

The Reversibility of Global South Politics in the Contestation of World Order: A Postcolonial Critique of Eurocentrism and the Captive Mind

Adrianus Lengu Wene

Universitas Kristen Indonesia, Indonesia

Email: mrandre1705@gmail.com

Keywords:

Eurocentrism;
Reversibility; Captive
Mind; Postcolonialism;
World Order

Abstract

This article offers a critical reflection on the subordination of the Global South within a global world order constructed upon Eurocentric foundations. Employing a postcolonial approach and historiographical method, this study examines how Eurocentrism—as a representation of Global North power—operates through political, intellectual, cultural, and moral dimensions to sustain forms of hegemony over the Global South. This dynamic is manifested in the economic sphere (through institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO, and trade standardization mechanisms), the security sphere (through alliance frameworks such as AUKUS), and the socio-cultural sphere (through processes of globalization and Westernization). This condition contributes to what Syed Hussein Alatas termed the "captive mind," referring to an uncritical and imitative mode of thinking that may constrain the Global South by reinforcing the perception that emulating Western models represents the primary pathway toward civilizational advancement. Building on these observations, this article proposes the concept of the reversibility of Global South politics as an effort to redirect dominant patterns of thought through five key strategies: exploring the intellectual contributions of local Global South thinkers, formulating values grounded in local cultural contexts, disseminating alternative discourses through institutionalized platforms, addressing entrenched forms of feudalism that inhibit critical thought, and internationalizing locally developed concepts. By utilizing potential resources such as cultural diversity, the emergence of China as a non-Eurocentric global actor, and structural interdependencies between the Global South and the Global North, this reversibility seeks to strengthen the intellectual autonomy of Global South perspectives and contribute to the development of a more equitable, peaceful, and pluralistic world order based on diverse worldviews.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, the contestation of world politics has produced knowledge systems concerning the categorization of advanced and less-developed civilizations (Lee, 2023; Nakamura, 2025; Oloruntoba et al., 2026). The international order has been shaped by a worldview that dichotomizes Western states as the Global North and Eastern states as the Global South. This production of knowledge originates from power relations historically constructed within the Global North, which has often been represented as possessing advanced and superior civilization compared with the Global South, which has frequently been portrayed as backward, poor, and inferior. The imperialism of previous centuries demonstrates how Western power relations operated across the East and penetrated various aspects of Eastern societies, ultimately contributing to the formation of what Syed Hussein Alatas described as the "captive mind." Western imperialism involved not only the control of natural resources but also the control of knowledge production and intellectual frameworks among Eastern societies

through standards established by Western powers themselves (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 2007).

Within the orientalist worldview, the perceived inferiority of the Global South has historically been used to justify the imposition and dissemination of Global North values into the political systems of Global South societies (Alamu & Ololade, 2025; Dhakchayani & Sathiyarajan, 2026; Forough et al., 2023; Hübner, 2025; Qaiser, 2024). These values have often been promoted through standards shaped by Western perspectives to maintain influence and authority, even without direct physical control over the societies concerned (Said, 1978). This process has enabled capitalism, neoliberalism, democracy, human rights, and other Eurocentric-oriented knowledge discourses to become embedded within the epistemic structures of the Global South, where they have frequently been adopted as universal principles applicable to political systems. The production and circulation of Northern knowledge within Global South contexts have contributed to unequal relationships in which Global South states may function as dependent actors within a broader global system. This asymmetry has been continuously reproduced through the dissemination of Eurocentric values, whether through institutional cooperation frameworks or through forms of Western intervention in Global South affairs.

Eurocentrism represents a form of Global North intellectual and structural dominance (Biraimah et al., 2024; Marginson & Xu, 2023; Miskinzod, 2023). In its representative function, Eurocentrism operates systematically and subtly to preserve influence over the Global South as a hegemonic force, allowing the interests of the Global North to accumulate within an unequal and imbalanced world system. In Wallerstein's perspective, this structural imbalance is maintained through a global system in which peripheral states remain dependent on core states (Hout, 1993). Amid this division between a Eurocentric Global North and a Global South shaped by historical inequalities, the central question requiring critical reflection is how to develop a more equitable, peaceful, and pluralistic world order based on the Global South's own perspectives and worldviews. Alternatively, it raises the question of how global politics might be transformed to provide greater space for Global South agency. It is widely argued that contemporary international relations continue to reflect Eurocentric characteristics. The existence of institutions, norms, and practices in international relations that originated and developed within European historical experiences has often become a dominant reference point for global political understanding and practice. Therefore, this condition presents a significant challenge in developing alternative perspectives capable of reducing epistemic dependency and strengthening Global South contributions within a more inclusive world order.

