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The study of the social sciences can be approached in a variety of ways. Various types of meta-analyses exist, and concerns range from the epistemological to the empirical. Metatheory, or the reflexive study of the social sciences, involves the study of the social, cultural and historical contexts of theories and theorists, and their philosophical roots. The particular variety of metatheory that I focus on in this essay is the political economy of the social sciences, with reference to the cases of India and Malaysia.

In what follows, I introduce the topic by way of a discussion of the relevance of the social sciences to developing societies, after which I move on to an account of the structure of academic dependency. This account concerns the manner in which the social sciences in developing societies are dependent upon American social science. I then suggest that academic dependency alone is insufficient to explain the continued currency of American-dominated social science in the Third World. There is a rhetorical dimension to the social sciences that in part explains the global spread of the social sciences. The overall aim of this essay is to shed light on the nature and typology of intellectual dependency.
The Problem of Relevance and Academic Dependency

The institutional and theoretical dependence of scholars in developing countries on Western social science has resulted in an uncritical and imitative approach to ideas and concepts from the United States and, to some extent, Great Britain, France and Germany. Whereas, the relevance of the social sciences for developing countries has been called into question (Myrdal, 1957; Singh Uberoi, 1968, Misra, 1972), the ideas of social science became entrenched. For example, even though it seemed that the humanistic and less technical political economy would be relevant because it stressed the role of non-economic variables in development, it was modern economic science in the form of abstract models that established itself in much of the Third World (Pieris, 1969: 439-440). In the discipline of geography, for instance, it has been noted that in the 1970s more theoretical works addressing the relevance of Western-derived development models began to appear (Raguraman & Huang, 1993: 285). What the discipline of geography experienced is true for other disciplines as well. Political decolonization was accompanied by the spread of a polycentrism in world geography in which the relevance of Western or Anglo-American models is questioned (Hooson, 1994: 5-6).

Reflection on the question of the relevance and utility of the social sciences for non-Western societies has resulted in the highlighting of a number of themes that have emerged as a result of the encounter between a largely Western-oriented social science tradition on the one hand, and specifically national/regional socio-political issues on the other. One such theme is academic dependency.

The social sciences, as they were introduced in the colonies and other peripheralised regions of the world from the nineteenth century onwards, were imported and implanted without due recogni-
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tion of the different historical backgrounds and social circumstances of these societies, a greater awareness of which would have warranted modified and revamped theories and methods. Following political emancipation, the intellectual dependence of the former colonies on American and European models continued. Although the leading theoretical perspectives originating in Europe and America have not always been relevant in alien milieus, their continuing presence in university syllabi and lists of references in journal articles in the non-West are testimony to the process of adaptation to the “rules of the dominant caste within the Euro-American social science game” (Kantowsky, 1969: 129).

This intellectual dependence can be seen in terms of both the structures of academic dependency and imported ideas whose relevance are in question. The former can be gauged from the relative availability of First World funding for research, the prestige attached to publishing in American and British journals, the high premium placed on a Western university education, and a host of other indicators. As far as intellectual dependency on ideas is concerned, this can be readily understood from a survey of theoretical perspectives in vogue across a range of disciplines in the Third World. For example, in former British colonies the social sciences are likely to be dominated by Anglo-Saxon theoretical traditions.

An example of this comes from the biggest and probably the most notorious research project in the history of sociology and the social sciences, Project Camelot. Launched in early 1964 with a grant of up to US$6 million, the short-lived “Project Camelot was conceived in late 1963 by a group of high-ranking army officers connected with the Army Research Office of the Department of Defence” of the United States (Horowitz, 1965: 4). The aim of this project was to investigate the causes of internal revolt and revolution in developing societies and to assist the United States Army in its mission of “insurgency prophylaxis”. Many well-known scholars were invited to join the project, including the famous conflict theorist, Johan Galtung. Not only did Galtung decline but he also advanced arguments against the project. During this period Galtung happened to be in Santiago de Chile while the Rector of the University of Chile himself was negotiating the terms of a Project Camelot study with a Chilean-born sociologist from Pittsburgh, Hugo Nutini. As Galtung’s arguments became known in Chile, Chilean and other Latin American sociologists started a campaign over what should be done with the research. In the end, the project was cancelled.

