



ROUTLEDGE
HANDBOOKS



Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations

Edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley

Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations

South–South cooperation is becoming ever more important to states, policy-makers and academics. Many Northern states, international agencies and NGOs are promoting South–South partnerships as a means of ‘sharing the burden’ in funding and undertaking development, assistance and protection activities, often in response to increased political and financial pressures on their own aid budgets. However, the mainstreaming of Southern-led initiatives by UN agencies and Northern states is paradoxical in many ways, especially because the development of a South–South cooperation paradigm was originally conceptualised as a necessary way to overcome the exploitative nature of North–South relations in the era of decolonisation.

This handbook critically explores diverse ways of defining ‘the South’ and of conceptualising and engaging with ‘South–South relations’. Through 30 state-of-the art reviews of key academic and policy debates, the handbook evaluates past, present and future opportunities and challenges of South–South cooperation, and lays out research agendas for the next 5–10 years. The book covers key models of cooperation (including internationalism, pan-Arabism and pan-Africanism), diverse modes of South–South connection, exchange and support (including South–South aid, transnational activism, and migration), and responses to displacement, violence and conflict (including Southern-led humanitarianism, peace-building and conflict resolution). In so doing, the handbook reflects on decolonial, postcolonial and anticolonial theories and methodologies, exploring urgent questions regarding the nature and implications of conducting research in and about the global South, and of applying a ‘Southern lens’ to a wide range of encounters, processes and dynamics across the global South and global North alike.

This handbook will be of great interest to scholars and post-graduate students in Anthropology, Area Studies, Cultural Studies, Development Studies, History, Geography, International Relations, Politics, Postcolonial Studies and Sociology.

Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh is Professor of Migration and Refugee Studies, Department of Geography, University College London, UK.

Patricia Daley is Professor of Human Geography of Africa at the School of Geography and the Environment at the University of Oxford, UK.

“Within the complex topographies of global power relations and the struggles for more just ways of life, this book restores vitality to the notion of many "Souths" through a comprehensive exploration of relations of all kinds—which in turn substantiate different ways of being in the world.”

*AbdouMaliq Simone, Senior Professorial Fellow, Urban Institute,
University of Sheffield, UK*

“Only action from the global South will change world inequalities; but how? This handbook explores South-South connections, from economic development to politics, education, art and science, refugees, environment, and more. It is a great resource for all concerned with global justice.”

Raewyn Connell, Professor Emerita, University of Sydney, Australia

“Much has been written about the South, but very little has been written *with* the South and, even less, from the perspective of the South. This path-breaking book fills this gap. A must-read for everyone interested in knowing that one of the causes of our current global crisis stems from a massive waste of precious social experience forcefully emerging in this book.”

*Boaventura de Sousa Santos, Professor of Sociology, University of Coimbra,
Portugal, and Distinguished Legal Scholar, University of
Wisconsin-Madison, USA*

Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations

*Edited by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and
Patricia Daley*

First published 2019
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2019 selection and editorial matter, Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and
Patricia Daley; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley to be identified as
the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual
chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the
Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or
utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or
registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation
without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena, 1978- editor. | Daley, Patricia (Patricia O.),
editor.

Title: Routledge handbook of South-South relations / edited by Elena
Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley. Other titles: Handbook of
South-South relations

Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2019. | Includes
bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018035010 (print) | LCCN 2018046607 (ebook) |
ISBN 9781315624495 (Master) | ISBN 9781317229155 (Adobe Reader)
| ISBN 9781317229148 (ePub) | ISBN 9781317229131 (Mobipocket
unencrypted) | ISBN 9781138652002 (hbk) | ISBN 9781315624495 (ebk)

Subjects: LCSH: Developing countries—Foreign relations. | Developing
countries—Foreign economic relations | Developing countries—
Relations. | International cooperation.

Classification: LCC D887 (ebook) | LCC D887 .R68 2019 (print) | DDC
327.09172/4—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018035010>

ISBN: 978-1-138-65200-2 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-62449-5 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Swales & Willis Ltd, Exeter, Devon, UK

**In memory of our friend and
colleague, Kenneth Tafira**



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contents

<i>List of illustrations</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xiii</i>
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	<i>xx</i>

1 Introduction: conceptualising the global South and South–South encounters <i>Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley</i>	1
---	---

PART I

Conceptualising and studying South–South relations 29

2 Sociology through the ‘South’ prism <i>Sujata Patel</i>	31
3 Postcolonialism and South–South relations <i>Dominic Davies and Elleke Boehmer</i>	48
4 ‘When spider webs unite they can tie up a lion’: anti-racism, decolonial options and theories from the South <i>Amber Murrey</i>	59
5 Postcolonialism’s after-life in the Arab world: toward a post-authoritarian approach <i>Sari Hanafi</i>	76
6 South–South relations in the academic world: the case of anthropology <i>Gordon Mathews</i>	86