Samir Amin, in his book *Eurocentrism*, provides a theoretical explanation of world-system transformation by presenting two contrasting conditions within global structures: on one side, a colonized, marginalized, less-educated, and dependent Global South, consisting largely of former colonial territories; and on the other side, an advanced, rational, civilized, and educated Global North positioned as the center of the world system (Thomas, 1994). Within this framework, the concepts of the Global South and Global North are not determined solely by geographical location but also by political, economic, and historical characteristics that distinguish their positions within the global system. According to Amin, Eurocentrism represents a defining feature of the modern world system. It has become an established worldview constructed through the historical dominance of Western capitalism, positioning

European civilization and culture—from ancient Greece to contemporary times—as representing the progressive superiority of the West within the global order (Thorpe, 1996). Amin identifies two historical periods that contributed to shaping the contemporary modern world. The first period began with the Renaissance and Enlightenment movements during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which marked the emergence of capitalism and modernity as European societies experienced significant transformation and capitalism gradually replaced mercantilism. These developments contributed to European expansionist ideas and the pursuit of global influence by Western powers. Based on perceptions of cultural superiority and civilizational advancement, European societies positioned themselves as superior to various peoples in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, which subsequently became territories of colonial expansion. The second period relates to the emergence of modern social class structures, particularly the bourgeois class, as a consequence of modernity. This period further intensified distinctions between developed and developing societies within a global structure influenced by capitalist powers and institutions that shaped international economic and political relations according to their own standards. During this period, expansionist practices toward the Global South contributed to dependency relationships and reinforced inequalities within the world order, influenced by the continuing presence of Eurocentric frameworks in political, economic, and intellectual structures.

From Immanuel Wallerstein's perspective, Eurocentrism represents an expression of Western cultural identity that positions itself as superior, unique, and advanced, thereby assuming a perceived responsibility for advancing global civilization. Within this framework, expansionism, colonialism, imperialism, and the internationalization of Western values, norms, and beliefs were historically justified as efforts to promote civilization in other regions of the world (Tiffin, 1995). In international relations, Eurocentric assumptions have served as one of the ideological foundations that justified colonial practices in previous centuries. Furthermore, within knowledge production, Eurocentrism continues to influence scientific discourse through the selection, organization, and validation of knowledge systems. Following the emergence of the Global South after decolonization and the establishment of nation-states in former colonies, Eurocentric modes of thought have continued to influence many Global South societies. Individuals and states may experience challenges in defining their identities—whether through intellectual frameworks rooted in local cultural traditions or through ideas shaped by the internalization of Eurocentric perspectives (Jordan, 1995). Amin argues that Eurocentrism currently functions not only as an external structure of domination but also as a mechanism that shapes cultural and intellectual frameworks within non-European societies themselves.

As a reflection of Western dominance in shaping perceptions of the Global South, Eurocentrism has significantly influenced local cultures and knowledge systems within Global South societies. Its values and norms have often been adopted as universal standards of correctness and progress within projects aimed at modernizing the Global South toward a perceived better civilization. According to Samir Amin, modernity is closely associated with the development of capitalism, which expanded rapidly alongside the global spread of capitalist relations (Kanth, 2005). Within this process, Eurocentrism has become a dominant cultural framework that seeks to reorganize social relations through capitalist logic while limiting recognition of multicultural alternatives. Eurocentrism is based on principles of standardization and universalization, whereby the international diffusion of Western values contributes to the

formation of a global worldview shaped by capitalist communication patterns. The influence of Eurocentrism in the Global South has intensified alongside debates concerning cultural relativism, challenges to humanistic universalism, and critiques of Western rationalization and modernity projects (Connell, 2007). As a worldview that interprets cultural development primarily through Western cultural assumptions and structures of power, Eurocentrism has generated various critiques, including debates surrounding cultural relativism, epistemological diversity, and the universalization of Western cultural and humanistic principles (Kanth, 2005).