The use of such projects in the past also demonstrates that there is no one single model or strategy that works equally well in all developing countries. However, there is such thing as a ‘Third World’ and the former colonies, especially those in Asia, are part of that broader category. It is therefore not surprising that the Japanese government had its own version of Project Camelot known as the “Project for Knowledge of Japanese Society.”

The Structure of Dependent Social Science

Marxism, generally speaking, is the economic and political analysis of the structures and processes of society. It is a theory of social change and revolution. The basic premise of Marxism is that the material conditions of society determine the development of human society. This means that the economic system of a society, or the way in which society produces and distributes its wealth, is the key factor in shaping its social and political institutions. The nature of the economic system, in turn, is determined by the dominant class in society, which is the class that owns and controls the means of production.

In the context of the developing world, this means that the economic system of a society is determined by the relationship between the government and the economy. The government is the dominant class in society, and it is responsible for determining the economic policies of the country. The economic policies of a country are determined by the government, and the government is in turn determined by the ruling class. The ruling class is the class that owns and controls the means of production, and it is the ruling class that determines the economic policies of the country.

The economic system of a society is determined by the relationship between the government and the economy. The government is the dominant class in society, and it is responsible for determining the economic policies of the country. The economic policies of a country are determined by the government, and the government is in turn determined by the ruling class. The ruling class is the class that owns and controls the means of production, and it is the ruling class that determines the economic policies of the country.

In the context of the developing world, this means that the economic system of a society is determined by the relationship between the government and the economy. The government is the dominant class in society, and it is responsible for determining the economic policies of the country. The economic policies of a country are determined by the government, and the government is in turn determined by the ruling class. The ruling class is the class that owns and controls the means of production, and it is the ruling class that determines the economic policies of the country.
can sociologists, politicians and journalists protested to Washington over what they saw as American interference under the pretext of research. In the United States itself there was friction between the State Department (which seemed left out of the project) and the Department of Defence. The project was cancelled by the Department of Defence on July 7, 1965 while a Congressional hearing on Camelot was underway (Dahrendorf, 1968: 259-261).

The use of this example is not to suggest that most research projects in the United States have the aim of counterinsurgency or that there is a conscious academic imperialist policy on the part of United States funding organizations and American social scientists. However, it cannot be denied that the nature of world social science is such that the development and expansion of social science in developing societies is a reflection of its development in the United States and to a lesser extent in Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan. It is this structure of dependency in the social sciences that I attempt to delineate in what follows.

The Structure of Academic Dependency

Marxist, dependency and world-system theories of development generally look upon culture, including social science, as reflecting economic hierarchies in the world-system. The spread of Western culture and modes of knowledge, or cultural imperialism, serve to perpetuate global inequalities to the extent that Third World peoples are prepared culturally and ideologically to receive Western goods, services, technology and aid (Chase-Dunn 1989: 88-105; Meyer 1987; Meyer & Hannan 1979; Szymanski 1981: 257-288; Toh 1983). Such a perspective does not necessarily view consciousness, ideology, norms and values as dominant institutions that integrate the modern world-system. Indeed, the view that culture plays a secondary role in the reproduction of global capitalism is partly responsible for the neglect of the study of the internal dynamics of global social science. Nevertheless, there have been attempts to understand the political economy of social science not merely in terms of 'base-superstructure' arguments, but also by way of the application of the market analogy. Such an approach either takes its cues from classical economics with its emphasis on the free market, or from the concerns of dependency/world-system analysis with the hierarchical nature of the capitalist world-economy. According to the former, social sci-
ence operates according to the principles of *laissez-faire*. Scientific (and by extension, social scientific) communities are seen to function on the basis of perfect competition (Storer 1970, cited in Garreau 1991: 303). Academic dependency theory, however, recognises an imbalance in the production of social sciences across societies and the resultant division of labour between the producers and consumers of such knowledge (Oomen 1991: 67). Thus, it is no coincidence that the great economic powers are also the great social science powers (Garreau 1985: 64, 81, 89; see also Chekki, 1987).