Contents

7	Geographies of South–South relations and regionalisation processes in Latin America–Caribbean <i>Thomas Muhr</i>	95
8	Creating indigenous discourse: history, power and imperialism in academia, Palestinian case <i>Janette Habashi</i>	112
PART II		
South–South cooperation: histories, principles and practices		125
9	The invention of the global South and the politics of South–South solidarity <i>Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Kenneth Tafira</i>	127
10	South–South cooperation and competition: a critical history of the principles and their practice <i>Urvashi Aneja</i>	141
11	Dreaming revolution: tricontinentalism, anti-imperialism and Third World rebellion <i>Isaac Saney</i>	153
12	The rise and fall of pan-Arabism <i>Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou</i>	168
13	Pan-Africanism: a history <i>Ama Biney</i>	177
PART III		
South–South cooperation: reviewing international development		189
14	Southern leaders, Northern followers? Who has ‘socialised’ whom in international development? <i>Emma Mawdsley</i>	191
15	South–South approaches to international environmental negotiations: the case of climate change <i>Eberhard H. Weber and Andreas Kopf</i>	205
16	Climate change and the future of agriculture in the Caribbean: prospects for South–South cooperation <i>Kevon Rhiney</i>	215

- 17 South–South relations in African agriculture: hybrid modalities of cooperation and development perspectives from Brazil and China 226
Lídia Cabral

PART IV

South–South cooperation in displacement, security and peace 237

- 18 Southern-led responses to displacement: modes of South–South cooperation? 239
Elena Fiddian-Qasmieh
- 19 China, ‘state-centric’ humanitarianism, and the International Committee of the Red Cross: a historical background 256
Caroline Reeves
- 20 South–South cooperation in international organisations: its conceptualisation and implementation within UNDP and UNHCR 270
Naohiko Omata
- 21 Cooperation on refugees in Latin America and the Caribbean: the ‘Cartagena process’ and South–South approaches 282
David James Cantor
- 22 The ‘need to be there’: North–South encounters and imaginations in the humanitarian economy 296
Estella Carpi
- 23 Security cooperation in Latin America and the Caribbean: threats, institutions and challenges 309
Yonique Campbell
- 24 Toward South–South peace-building 320
Patricia Daley

PART V

South–South connections 333

- 25 Struggles for gender justice: regional networks and feminist experiences of South–South collaborations 335
Sohela Nazneen

Contents

26	A political economy analysis of South–South youth relations in Africa: drivers and future research questions <i>Grace M. Mwaura</i>	345
27	South–South education relations <i>Thomas Muhr and Mário Luiz Neves de Azevedo</i>	357
28	South–South cooperation through education? The example of China with/in Africa <i>Johanna L. Waters and Maggi W.H. Leung</i>	370
29	South–South migration and diasporas <i>Jonathan Crush and Abel Chikanda</i>	380
30	South–South medical tourism <i>Meghann Ormond and Heidi Kaspar</i>	397
31	Art connections: South–South transnational flow(s) <i>Miguel Rojas-Sotelo</i>	406
	<i>Index</i>	425

Illustrations

Figures

10.1	Panchsheel Principles and Bandung Principles	143
10.2	Principles of South–South cooperation	146
10.3	Nairobi document	147
28.1	Sino–African higher education programmes and initiatives	371
29.1	Changes in the share of migrants by migration corridors, 1960–2000	383
29.2	Proportion of female migrants by region, 1960 and 2000	388
31.1	Circular plot of migration flows between and within world regions during 2005 to 2010	408
31.2	Miguel Calderón, <i>Evolution of Man</i> , 1995	413
31.3	Jaime Ávila, <i>Dios de la Miseria</i> (<i>Life is a Catwalk</i> series); <i>Diez metros cúbicos</i> (<i>Fourth World</i> series)	414
31.4	Percentage of biennials organised in each area of the world by 2010	416
31.5	History of the Havana Biennale	417
31.6	The South Network. The Havana Biennale	418
31.7	Percentage of regions participating in the Havana Biennale from 1989 to 2006	419
31.8	Overall women’s participation in the Havana Biennale from 1989 to 2006	420
31.9	Distribution of the top 500 artists by gender and contemporary artists born after 1980	420
31.10	10th Havana Biennale, 2009	421

Tables

7.1	Latin America–Caribbean regionalisms in the ‘Greater Caribbean’	98
14.1	Dominant narrative framings of DAC aid and South–South development cooperation	196

List of illustrations

17.1	Selection of Brazilian and Chinese agricultural initiatives in Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique and Zimbabwe	229
29.1	Different definitions of South–South migration	382
29.2	International migrant stock by region of origin and destination, 2015	383
29.3	Number of South–South migration origin and destination countries, 2015	384
29.4	Major South–South migration countries of origin, 2015	385
29.5	Major South–South migration countries of destination, 2015	386
29.6	Major South–South migration corridors, 2015	387
29.7	Proportion of female migrants in top 20 South–South migrant origin countries, 2015	388
29.8	Proportion of female migrants in top 20 South–South migration destination countries, 2015	389
29.9	Proportion of female migrants in major migration corridors, 2015	390
29.10	A typology of South–South migration	391
29.11	South–South remitting to major migrant origin countries, 2015	392
29.12	South–South remitting from major migrant destination countries, 2015	393

Acknowledgements

This handbook has been born from our academic, personal and political commitment to different forms of social justice and a determination to identify and critically examine alternatives to diverse forms of structural inequalities and modes of exploitation and marginalisation around the world. We are grateful to the chapter authors who have joined us on this journey to individually and collectively explore various ways of studying, knowing and responding to diverse encounters within, across and beyond the global South (in addition, of course, to delineating and critiquing the contours of the very notion of ‘the South’ itself).