The continued dissemination of Eurocentric worldviews within the Global South reinforces perceptions that the Global North functions as the primary center of legitimate knowledge production and the authority for defining what constitutes civilized knowledge. To expand the influence of Western perspectives globally, particularly within Global South societies, Eurocentric values have been incorporated into various dimensions of social, political, and intellectual life. Through these processes, Global South systems may become increasingly aligned with frameworks developed within Global North contexts. The Global North maintains its influence through multiple forms of power, including political, intellectual, cultural, and moral dimensions. Political power involves the historical formation of imperial and colonial structures as well as the construction of hierarchical distinctions between dominant and subordinated groups. Through these relations, colonial systems produced mechanisms of oppression and discrimination against colonized societies. Intellectual power operates through knowledge institutions, including education, science, and linguistic systems. Within these intellectual relations, scholars from the Global South have often faced structural dependencies on Western academic institutions, while Western-produced knowledge has frequently been positioned as a dominant reference within academic practices. According to Samir Amin, this dependency is reflected in unequal structures of research funding, knowledge production, and academic publishing, which contribute to the persistence of Eurocentric orientations within global scholarship. Cultural power involves the influence and circulation of cultural preferences, texts, and values. Through historical colonial encounters in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, Western cultural forms became widely adopted and influenced cultural expressions in colonized societies. Moral power relates to the construction of ethical frameworks that define acceptable and unacceptable practices according to particular cultural perspectives. Through this form of power, Western moral standards have often been presented as universal principles and applied within non-Western contexts (Kaul, 1995).

The implications of Eurocentrism have contributed to the condition that Syed Hussein Alatas conceptualized as the "captive mind" (Santos, 2014). According to Syed Alatas, the condition of the captive mind emerges through extensive exposure to Western texts and humanities disciplines, particularly when these frameworks are transmitted without sufficient critical engagement (Rosa, 2014). In general terms, the captive mind refers to an uncritical and imitative mode of thinking that relies heavily on external intellectual frameworks while limiting independent analysis. The unquestioned application of Western theories without adaptation to specific historical, social, and cultural contexts represents one manifestation of this condition. Such tendencies may encourage the reproduction of Western theoretical frameworks without sufficient consideration of alternative perspectives within local intellectual traditions (Alatas, 1974). This condition can reduce academic creativity and originality by distancing scholars from their own intellectual environments and cultural

contexts. One paradox of the captive mind is that Western knowledge may be pursued and maintained by Global South academics as a means of gaining recognition and legitimacy within academic systems shaped by Western intellectual standards. According to Syed Alatas, the captive mind represents a persistent challenge within Global South societies resulting from unequal structures of knowledge and power (Alatas, 2006). In practice, academic systems in the Global South have historically been influenced by Western disciplines, while Western academic institutions have comparatively incorporated fewer non-Western intellectual traditions into their dominant curricula and research frameworks. Drawing upon Edward Said's concept of orientalism and Samir Amin's concept of Eurocentrism, Syed Alatas explains that Western knowledge has often been positioned as rational, advanced, and civilized, whereas Eastern knowledge has historically been represented through stereotypes of irrationality, backwardness, and inferiority (Alatas, 1974). Such representations construct the East as a civilization perceived as closely associated with metaphysical traditions and social stagnation. Consequently, Western expansionist projects were historically justified through narratives of educating, enlightening, and rationalizing Eastern societies.

Despite extensive scholarship on Eurocentrism, orientalism, and the captive mind, a significant gap remains regarding the systematic development of a framework for reversing the persistence of Eurocentric dominance. Previous studies have extensively examined mechanisms of Eurocentric hegemony (Said, 1978; Amin, 1989; Wallerstein, 1997) and the epistemological consequences of the captive mind (Alatas, 1974, 2006); however, fewer studies have proposed comprehensive and practical frameworks for intellectual resistance and transformation. Furthermore, while decolonial scholars such as Mignolo (2011), Quijano (2000), and Dussel (1995) have developed critiques of Eurocentrism, much of their work has emphasized the analysis and deconstruction of coloniality rather than the formulation of alternative intellectual frameworks rooted in Global South epistemologies. This article addresses this gap by proposing the concept of the "reversibility of Global South politics"—a framework that not only critiques Eurocentric structures of knowledge and power but also identifies strategic pathways for strengthening the intellectual autonomy of Global South perspectives. The contribution of this article lies in integrating postcolonial critique, historiographical analysis, and normative reflection to provide both a critical diagnosis of existing structures and a conceptual framework for epistemic transformation.