Academic dependency theory, or the dependency theory of social science, originated in Brazil in the 1950s. Its proponents advocated that Brazilian and Latin American sociologists delink from the main centres of sociology in the West and develop autonomous or indigenised sociologies (Garreau 1985: 114-115). From this perspective, Third World social science communities are seen to be dependent to the extent that the definition of problem areas, methods, and standards of excellence belong to another social science community (Lamy 1976: 107). Kuwayama speaks of the "world system" of anthropology in which the three core countries, that is, the United States, Great Britain and France, determine the nature of the discourse in anthropology (Kuwayama & Bremen, 1997: 54).

While there has been recognition of the phenomenon of academic dependency, there have been few attempts to delineate its structure, the exceptions being the works of Altbach (1975, 1977) and Garreau (1985, 1988, 1991).

The structure of academic dependency can be understood in terms of the following dimensions:

1. dependence on ideas as well as the media of ideas
2. dependence on the technology of education
3. dependence on aid for research and teaching
4. dependence on investment in education

**Dependence on ideas, media of ideas.** Such dependence is the general condition of knowledge in the Third World. Although scholarly communities in developing societies have tirelessly pointed out ethnocentric biases in the Western social sciences, the emergence of autonomous, alternative theoretical traditions has yet to be seen, and the dependence on theories and concepts generated in the context of Western historical backgrounds and cultural practices continues.
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This problem of dependence is linked to the pervasiveness of imitation. In the case of India, as elsewhere, mimesis may involve the internalization of ethnic and cultural prejudices, as noted by Nandi (1994). For example, although many Indians are dark, phrases such as “black sheep,” “black heart” or “black eye” have found their way into Indian discourse with all their negative connotations (Nandi, 1994: 23).

That no contemporary non-Western political scientist has created original theory is true of other disciplines and is a serious concern as well (Parekh, 1992: 535). Even an intellectually lively society such as India has generally failed to Indianize the social sciences. For example, questions such as the nature of the state, state-society relations, secularism, and political morality have frequently been debated in parliament, but have not been worked on as material for a distinctly Indian brand of political theory in terms of ideas and problem-raising. The same is true for Gandhism, the conservatism of Bipan Chandra Pal, Aurobindo Ghose and Swami Vivekananda. Neither have Indians reinterpreted or reworked the theories of Marx against the backdrop of Indian history and experiences (Parekh, 1992: 546-547). A similar verdict could be handed down to the social sciences of the last two centuries throughout the non-West.

Apart from dependency upon knowledge, there is also the problem of dependency upon the media of knowledge such as books and journals. Indeed, the degree of academic dependency can be gauged from the structure of ownership and control of international journals. The greatest numbers of social science journals are published in the United States together with France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom. Over 80% of articles in political science journals in these countries were contributed by scholars who belonged to a professional organization of the same nationality as that of the journal (Garreau, 1988: 173).

The bulk of the world’s intellectual output is produced in industrialised nations, particularly in the United States, Britain, France and Germany. As early as the 1970s, a survey of social science journals reported that more than 60% were published in the United States, Britain and France (Line and Roberts 1976: 133). Where books, journals and other periodicals are concerned, the better-established publishers and distributors are located in the West, with the Third World being net importers of foreign reading materials.
The distribution networks between core and periphery have come to be well developed over the years while those among Third World countries are lacking. Consequently, in a place like Malaysia or India it is much easier to obtain works published in the United States and Britain than in each other’s countries. While there are efforts to develop a publishing industry in several Third World countries, publishing and distribution are still dominated by the social science powers. As a result, Third World scholarship in terms of the selection of problems, the language of communication, and the choice of research methods are often tailored to the requirements of the market. The problem with academic dependency is readily comprehensible when one considers the close links between foreign and economic policy prescriptions originating in developed countries and policymakers/academics in developing countries who are at the receiving end of these prescriptions.