On a personal level, Elena is grateful to Yousif M. Qasmiyeh and Bissan-Maria Fiddian-Qasmiyeh for their patience and support throughout the process of preparing and bringing this project to fruition. In innumerable ways, they have helped frame the volume and Elena’s resolve to continue tracing ways, individual and collective, for us to articulate, embody and develop critiques, counter-narratives and alternative ways of knowing, being in, and responding to the world. Elena would also like to extend her thanks to the European Research Council for funding her on-going research into South–South humanitarianism, through the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (Grant Agreement No. 715582).

Patricia would like to thank Elena for giving her the opportunity to work with her on this seminal text, and her current and former students who have continued to stimulate her interests in critical development studies, feminist political ecology, pan-Africanism, and other forms of decolonial thought.

At Routledge, we are very grateful to Rebecca Brennan, Margaret Farrelly, Helena Hurd, Matthew Shobbrook and Khanam Virjee for supporting this project from its inception; for their assistance at different stages of putting the volume together, we would like to extend our thanks to Rosanna Gillespie, Erkan Gursel, Andrew Knight, Oska Paul, Sorchá Daly, and Rachel Carter.

Chapter 8 is a reprint of Janette Habashi’s 2005 article by the same title, ‘Creating Indigenous Discourse: History, Power, and Imperialism in Academia, Palestinian Case’, published in *Qualitative Inquiry* 2005 11: 771. We are grateful to the publishers for allowing us to reprint this article.

Chapter 14 by Emma Mawdsley is based on a longer paper published by *Asia Pacific Viewpoint* under the title ‘The Southernisation of Development’. We are grateful to the editors of the journal, and the publishers, Wiley, for allowing the author to use material from that paper. Thanks are also due to the special issue editors, Kearrin Sims and Lisa Law of James Cook University.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the artists who have granted permission for the usage of images of their artworks in Chapter 31 by Miguel Rojas-Sotelo, as noted in the chapter, and as follows: Miguel Calderón, *Evolution of Man*, 1995. La Colección Jumex, México. Courtesy: Fundación Jumex Arte Contemporáneo; and Jaime Avila, *Dios de la Miseria* (*Life is a Cat's Walk* series); *Diez metros cúbicos* (*Fourth World* series). Photographs of shanty towns of the megacities of the South, printed and folded in cardboard (2003–2007) – courtesy of the artist.

Abbreviations

AAPC	All African Peoples Conference
AAWORD	Association of African Women in Research and Development
ACC	Arab Cooperation Council
ACS	Association of Caribbean States
AIMS	African Institute of Mathematical Studies
AKAA	Also Known as Africa
ALBA-TCP	Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America – People’s Trade Agreement (Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América – Tratado de Comercio de los Pueblos)
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
APRM	African Peer Review Mechanism
ARROW	Asia Resource and Research Centre on Women
ASA	Africa–South America
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
ASF	African Standby Force
ASK	Ain Salish Kendra
ATDCs	Agricultural Technology Demonstration Centres
AU	African Union
BAPA	Buenos Aires Plan of Action for Promoting and Implementing Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries
BCE	Before the Common Era
BCM	Black Consciousness Movement
BDPA	Brazil Declaration and Plan of Action
BPoA	Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS)
BRIC	Brazil, Russia, India, China
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa
BRICS STI	BRICS Science, Technology and Innovation
BRIICS	Brazil, Russia, India, Indonesia, China, and South Africa
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme

Abbreviations

CAFRA	Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Advocacy
CAFTA-DR	Central American Free Trade Agreement-Dominican Republic
CARICOM	The Caribbean Community
CARIFORUM	CARICOM and Dominican Republic
CBDR	Common But Differentiated Responsibilities
CCCCC	Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre
CDB	Caribbean Development Bank
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CE	Common Era
CEEWA	Council for the Economic Empowerment of Women
CELAC	Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños)
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency (United States of America)
CIAT	International Center for Tropical Agriculture (Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical)
CIF	Climate Investment Fund
CIMH	Caribbean Institute for Meteorology and Hydrology
CIP	Citizenship by Investment Programme
CIREFCA	International Conference on Central American Refugees (Conferencia Internacional sobre Refugiados Centroamericanos)
CONVIASA	Venezuelan Consortium of Aeronautics Industries and Air Services (El Consorcio Venezolano de Industrias Aeronáuticas y Servicios Aéreos)
COP	Conference of Parties
CRA	Contingent Reserve Arrangement
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DAWN	Development Alternatives for Women in a New Era
DCF	Development Cooperation Forum
DEMIG	Determinants of International Migration
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
EAC	Eastern Africa Community
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central Africa States
ECOALBA	Bolivian Alliance for the People of Our America Economic Space (Espacio Económico de Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América)
ECOALBA-TCP	ECOALBA – Tratado de Comercio de los Pueblos
ECOSOCC	Economic, Social and Cultural Council
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EFA	Education for All
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FARC	Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia)
FBO	Faith-Based Organisations
FEMNET	African Women’s Development and Communications Network
FERAP	Federation of African Women
FOCAC	Forum on China–Africa Cooperation
FSLN	Sandinista National Liberation Front (Frente Sandinista de Liberación Nacional)

GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GBMD	Global Migration Bilateral Database
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GHG	Global Health Governance
GMD	Guo Ming Dang (Chinese Nationalist Party)
GMOD	Global Migrant Origin Database
GONGO	Government-Organised Non-Governmental Organisation
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
GRULAC	Group of Latin American and Caribbean Countries
G-7	Group of Seven (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States)
G77	Group of 77 (Charter of Algiers)
HDI	Human Development Index
IADB	Inter-American Defense Board
IAFA	International African Friends of Abyssinia
IASB	International African Service Bureau
IBSA	India-Brazil-South Africa Dialogue Forum
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
ICT	Information, Communication, Technology
IDP	Internally Displaced Peoples
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IGC	Intergovernmental Consultations on Migration, Asylum and Refugees
IGTN	International Gender and Trade Network
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMI	International Migration Institute
IMPACS	Implementing Agency for Crime and Security System
INDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation
IOM	International Organisation of Migration
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPLAC	Latin American and Cuban Pedagogical Institute (Instituto Pedagógico Latinamericano y Caribeño)
IR	International Relations
ITEC	Indian Technical and Economic Cooperation
IUAES	International Union of Anthropological and Ethological Studies
JCR	Web of Knowledge Journal Citation Reports
LAC	Latin American and Caribbean
LAIA	Latin American Integration Association
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
LOC	Line of Credit (India)
MDA	Ministry of Agrarian Development
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MDPA	Mexico Declaration and Plan of Action
MENA	Middle East and North Africa

Abbreviations

MERCOSUR	Common Market of the South
MFI	More Food International
MRE	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Brazil (Ministério das Relações Exteriores)
MST	Landless Workers Movement (Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra)
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NCBWA	National Congress of British West Africa
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIEO	New International Economic Order
NTCA	Northern Triangle of Central America
OAS	Organisation of American States
OAU	Organisation of African Unity
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD-DAC	The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
OIC	Organisation of the Islamic Conference (renamed Organisation of Islamic Cooperation)
OLAS	Organization of Latin American Solidarity
OPEC	Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
OSPAAAL	Organization of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America
PAC	Pan-African Congresses
PAM	Pan-African Movement
PAP	Pan-African Parliament
PDV	Petróles de Venezuela Ltd
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
PPCR	Pilot Program for Climate Resilience
PRC	People's Republic of China
RFNSP	Regional Food and Nutrition Security Policy
RMF	Rhodes Must Fall
RROCM	Regional Network of Civil Organisations on Migration (Red Regional de Organizaciones Civiles para las Migraciones)
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SCF	Strategic Climate Fund
SCO	Shanghai Cooperation Organisation
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SELA	The Latin American and Caribbean Economic System (Sistema Económico Latinoamericano y del Caribe)
SHOCS	Strengthening Hydro-meteorological Operations and Services in Caribbean Small Island Developing States

SICA	Central American Integration System (Sistema de la Integración Centroamericana)
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
SSC	South–South cooperation
SSCI	Social Science Citation Index
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics
STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
SUCRE	Unitary Regional Clearing System (Sistema Unitario de Compensación Regional)
TCP	Peoples' Trade Agreement (Tratado de Comercio de los Pueblos)
TNE	Transnational Education
TVET	Technical Vocational Education & Training
UAE	United Arab Emirates
UAR	United Arab Republic (<i>al-Jumhuriyah al-'Arabiya al-Mutahida</i>)
UAS	United Arab States
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNAC	National Union of Small-scale Farmers, Mozambique (União Nacional de Camponeses)
UNAM	National Autonomous University of Mexico (Universidad Autónoma de México)
UNASUR	Union of South American Nations (Unión de Naciones Suramericanas)
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNCHE	United Nations Conference on the Human Environment
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education Scientific & Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIA	Universal Negro Improvement Association
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organisation
UNIFIL	UN Interim Forces in Lebanon
UNOSCC	United Nations Office for South–South Cooperation
UNTS	United Nations Treaty Series
UNU	United Nations University
UPC	Union of the Peoples of Cameroon (Union des Populations du Cameroun)
USA	United States of America
USD	United States Dollar
WASU	West African Student Union
WAU	World Anthropological Union
WCAA	World Council of Anthropological Associations
WLUML	Women Living Under Muslim Law
WTO	World Trade Organisation
ZEP	Petrocaribe Economic Zone (Zona Económica Petrocaribe)

Contributors

Urvashi Aneja is Associate Professor of International Relations at the OP Jindal Global University, India, and Founding Director of Tandem Research, a multidisciplinary research collective generating policy insights on technology, society and sustainability.