METHOD

This study employed a qualitative research design using a historiographical method. The analysis focused on examining the relationship between Eurocentrism as a representation of Global North perspectives and the *captive mind* as an intellectual consequence associated with Eurocentric influence. The data sources consisted of secondary materials collected through literature research, including books, academic journals, reports, and relevant publications concerning historical developments and experiences in the Global South. The collected data were critically analyzed and synthesized to construct a comprehensive historical narrative.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Reversibility of Global South Politics in the Contestation of World Politics

Since the triumph of capitalism following the collapse of the Soviet Union, the contestation of world politics has become unbalanced, placing the Global North in a position of hegemonic power relative to the Global South. With this hegemonic power, it has become increasingly easy for the Global North to disseminate its values, norms, institutions, and consensus to the Global South for acceptance, adoption, and implementation within the Global South's national politics. On the pretext that values such as neoliberalism, democracy, and human rights are noble, superior, and virtuous, the Global North aggressively compels the Global South to comply with and follow what it prescribes. The fact that the Global North intervenes in Global South politics stems from its Eurocentric belief that the Global South remains deeply underdeveloped and marginalized, and therefore must be assisted in order to become a center in the same manner as the Global North. The Global North is conscious of its long history of superior civilization, which has produced advanced knowledge enabling it to lead a just, peaceful, and civilized world order. Historiographically, Eurocentrism has been the driving spirit of world politics to the present day. The establishment of Bretton Woods, along with the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO with its free-market mechanisms, the Washington Consensus, and various international and regional economic institutions, all represent Eurocentric values regarded as superior knowledge for advancing the global economic order—particularly by paving the way for the Global South to become a metropole in the same manner as the Global North. The assumption that the Global South, as a former European colonial territory, is backward and poorly educated has served as the justification for the Global North to instill and reinforce its Eurocentric values within the mode of thought of the Global South.

In the economic domain, within the power relations between the Global North and the Global South, trade and investment cooperation under the neoliberal system—used as the basis for trade and investment—reveals an ironic reality for the Global South. Given the disparity in capability between the Global North and the Global South, economic cooperation does not occur under conditions of equilibrium. In aggregate, the Global North benefits more from such cooperation, since economic standards, along with all associated economic knowledge, are determined according to the system it has itself created. Trade and investment cooperation, though presumed to bring progressive economic development to the Global South, does not necessarily prove beneficial; it may in fact become a chronic problem when the Global South becomes dependent on markets, products, capital, scientific research, technology transfer, and even its own human resources. This is the condition that Andre Gunder Frank described as the dependency relationship of the periphery—the Global South—upon the metropole—the Global North. The Global South may sustain this condition for its own interests over the long term, although there always remains the possibility for the Global South to develop into a semi-periphery, and eventually a core state, as articulated by Immanuel Wallerstein in his world-system theory. The involvement of global financial institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank, as well as the World Trade Organization, represents a new form of imperialism—in Kwame Nkrumah's terms—aimed at subordinating the economies of the Global South to comply with the rules and interests of the Global North as represented in the IMF, the WTO, and the World Bank. As an illustration, the European Union, through its trade regulations and standards imposed on Global South products—such as the GSP, RED II, SVLK certification,

and REACH—as well as its promotion of democracy and human rights to the Global South, constitutes a subtle form of European economic imperialism, notwithstanding the view that such regulations and standards are common practice in protecting European Union industries.

In the security domain, the Eurocentric power relations of the Global North are also evident in Global South security affairs. Direct Global North intervention in Global South security matters is strongly felt through various security pacts and agreements. The presence of the United States, together with its allied states such as the United Kingdom and France, has fostered dependency on Global North protection to guarantee security against states perceived as potential threats to national or regional stability. Under such security arrangements, the Global North is granted access to establish military bases and becomes involved in joint peace commitments, including participation in the security politics of allied states when they face threats from other nations. The efforts of the United States and its allies to contain China's sphere of influence—which represents the rise of the Global South—reflect American anxiety over losing its hegemony in the Global South, as well as concern that Global South states might emulate or align with China as a new center, thereby abandoning their partnership with the Global North. The AUKUS pact, agreed upon by the United States and its allies in the Asia-Pacific region, in fact constitutes an indoctrination of the belief that Global South security remains dependent on the Global North in order to eliminate the perceived threat posed by China to other Global South states.