**Dependence on the technology of education.** The technology relation is a very important dimension of the dependency relation in the social sciences. At one time, in the 1960s and 1970s when many major journals in the social sciences were publishing articles utilising advanced statistical methods, richer countries tended to have a comparative advantage because of the lack of computing facilities in many Third World countries. While this may not be true today because of the relative ease with which such facilities can be acquired, the dependency upon the technology of education continues in other ways. Instructional materials such as films and laboratory instruments are imported because there is little innovation in the creation of curricula and instructional materials. This has partly to do with the lack of funds but also with the fact that many educationists in the Third World went through a Western education and continue to draw upon the West for their resources.

An example of the dependence on the technology of education comes from Malaysia. The Lincoln Resource Center at the Embassy of the United States of America in Kuala Lumpur provides useful resources to academicians, journalists and other interested members of the public. It is well equipped with video-conferencing and CD-ROM facilities. Books and documents are loanable items while a periodical list of articles covering American international relations, social issues, and the arts is maintained from which one can make selections and order free-of-charge. While many materials of interest, unava...
...test, unavailable elsewhere in Malaysia, can be obtained through the Lincoln Center, the choice of selection is understandably limited to those specified by the Americans.

**Dependence on aid for research and teaching.** Various governmental organizations as well as corporate foundations in the United States, Britain, France and Germany play crucial roles in the training of Third World scholars by providing scholarships and fellowships, funding social science research, and providing expert personnel for research and teaching institutions in the developing world, training which would otherwise not be available in the recipient countries.

The United States, for instance, has been very active in providing foreign assistance in the field of education. Land grant colleges based on an American model have been established in India, Indonesia, and Nigeria and in Latin America (Altbach 1977: 198). Huge amounts of funds and technical aid have been provided to develop these universities.

The United States, Britain, France and Germany have also sponsored the study of their languages and cultures in developing countries. The French are particularly active in this regard, both in terms of promoting French in the Third World and further developing the language in former French colonies. The Americans, too, have been active in establishing management training institutes in the developing world, and it has been suggested that the American orientation of such institutes results in their graduates being unable to find jobs because the training they underwent was unrelated to local conditions (Altbach 1977: 200).

Foreign aid in books and published materials is also crucial in fostering academic dependency. One aspect of this is foreign aid in publishing. Book programmes are another, in which the Americans are the most organised and widespread. A case in point is the Asia Foundation that provides books free-of-charge to organizations and individuals on a regular basis, covering both the social and natural sciences. The United States Information Agency provided funds for the production of 80 million copies covering some 9,000 works in 51 languages (Benjamin 1964: 72). This Book Translation Program is still active in a number of countries such as Indonesia, Thailand, Vietnam and China. The British also have their subsidized book programmes, such as the English Language Book Scheme (Altbach...
1977: 201). Foreign aid programmes and private foundations also make it possible for libraries in Third World countries to receive Western academic journals.

Even in the case of locally published journals, it is often the case that funding comes from abroad. An example is the Congress for Cultural Freedom that sponsored the publication of several leading journals in India and other countries. In fact, some of these funds originated from the Central Intelligence Agency and the Ford Foundation (Lasch 1969: 61-114). Today, many American, British, German and French organizations continue to be active in providing assistance to Third World journals that would otherwise have to cease publication.

Notwithstanding the fact that the above remarks are based on information and observations from the 1960s and 1970s, there is little reason to suggest that there have been significant changes in this dimension of academic dependency in India and Malaysia. The Indian anthropologist, J. P. Singh Uberoi's indictment of foreign aid is as relevant today as it was in 1968:

The existing system of foreign aid in science, to which the internationalist notion of collaboration lends credence, in truth upholds the system of foreign dominance in all matters of scientific and professional life and organization. It is nothing but the satellite system, with an added subsidy. It subordinates the national science of the poor to the national and international science of the rich. It confirms our dependence and helplessness and will not end them (1968: 120).