Ama Biney is an independent scholar based in the UK with research interests in African history and politics, international development and the political economy of Africa.

Elleke Boehmer is Professor of World Literature in English at the University of Oxford, and a founding figure in the field of colonial and postcolonial literary studies. She is the author, editor or co-editor of over 20 books. Her website is www.ellekeboehmer.com/.

Lidia Cabral is a Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), University of Sussex. Her work focuses on the governance of development assistance and the politics of agricultural policymaking, especially in Africa and Latin America.

Yonique Campbell is Lecturer in the Department of Government at the University of the West Indies where she teaches public policy and management. Her research interests include national security, substantive citizenship rights, state legitimacy and policy effectiveness in small states.

David James Cantor is founder and Director of the Refugee Law Initiative at the School of Advanced Study, University of London. His wide-ranging research on the displaced in Latin America recently won the *Times Higher Education* research project of the year award (2017–2018).

Estella Carpi is Research Associate in the Migration Research Unit, Department of Geography, University College London. Her present work focuses on Southern-led humanitarian responses to displacement from Syria.

Abel Chikanda is Assistant Professor in the Departments of Geography & Atmospheric Science, and African and African-American Studies at the University of Kansas. His research focuses mainly on migration and development, and food security in Southern Africa.

Jonathan Crush holds the CIGI Chair in Global Migration and Development at the Balsillie School of International Affairs, and is University Research Professor of Geography and Environmental Studies at Wilfrid Laurier University. From 2006–2016, he was an Honorary Professor at the University of Cape Town. Jonathan has published extensively on international migration, food security and African development.

Patricia Daley is Professor of the Human Geography of Africa at the School of Geography and the Environment at the University of Oxford. She has published extensively on refugees, peace-making and gender issues in Eastern and Central Africa. Patricia is co-editor of the *Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations*.

Dominic Davies is Lecturer in English at City, University of London. He has written a monograph and co-edited two essay collections, as well as a number of journal articles and book chapters, relating broadly to the field of postcolonial studies.

Elena Fiddian-Qasbiyeh is Professor of Migration and Refugee Studies and Co-Director of the Migration Research Unit at University College London (UCL). Her research examines experiences of and responses to displacement, with a particular focus on protracted refugee situations in the Middle East and North Africa. Elena is co-editor of the *Routledge Handbook of South–South Relations*.

Janette Habashi is a Full Professor in the Human Relations department at the University of Oklahoma. In addition to teaching, her passions include researching sociopolitical issues on children and youth in a multitude of societies and cultures as well as indigenous discourse.

Sari Hanafi is Professor of Sociology at the American University of Beirut, editor of *Idafat: the Arab Journal of Sociology*, and President of the International Sociological Association. He was previously Vice President of the Board of the Arab Council of Social Science.

Heidi Kaspar is a senior researcher and social and health geographer at the Kalaidos University of Applied Sciences in Switzerland. Her research focuses on transnational health care and care work as a product and productive of everyday, as well as extraordinary, practices and global and intimate relations.

Andreas Kopf is Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Sciences at The University of the South Pacific. His research interests include examining the social and human dimensions of contemporary global climate change, particularly in relation to sustainable development and human security in the global South.

Maggi W.H. Leung is Associate Professor at the Department of Human Geography and Planning, Utrecht University. Her research interests include the geography and impact of migration and mobility (esp. academic and professional mobility), and the internationalisation of education.

Gordon Mathews is Professor and Chair in the Department of Anthropology, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. He has written, most recently, with Linessa Dan Lin and Yang Yang, *The World in Guangzhou: Africans and Other Foreigners in South China's Global Marketplace* (University of Chicago Press, 2017).

Emma Mawdsley is Reader in Human Geography at the University of Cambridge. She has worked extensively on South–South Cooperation, and more recently on the implications for the (so-called) ‘traditional’ donors. From October 2018 she will be Director of the new Margaret Anstee Centre for Global Studies at Newnham College, Cambridge.

Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou is Professor of International History and Chair of the International History Department at the Graduate Institute in Geneva.

Thomas Muhr is Assistant Professor at Habib University, Pakistan, and Honorary Assistant Professor at the University of Nottingham, UK. He has published widely on education policy, and development and cooperation geographies of the global South.

Amber Murrey is a decolonial political geographer and anti-racist scholar. Her work has been published in *Political Geography*, *Third World Quarterly*, *Journal of Black Studies*, *The Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* and more.

Grace M. Mwaura is a non-resident Research Fellow with the African Centre for Technology Studies. She is interested in the multidisciplinary work on youth, environment and development in Africa.

Sohela Nazneen is a Fellow at the Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex and previously based at the University of Dhaka, Bangladesh. Her research mainly focuses on gender and governance, feminist movements and women's empowerment in South Asia and Africa.

Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni is an historian and decolonial theorist. He is Executive Director of the Change Management Unit in the Vice-Chancellor's office and former Founding Head of the Archie Mafeje Research Institute for Applied Social Policy at the University of South Africa.

Mário Luiz Neves de Azevedo is Full Professor at Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Brazil. He was a Visiting Fellow at the University of Bristol in 2011 and has been a Researcher at CNPq (Brazil) since 2008.

Naohiko Omata is Senior Research Officer at the Refugee Studies Centre (RSC) at the University of Oxford. Prior to joining the RSC, Naohiko was a Senior Teaching Fellow at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London.

Meghann Ormond is Associate Professor in Cultural Geography at Wageningen University in the Netherlands. Her research focuses mainly on transnational mobility, health and care. Her work offers insight into how shifting visions and practices of citizenship and belonging transform travel, health and social care practices.

Sujata Patel is National Fellow at the Indian Institute of Advanced Studies. Her work explores the episteme that organise social science theories and methodologies on unequal, exclusionary and discriminatory discourses and social relationships. She is the author/editor of ten books and 60 peer-reviewed articles/book chapters and has contributed to social theory and urban studies.

Caroline Reeves is an Associate in Research at the Harvard University Fairbank Center for Chinese Studies. Her work focuses on the history of Chinese charity. She has published widely in English and Chinese.

Kevon Rhiney is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Geography at Rutgers University, USA. His research is situated at the nexus of critical development studies, human-environment geography and political economy, with a focus on the Caribbean.

Miguel Rojas-Sotelo is an art historian, visual artist, media activist, scholar and curator. He directs the Hemispheric Indigeneity project, and co-leads the Working Group on Environmental | Arts | Humanities: Narrating Nature at Duke University.

Isaac Saney teaches at Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada. His research encompasses Africa, Cuba and African Canadian history. He is currently finishing the book manuscript, *Africa's Children Return: Cuba, the War in Angola and the End of Apartheid*.

Kenneth Tafira is an independent researcher and writer, a former Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Archie Mafeje Research Institute for Applied Social Policy (AMRI) at the University of South Africa (UNISA), and author of *Xenophobia in South Africa: A History* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018) and *Black Nationalist Thought in South Africa: The Persistence of an Idea of Liberation* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

Johanna L. Waters is Reader in Human Geography at University College London (UCL), and is interested in researching the intersection of migration and education – particularly the mobilities of children, young people and households in search of educational opportunities.

Eberhard H. Weber is Associate Professor in Human Geography at the School of Geography, Earth Science and Environment at The University of the South Pacific. His research interests include social science research on vulnerability and resilience to climate and natural hazards and disasters as well as on environment-induced migration in the Pacific Island region.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

Conceptualising the global South and South–South encounters

Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Patricia Daley

The study of ‘South–South relations’ is of increasing interest to states, policy-makers and academics,¹ often due to a professed desire to identify ways to maximise the potential benefits of the policies and practices developed by states across the global South. Especially since the 2010s, European and North American states and diverse international agencies have recognised (arguably especially in light of the financial crises which have led to pressures on their own aid allocations) the extent to which Southern states can ‘share the burden’ in funding and undertaking development, assistance and protection activities. As such, United Nations (UN) agencies, International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) and powerful donor states are actively promoting both the ‘localisation of aid’ and South–South partnerships more broadly as a means of promoting sustainable forms of human development. Following the expansion and reconfiguration in 2004 of the ‘Special Unit for South–South Cooperation of the United Nations Development Programme’, the UN Development Programme’s 2013 Human Development Report ‘call[ed] for new institutions which can facilitate regional integration and South–South cooperation’. The Report, entitled *The Rise of the South*, noted that ‘[e]merging powers in the developing world are already sources of innovative social and economic policies and are major trade, investment, and increasingly development cooperation partners for other developing countries’ (UNDP 2013, p. iv), before concluding, ‘The South needs the North, and increasingly the North needs the South’ (2013, p. 2).

Such assertions demonstrate the extent to which South–South relations cannot be viewed in isolation from historic and contemporary modes of South–North and North–South relations. Indeed, South–South relations, including different forms of South–South cooperation (SSC), are by no means new phenomena, and yet the mainstreaming of Southern-led initiatives by UN agencies and states from across Europe and North America is paradoxical in many ways. This is especially the case since SSC and its underlying principles are historically associated with the Non-Aligned Movement, and anticolonial and anti-imperialist struggles around the world. The purposeful development of a SSC paradigm was, in essence, originally conceptualised as a necessary means of overcoming the exploitative nature of North–South relations in the era of decolonisation, with diverse models of transnational cooperation and solidarity developed since the 1950s and 1960s; these include internationalist and socialist approaches and regional initiatives such as pan-Arabism and pan-Africanism.

