that new paradigms can emerge when subaltern perspectives encounter those formalized by normal social science. As mentioned earlier, funding is very critical to it. And not only funding from public and private social science research

foundations, but also the support of government, and also of alternate intellectual networks and these days of crowdfunding. Despite these support structures, scholarship has remained marginal and is likely to do so until the mainstream itself changes.

There are tensions in these various positions which I've outlined. And this relates to demands of evidence and analysis, and more generally with the protocols of social science scholarship. Even though today, mainstream social science accepts that social world is complex and heterogenous, contingent and plastic, and thus cannot be interpreted through principles formatted by natural science, scientific issues are important and need to be engaged with. There remains there also, a schism between post-colonialists and decolonialists who promote an anti-foundational epistemology, and scholars who insist that the real evidence is necessary to make relevant, insignificant, and analytical arguments. And I would argue that this remains a critical tension in this project and those of you who have heard all the previous presentations, you'll recognize various scholars have taken different perspectives on this matter.

In the last 80 to 100 years, we have seen a slow dismantling of the epistemological assumptions that have governed Eurocentric epistemology of the discipline. No longer modernity is equated with the West and the West is thought to be the center of modernity's geography. I have highlighted the differences within the ex-colonial countries and the Global South, regarding how colonialism has been perceived and we now recognize these differences are also there within Europe and North America. This has raised the query of whether all forms of dominations have been touched by colonialism, and can we call everything decolonial? Consequently, I would argue that a one-fits-all position has become dysfunctional. Most scholars now agree that it's important to write histories and to do sociologies in terms of differing scales. And from epistemes that organized colonial and national margins. No wonder they also assert the necessity for interrogating the methods and methodologies of science given the embeddedness of ways of seeing and knowing in power/knowledge dynamics, which in turn are defined by dominant subaltern circuits of colonial knowledge, and this becomes imperative in the context of two processes that have taken place in the last two to three decades, neo-liberalism and the present pandemic, where we have to understand the differences, given the global control of both science and of biomedical systems on the way we continuously reproduce a life.

I'm sorry I took so much time and thank you for listening to me.