According to Saberwal (1968: 13), the “dependence on North American sponsors is pathetic; its consequences for problem selection, research design, and modes of publication are disastrous”. This statement, by an Indian social scientist from the 1960s still holds true today of both India and Malaysia (see Alatas, 2000). While the state of academic dependency may have changed in a number of ways, the fact remains that models, theories, concepts, and research agendas from North America continue to play a defining role. On the other hand, no North American social science is influenced by trends in India or Malaysia.

Dependence on investment in education. The last dimension of academic dependency under consideration is derived by drawing a parallel between multinational corporations and the knowledge in-
dustry (Garreau 1985: 60). Educational institutions in industrialised nations do invest in education in the Third World. An example is the various degree programmes being offered in Malaysia by various North American, British and Australian universities. These involve joint ventures between foreign and local institutions. In one particular variant, known as the twinning programme, students spend a large portion of their academic career in Malaysia, taking courses of which the credits are transferable to the university that is twinned with the Malaysian counterpart. In this way, the financial burden of studying abroad is greatly reduced. At the same time, Western universities are more or less guaranteed contingencies of foreign students who otherwise may not attend foreign universities because of prohibitive costs.

The dependence of Third World academic communities on First World social science establishments and institutions along these four dimensions constitute the vertical relations on which global social science is founded. An important feature of these vertical relations is the one-way flow of information from the periphery to the core and the lack of communication among peripheral social science communities (Garreau 1985: 107; Garreau 1991: 300-301). These vertical relations are seen to obstruct the flow of independent and original ideas, promote pro-capitalist ideologies, and subject Third World countries to development policies supportive of the globalization of capital (Toh 1983).

The Demerits of Academic Dependency Theory

Academic dependency theory provides an interesting structural approach with which to understand the relationship between First World and Third World social science. While many ideas pertaining to academic dependency theory took shape in the 1960s and 1970s, there is continuing concern with the problem in both India and Malaysia, as revealed by publications in the 1990s and 2000s (see, for example, Mukherji, Akhara & Sengupta, 1997; Alatas, 2000). However, academic dependency theory is not without its weaknesses. The analogy supplied by economic dependency theory is not always appropriate.

For example, with regard to dependency on ideas and the media of ideas, the problem is less a structural one and more a question of lack of interest. In many Third World countries, there is a sufficient
number of books, both foreign and local, to enable a theorist to develop some interesting and researchable ideas, assuming that his/her reflection is carried out against the backdrop of local conditions. A collection of the Western classics in the social sciences, local reading materials, and the empirical field of the researcher's society are the right ingredients for an autonomous social science tradition.

Regarding dependency on the technology of education, this would be a problem only to the extent that educational technologies are crucial to the development of social science. But it is quite clear that there are many areas of interest in the social sciences for which state of the art technology is not crucial. Nevertheless, even in these areas the social sciences in the Third World lag behind that of industrialised nations.

On dependency on aid for research and teaching, the analogy of economic dependency is not entirely appropriate because there is nothing equivalent to World Bank or IMF conditionality in the funding of research by international foundations or government organizations. In other words, the terms and conditions of grants are sufficiently flexible to give Third World researchers autonomy in deciding upon the areas of research and the methods to be used.

Finally, foreign investment in education does not necessarily foster unoriginality. Twinning programmes in Malaysia and elsewhere, for example, could easily be modified in such a manner as to offer courses more relevant to local situations while at the same time satisfying the requirements of the foreign 'twin'.