Importantly, in Chapter 27 in this volume, Thomas Muhr and Mário Luiz Neves de Azevedo make the distinction between SSC – dating back to the 1950s and representing solidarity against imperialism – and forms of ‘triangular cooperation’ and ‘triangular collaboration’ that have been actively promoted by Northern actors since the 1990s under neoliberalism. Indeed, neoliberal globalisation and technological innovations have helped usher in transformations in the nature of political mobilisation and the intensification of population mobility in the global South. Commonalities of experience across the global South have led to diverse forms of regional and transnational activism, a trend toward new social movements (including between women, feminists, LGBTQI and youth) and individual mobility across wide geographical areas, including for employment, education and health. There is a need to understand these forms of cooperation to unpack whether they represent the continuation of older forms of SSC that sought to break with the dominance of the global North, or a reconfiguration of North–South interactions based on links with members of diasporas situated in the North, or are being used to promote Northern ‘best practice transfer’ between global South countries as debated in Chapter 27. These new forms of cooperation have become targets for Northern development interventions, as multi-lateral development agencies and aid donor countries in the global North attempt to guide the nature of the interactions through what they term ‘triangular cooperation’. In this context, ‘triangular cooperation/collaboration’ – a development policy intervention – is viewed by critics as instrumentalising and co-opting SSC and hence depoliticising potential sources of resistance to the North’s neoliberal hegemony.

Against this backdrop, it is clear that the paradoxes of contemporary attempts to promote the mobilisation of Southern states to fulfil goals delineated by Northern and Northern-led actors are indeed manifold. This is because such efforts are antithetical to the history and foundations of SSC, and also inconsistent with the longstanding determination to develop ways of understanding and responding to the world that challenge, rather than reify, global structures of inequality, ‘domination, exploitation, subalternisation and peripherisation’ (Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira, this volume).

Indeed, long before the institutional interest in ‘engaging with’, and ostensibly mobilising and co-opting actors from across the global South, rich, critical literatures have been published in diverse languages around the world, demonstrating the urgency of developing and applying theoretical and methodological frameworks that can be posited as Southern, anti-colonial, postcolonial and/or decolonial in nature (e.g. Anzaldúa 1987; Chakrabarty 2007; Connell 2007; de Sousa Santos 2014; Dussell 1977; Grosfoguel 2011; Kwoba *et al.* 2018; Mignolo 2000; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013; Quijano 1991, 2007; Said 1978; Spivak 1988; Sundberg 2014; Trinh T. Minh-ha 1989; Tuhiwai Smith 1999; wa Thiong’o 1986; Wynter 2003). These and other approaches have traced and advocated for diverse ways of knowing and being in a pluriversal world characterised (and constituted) by complex relationalities and unequal power relations, and equally diverse ways of resisting these inequalities – including through historical and contemporary forms of transnational solidarities.

Of course, the very term ‘South’ which is included not once but twice in the title of this volume, is itself a debated and diversely mobilised term, as exemplified in the different usages and definitions proposed (and critiqued) across the following chapters. For instance, a number of official, institutional taxonomies exist, including those which classify (and in turn *interpellate*) different political entities as ‘being’ from and of ‘the South’ or ‘the North’. Such classifications have variously been developed on the basis of particular readings of a state’s geographical location, of its relative position as a (formerly) colonised territory or colonising power, and/or of a state’s current economic capacity on national and global scales.² In turn, Medie and Kang define ‘countries of the global South’ as ‘countries that have been marginalised in the international

political and economic system' (2018, pp. 37–38). Indeed, Connell (2007) builds upon a long tradition of critical thinking to conceptualise the South and the North, respectively, through the lens of the periphery and the metropole, as categories that transcend fixed physical geographies. And of course, as stressed by Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Kenneth Tafira in Chapter 9, such geographies have never been either static or defined purely through reference to physical territories and demarcations: 'imperial reason and scientific racism were actively deployed in the invention of the geographical imaginaries of the global South and the global North.'

Through conceptualising the South and North through the lenses of the periphery and metropole, Connell argues that there are multiple souths in the world, including 'souths' (and southern voices) within powerful metropolises, as well as multiple souths within multiple peripheries. As Sujata Patel notes, it is through this conceptualisation that Connell subsequently posits that 'the category of the south allows us to evaluate the processes that permeate the non-recognition of its theories and practices in the constitution of knowledge systems and disciplines' (Patel, this volume). It enables, and requires us, to examine how, why and with what effect certain forms of knowledge and being in the world come to be interpellated and protected as 'universal' while others are excluded, derided and suppressed 'as' knowledge or recognisable modes of being (also see Mignolo 2000; Dabashi 2015). Indeed, in her chapter in this volume Patel follows both Connell (2007) and de Sousa Santos (2014) in conceptualising 'the South' as 'a metaphor' that 'represents the embeddedness of knowledge in relations of power'.

In turn, in Chapter 3, Dominic Davies and Elleke Boehmer centralise the constitutive *relationality* of the South by drawing on Grovogui (2011, p. 177), who defines 'the term "Global South" not as an exact geographical designation, but as "an idea and a set of practices, attitudes, and relations" that are mobilised precisely as "a *disavowal* of institutional and cultural practices associated with colonialism and imperialism"' (cited in Davies and Boehmer, this volume – emphasis added). Viewing the South, or souths, as being constituted by and mobilising purposeful resistance to diverse exploitative systems, demonstrates the necessity of a contrapuntal reading of, and through, the South.