In the socio-cultural domain, Eurocentric values embodied in the products of globalization and westernization have penetrated deeply into the socio-cultural systems of the Global South. As a consequence of the currents of globalization, the local cultures of the Global South have been disrupted within the social and cultural life of their societies. Imported products from the Western world flood Global South markets. Modes of dress, speech, and thought are all uncritically imitated from these global products. The presence of McDonald's, Shell, Pizza Hut, Kentucky Fried Chicken, Starbucks, and KFC in the Global South represents a passive penetration of Global North culture. The existence of supermarkets and department stores in the Global South likewise reflects an imitation of what already exists in the Global North. In addition, films produced by the Global North, featuring scenes of violence and sexuality, have become commodities that are consumed and imitated openly without critical reflection. Processes of mimicry and hybridity occur with remarkable ease, and societies blindly identify themselves as Westernized, abandoning the Eastern values or local wisdom that once guided their way of life. All cultural orientation remains centered on the Global North. This constitutes a synchronization of culture, in which the flow or circulation of cultural products remains unidirectional and follows a synchronic mode, as articulated by Cees Hamelink. This unidirectional flow of cultural products threatens the erosion of Global South local cultures, owing to their inability to compete with Global North cultural products.

From this empirical exposition, Eurocentrism operates mechanically, tactically, and with great subtlety in shackling the captive mind of the Global South. The Global North is aware that its colonial legacy still lingers within the life of Global South societies, deeply embedded in the Global South's collective mind as a consequence of the intellectual, cultural, political, and moral power once exercised during the colonial period—and which continues to this day, albeit through a different mechanism of power relations. Many values, norms, systems, and even institutions have been adopted by the Global South from Western Eurocentric models to

sustain its own existence. Although *de facto* and *de jure* independence has been legitimately achieved by the Global South, the magical force of Eurocentrism remains remarkably strong as a basis for thought and for practices in policy-making and other activities. First, the Global South's collective mind has been indoctrinated since the colonial era to believe that Western knowledge and values are superior, good, enlightening, civilized, and modern. Consequently, mimicry, hybridity, cultural synchronization, dependency, and subalternity have become conditions arising from the belief that Western knowledge is the ideal path toward transforming the Global South into a civilization resembling the West. Second, cooperation or partnership between the Global North and the Global South, supported by various international institutions, has become a new mechanism of Western subjugation. Conceptually, although cooperation is presumed to bring mutual benefit to both parties, the enduring question remains as to who benefits most from such cooperation. In practice, cooperation reflects a non-equilibrium position. This imbalance provides an easy avenue for the Global North to accommodate its interests through Eurocentric values imposed upon the Global South. The mechanism of Western Eurocentrism operates by offering something needed by the Global South—loans, grants, investment, technology transfer, research studies, free access, and the like—but on the precondition that the Global South must incorporate, apply, or adhere to Eurocentrism as the foundational concept of its policies. Through this cooperative mechanism, there is no overt coercion, intimidation, threat, or deployment of hard power by the West against the Global South to compel compliance with Western wishes.

The Global South appears to be granted free choice or free will in determining its stance toward Eurocentrism. Yet the strongly integrated international world, bound by Western-created globalization, indirectly constrains the free will of the Global South in its rational choices. This means that, as an inseparable and integral part of the global world, the Global South lacks strong bargaining power to resist or extricate itself from a global order controlled by Western globalization. Within this mechanism, it becomes difficult for the Global South to mount direct confrontation or declare hostility toward the West as an expression of its independence. Eurocentrism operates subtly, constructing its hegemony over the Global South such that the captive mind emerges and the Global South becomes apathetic toward genuine change and authentic autonomy. A simple test of this is to examine our own mode of thinking—has it ever truly broken free from Western modes of thought, or does it merely claim to speak on behalf of the East in building a just, peaceful, and civilized world order while still thinking in Western terms? This is the hegemony of Western Eurocentrism that traps the Global South in the illusion that emulating the West is the best path toward achieving civilizational equality with the West.