This is not to suggest that academic dependency theory is without merit. It is useful in providing a structural account of the transnational flow of ideas. But the understanding of such flows cannot be limited to structural accounts. The billions spent on advertising is due to the realization that it takes more than economic power to sell products and services worldwide. Similarly, it takes more than academic power to 'sell' ideas worldwide. A more compelling explanation for the spread of ideas from core to periphery comes from enumerating the 'selling strategies' resorted to by social science discourse, even if these are deployed within the context of the structures of academic dependency. These selling strategies are the rhetorical devices internal to the social sciences.
Rhetorical Analysis and the Rhetoric of Social Science

We are used to conceiving art and science as belonging to separate domains. The aesthetic refers to the sphere of non-cognitive experience while the scientific refers to that of cognitive explanation. This dichotomy is expressed in terms of various other oppositions such as emotional versus rational, intuition versus knowledge, beauty versus truth, subjectivity versus objectivity, and symbolic versus real.

This separation, however, is fairly recent. In Western civilization in premodern times, historical writing was seen as a genre of literature, while literature was considered as belonging to the arts. Historical writing as an art form was an everyday activity involving the writing of diaries, sermons, eulogies and essays (Brown 1985: 667). However, with the rise of industrial society, art and literature became distinguished from the everyday world of the market, partly because this was seen as a degraded world, and partly because art and literature came to be replaced by positivist science. History “passed from the hands of the poet and man of letters into those of the professor. The old common ground of history and literature - the idea of mimesis, and the central importance of rhetoric - has thus been gradually vacated” by historians and literary people (Grossman 1978: 7, cited in Brown 1985: 678).

The contemporary notion of the epistemological opposition between art and science veils the idea that they are both symbolic forms claiming their own respective domains of application. This being the case, the various social sciences can be analyzed from an aesthetic point of view as if they were poetic or literary texts. The social sciences are not only based on logical deduction and controlled research but on intuition and subjective understanding as well. For this reason, social scientific texts are also poetic or rhetorical in much the same way that novels, poetry and drama are. Rhetoric and poetic are not confined to aesthetic literary production. To the extent that social science is constituted by symbols, is based on the subjectivity, feelings and interpretation of researchers, and requires emphatic understanding and insight, it would be possible to analyze social science from an aesthetic viewpoint as we would a novel, poem or dramatic text.

The recognition of sociology and the other social sciences as textual activity implies that there are rhetorical techniques employed
by authors to evoke responses to truth claims. A successful discourse is one that resorts to metaphors, metonyms, irony and the like, in order to present its version of reality as “attractive, edifying, obvious, compelling” (Baehr & O’Brien 1994: 62). The study of the relationship between the sociologist and his audience and the persuasive dimension of sociological discourse has been referred to as the poetics of sociology (Brown 1977; Peters 1990; Simons 1989).

What this means is that the assessment of social theories need not be restricted to their logical or empirical dimensions. In other words, social theories are not only constructed logically and empirically, but rhetorically as well. The rhetorical construction of social theory involves the employment of rhetorical techniques that function to “persuade” the audience to accept a particular version of reality. The success of this deployment partly depends on the “common concerns, common places in their cognitive charts” (Davis 1986: 286) of the audience to which the sociologist-rhetor speaks.

For example, Western sociological theory of the nineteenth century was classic because it addressed certain audience concerns with theory, and had to speak to these concerns (Davis 1986: 287). Such concerns include the need to explain the perceived uniqueness of modern Western society, the disintegration of the individual in modern society, the devitalization of society, and the spread of “evil” (Davis 1986: 287-293). In other words, quite apart from the factual concerns and truth value of theory, the ability of social theorists to get their audience to consider their utterances seriously has to do with how well they address such audience concerns.

The Rhetorical Element in the Global Spread of the Social Sciences

The success of the rhetorical programme of social science is dependent upon its ability to capture the attention of its audience.

What are the rhetorical techniques that the social sciences resort to or should resort to in order that their implantation in Third World countries is seen as a legitimate and necessary project? The answer to this depends, as Ibn Khaldun said, upon the “conditions of the speakers, as well as the speech, in order to achieve conformity with all the requirements of a given situation” (1958: 335). This given situation refers to the worldview of the audience of Western social science in the Third World. What then characterises the worldview of the scholarly audience of the Western social sciences?
These can be provisionally listed as positivism and counterism. Due to the intellectual upbringing and ancestry of most Third World scholars, they generally operate within the bounds of positivist science. In addition to that, there has emerged in much of the Third World, particularly since the 1970s, an apparent oppositional stance with regard to the Western social sciences that can be labelled as counterism. This stance is not to be confused with indigenization or the call for an autonomous social science tradition in the Third World. Counterism opposes Western modes of knowledge at the rhetorical level but nonetheless succeeds in incorporating Western assumptions, theories and concepts. Positivism and counterism each make social science audiences in the Third World responsive to rhetorical techniques deployed in the course of the global spread of the social sciences.

**Positivism.** The influence of positivism can be gauged from the success of quantification rhetoric. Numbers and other forms of quantification are pervasive in the social sciences. By attributing mathematical order to the objects of social reality, results can often be couched differently by using different kinds of comparisons and by switching between absolute numbers and percentages (Potter, Wetherell & Chitty 1991: 335). Perhaps the bias for statistical techniques, survey research methods and other forms of quantification can be understood in this light.

Positivism had also predisposed scholars in the Third World to being receptive to the rhetorical technique that may be termed the technicization of development. Faith in the notion that life is a machine and that the “study of man will reveal nothing except what is adequately describable in the concepts of mechanics and chemistry” (Lashley 1923) had resulted in the discursive reduction of development problems to purely technical ones. For example the problem of development in Egypt is seen to be due to 98 percent of the population crammed onto 4 percent of land along the Nile. The problems, therefore, are technical ones such as natural limitations, topography, and overpopulation (Mitchell 1991, cited in Escobar 1995: 47).

**Counterism and the proliferation of terminology.** The oppositional tide against Western social science, sometimes very rational and cosmopolitan, but sometimes rather insular unwittingly works in favour of the inflow of Western theory. For example, the body of
literature that has come to be known as Islamic economics grounds itself on a theory of rational man and a hypothetical-deductive methodology while adorning itself with a fine array of Islamic terminology. It has merely substituted Islamic terms for neoclassical ones, retaining the same assumptions and methods. The proliferation of new terminology, Islamic ones in this case, enables foreign ideas to be smuggled in and given pre-eminence while at the same time preserving the aura of Islamization of knowledge. The proliferation of indigenous terminology enables one to cut her cake and eat it too.

By way of summary of the above, the rhetorical construction of knowledge is successful to the extent that a problem is formulated and a concern addressed. This concern must be an issue of vital importance to the audience concerned. What general concerns must social science speak to in order to be taken seriously in the Third World? First of all, the social sciences must formulate a problem. The problem formulated is that of underdevelopment. Secondly, the audience concern addressed is that of the role of the scholarly community in addressing the problems of underdevelopment. Thirdly, the problem so formulated implies there is a need to offer a solution. The solution presented is that of the universalization or internationalization of the social sciences, which means its acceptance in the Third World. The purpose of highlighting the rhetorical dimension of social scientific discourse is to urge us to consider that "internationalization inspired from the West would necessarily be a search for an enlarged market for Western sociology [for sociology read social science and for Western read American]" (Oomen 1991: 82).

Conclusion

The prominence of American and western social sciences in the Third World depends not only on its ability to present a better fit between theory and practice (which may in fact be irrelevant), but on its ability to capture the attention of its audience of social scientists in developing societies. Rhetorical construction in social science activities constitutes the subjective dimension of the structures of academic dependency. In the context of academic dependency, the rhetorical techniques outlined above facilitate the acceptance of the social sciences in the Third World.
This paper grew out of a research project on “Alternative Discourses in the Social Sciences and Humanities” funded by the Volkswagen Foundation.

1 The nature and typology of irrelevancy has been discussed in detail elsewhere (Alatas, 1972, 1974) but is a field of research that remains undeveloped.
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