The reality of the captive mind experienced by the Global South inevitably renders it a satellite that merely follows developments or changes occurring in the Global North. In the contestation of international politics, and in efforts to create a world order more favorable to the Global South, a reversibility of Global South thought is required—one that reconstructs a robust and independent ideal as the foundational concept for systems, norms, institutions, approaches, and policy formulations that mark the freedom and independence of Global South thought from the spell of Eurocentrism. This implies the need for non-Western theory as a counter-discursive or counter-epistemic force against Eurocentrism. The Global South's captive mind results from the absence of non-Western theory or texts within the Global South

itself. Several factors account for the absence of non-Western theory as an insulation against Eurocentrism in the Global South: first, the production and reproduction of Western discourse remains overwhelmingly dominant in the Global South as the primary source of knowledge internalized following decolonization; second, the deeply entrenched feudal system of the Global South strongly inhibits the emergence of new, independent ideas from the lower classes; third, insufficient awareness of the concept of internationalization, owing to systems or concepts that remain overly focused on local cultural affairs; and fourth, local concepts remain too heterogeneous, lacking any unifying conceptual framework to serve as a shared national mode of thought. In addition, the Global South has grown accustomed to relying on Western texts, regarding them as capable of bridging local and Western thought. In the study of knowledge and scholarly discourse, Global South academics continue to draw on Western theoretical frameworks to analyze problems occurring within their own regions, despite the clear differences between Western and Eastern characteristics. The Global South's education system remains unprepared and inattentive to efforts aimed at fostering independent local thought. Scholarships to study in Europe likewise remain a matter of prestige for Global South academics, serving as legitimation of knowledge acquired through the European education system and from European academics.

Reversibility presupposes the capacity to redirect a trajectory of thought so that it may return to its original point of departure. The Global South must possess this capacity for reversibility by harnessing the opportunities emerging within the contestation of international politics, together with its own inherent potential. These opportunities and potentials include cultural diversity as a source for excavating conceptual ideas and independent expressions of identity; the rise of China as a locomotive of non-Eurocentrism within the Global South; and the West's own dependence on the Global South—a dynamic of binary opposition that indicates that, without the Global South, Western leadership would be rendered meaningless. Accordingly, the steps of reversibility that the Global South must undertake are as follows: first, focusing on the exploration and elaboration of the ideas of local Global South thinkers; second, formulating concepts, values, and norms rooted in the cultural relativity of the local Global South as a new image of the Global South; third, ensuring the production and dissemination of Eastern discourse under a single, centralized authority or power; fourth, dismantling the long-entrenched feudalism that obstructs the critical thinking of local intellectuals; and fifth, internationalizing local concepts as a manifestation of the conceptual contestation between Eastern and Western values. This process of reversibility constitutes an absolute imperative for the Global South in order to realize a just, peaceful, and civilized world order according to its own beliefs and worldview, and to reverse the trajectory of world politics toward one more favorable to the Global South.

Accordingly, the challenges to reversibility—such as globalization and the attributes of modernization, conflicts of interest among Global South states, and the development of Global South-oriented knowledge discourse—must be addressed seriously and radically. With the spirit of reversibility, the Global South can stand upon the independence of its own thought within the contestation of international politics to realize a world order that is just, peaceful, and civilized.

CONCLUSION

Eurocentrism represents a system of knowledge production that has historically positioned Western perspectives as rational, advanced, educated, and enlightened, while constructing representations of the Global South through narratives of backwardness, dependency, and inadequacy. Through hegemonic structures of power, Western perspectives have been disseminated and reproduced within the Global South through political, intellectual, cultural, and moral relations. This process contributes to the formation of the *captive mind*, a condition in which intellectual frameworks may become dependent on external references and limit the development of independent perspectives. Consequently, the Global South may experience challenges in developing autonomous knowledge systems when Western models are perceived as the primary reference for achieving social, political, and civilizational progress.

Eurocentric values, including free-market economic systems, liberal democracy, human rights frameworks, secularization, Westernization, the nation-state system, securitization practices, and dominant Western academic discourses, have influenced various dimensions of Global South societies. These influences may contribute to conditions of dependency, subalternity, mimicry, hybridity, and cultural homogenization, which shape how Global South actors understand and respond to global structures of power. Across multiple domains—including politics, security, economics, socio-cultural relations, and education—knowledge systems and institutional practices have been shaped by interactions with Eurocentric frameworks. Therefore, the concept of *reversibility* rooted in local intellectual traditions, cultural contexts of the Global South, and alternative mechanisms for disseminating non-Western perspectives represents an effort to challenge dominant knowledge structures. This process includes strengthening local concepts, critically reassessing inherited systems, and expanding the international recognition of Global South perspectives as part of a broader intellectual contestation within global politics. By utilizing existing potentials, including the emergence of China as an influential non-Western actor, the exploration of cultural diversity as a source of alternative theoretical perspectives, and the strategic importance of the Global South within global economic and political relations, Global South societies may strengthen their intellectual autonomy. These efforts also require addressing internal challenges, including differences among Global South states, the pressures of globalization and modernization, and structural limitations that may hinder collective action. Through these processes, the Global South can participate more actively in the contestation of international politics without being positioned solely through narratives of inferiority or inequality in relation to the Global North.

REFERENCES

- Alamu, I., & Ololade, E. O. (2025). Orientalism revisited: A critique of Western discourses of non-Western development through the post-colonial, subaltern and Marxist frames. *Radinka Journal of Science and Systematic Literature Review*, 3(1), 590–599.
- Biraimah, K., Roets, L., & Kurtz, B. (2024). The Impact of a Eurocentric Curriculum on Students from the Global South and North. *Bulgarian Comparative Education Society*.
- Dhakchayani, M., & Sathiyarajan, N. (2026). Orientalism Revisited: A Critique of Western Discourses of Non-Western Development through the Postcolonial, Subaltern and Marxist Frames. *Architecture Image Studies (AIS)*, 7(1), 3054.

- Forough, M., Dahbi, K., Waterman, A., & Woertz, E. (2023). Narratives of global order and re-ordering from the global south. *Antíteses*, 16(31), 292–325.
- Hübner, J. A. (2025). The West and the Rest: Eurocentrism, Colonialism, and Global Social Problems. In *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Social Problems* (pp. 1–43). Springer.
- Lee, R. E. (2023). Immanuel Wallerstein, world-systems analysis and the structures of knowledge. *The Anthem Companion to Immanuel Wallerstein*, 37–56.
- Marginson, S., & Xu, X. (2023). Hegemony and inequality in global science: Problems of the center-periphery model. *Comparative Education Review*, 67(1), 31–52.
- Miskinzod, D. (2023). Beyond Eurocentrism: lack of social justice and non-western perspectives in sexuality education classes. *Sex Education*, 23(4), 478–489.
- Nakamura, M. (2025). Localizing international relations: The intellectual and institutional formation of IR in Japan. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 25(3), 1caf009.
- Oloruntoba, S. O., Moyo, I., Olaitan, Z. M., & Mzimela, J. H. (2026). *Indigenous Knowledge Systems, Entrepreneurship and Sustainable Development in Africa* (Vol. 1). Anthem Press.
- Qaiser, R. (2024). Decolonizing International Relations: The Intellectual Contribution and Challenge of the Global South. *Global Strategic & Security Studies Review*, 9(3), 69–80.
- Alatas, S.F. (2006). *Alternative Discourses in Asian Social Science: Responses to Eurocentrism*. New Delhi: Sage
- Alatas, S.H. (1974). The Captive Mind for Creative Development. *International Social Science Journal*, 36 (4), 691-9
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, Helen Tiffin. (2007). *Post-Colonial Studies: The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern Theory: the Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Crows Nest: Allen & Unwin.
- Hout, Wil. (1993). *Capitalism and the Third World Development, Dependence and the World System*. England: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
- Jordan, G. and Weedon, C. (1995) *Cultural Politics: Class, Gender, Race, and the Postmodern World*, Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell
- Kaul, S. (1996). Colonial Figures and Postcolonial Reading. *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism*, 26 (1), 74–89
- Kanth, R. K. (2005). *Against Eurocentrism: A Transcendent Critique of Modernist Science, Society, and Morals: A Discursus on Human Emancipation: Purporting to be a Speculative Critique and Resolution of the Malaise of Modernism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Rosa, M.C. (2014). *Theories of the South: Limits and perspectives of an emergent movement in social sciences*. Current Sociology.
- Said, Edward. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd
- Santos, B de S.S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers
- Tiffin, H. (1995). Post-Colonial Literatures and Counter-Discourse in B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin (eds). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, 95–98.
- Thomas, N. (1994). *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Oxford: Polity Press

Thorpe, B. (1996). *Colonial Queensland: Perspectives on a Frontier Society*. St Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press.