As such, as Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira powerfully argue in Chapter 9, 'the global South was not only invented from outside by European imperial forces but it also invented itself through resistance and solidarity-building.' In this mode of analysis, the South has been constituted through a long history of unequal encounters with, and diverse forms of resistance to, different structures and entities across what can be variously designated the North, West or specific imperial and colonial powers. An analysis of the South therefore necessitates a simultaneous interrogation of the contours and nature of 'the North' or 'West', with Mignolo arguing that 'what constitutes the West more than geography is a linguistic family, a belief system and an epistemology' (2015, p. xxv, cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira, this volume).

Indeed, the acknowledgement of the importance of relationality and such mutually constitutive dynamics provides a useful bridge between these rich theoretical and conceptual engagements of, with and from 'the South' on the one hand, and empirically founded studies of the institutional interest in 'South–South cooperation' as a mode of technical and political exchange for 'international development' on the other. In effect, as noted by Urvashi Aneja in this volume, diverse policies, modes of political interaction and 'responses' led by political entities across the South and the North alike 'can thus be said to exist and evolve in a mutually constitutive relationship', rather than in isolation from one another.

An important point to make at this stage is that it is not our aim to propose a definitive definition of the South or to propose how the South should be analysed or mobilised for diverse purposes – indeed, we would argue that such an exercise would be antithetical to the very foundations of the debates we and our contributors build upon in our respective modes

of research and action. Nonetheless, a common starting point for most, if not all, of the contributions in this handbook is a rejection of conceptualisations of the South as that which is 'non-Western' or 'non-Northern'. As noted by Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2015 and this volume), it is essential to continue actively resisting negative framings of the South as that which is not of or from 'the West' or 'the North' – indeed, this is partly why the (still problematic) South/North binary is often preferred over typologies such as Western and non-Western, First and Third World, or developed and un(der)developed countries, all of which 'suggest both a hierarchy and a value judgment' (Mawdsley 2012, p. 12).

In effect, as Fiddian-Qasmiyeh argues in this volume (drawing on Brigg 2002), such modes of negative framing risk 'maintaining rather than disrupting the notion that power originates from and operates through a unidirectional and intentional historical entity'. She – like other contributors to this volume addressing the relationships between theoretical, conceptual and empirical dynamics and modes of analysis, response and action – advocates for us to 'resist the tendency to reconstitute the power of "the North" in determining the contours of the analysis', while simultaneously acknowledging the extent to which 'many Southern-led responses *are* purposefully positioned as alternatives and challenges to hegemonic, Northern-led systems'. This is, in many ways, a 'double bind' that persists in many of our studies of the world, including those of and from the South: our aim not to re-inscribe the epistemic power of the North, while simultaneously acknowledging that diverse forms of knowledge and action are precisely developed *as* counterpoints to the North.

As noted above, in tracing this brief reflection on conceptualisations of the South it is not our intention to offer a comprehensive definition of 'the South' or to posit a definitive account of Southern approaches and theories. Rather, the handbook aims to trace the debates that have emerged about, around, through and from the South, in all its heterogeneity (and not infrequent internal contradictions), in such a way that acknowledges the ways that the South has been constructed in *relation to, with, through* but also *against* other spaces, places, times, peoples, modes of knowledge and action. Such processes are, precisely, modes of construction that resist dependence upon hegemonic frames of reference; indeed, this handbook in many ways exemplifies the collective power that emerges when people come together to cooperate and trace diverse 'roots and routes' (following Gilroy 1993) to knowing, being and responding to the world – all with a view to better understanding and finding more nuanced ways of responding to diverse encounters within and across the South *and* the North.

At the same time as we recognise internal heterogeneity within and across the South/souths, and advocate for more nuanced ways of understanding the South and the North that challenge hegemonic epistemologies and methodologies, Ama Biney's chapter in this volume reminds us of another important dynamic that underpins the work of most, perhaps all, of our contributors. While Biney is writing specifically about pan-Africanism, we would argue that the approach she delineates is essential to the critical theoretical perspectives and analyses presented throughout this handbook:

Pan-Africanism does not aim at the external domination of other people, and, although it is a movement operating around the notion of being a race conscious movement, it is not a racist one . . . In short, pan-Africanism is not anti-white but is profoundly against all forms of oppression and the domination of African people.

While it is not our aim to unequivocally idealise or romanticise decolonial, postcolonial, anti-colonial, or Southern theories, or diverse historical or contemporary modes of SSC and transnational solidarity – such processes are complex, contradictory, and at times are replete

of their own forms of discrimination and violence – we would nonetheless posit that this commitment to challenging and resisting all forms of oppression and domination, of all peoples, is at the core of our collective endeavours.

Aims and structure of the handbook

With such diverse approaches to conceptualising ‘the South’ (and its counterpoint, ‘the North’ or ‘the West’), precisely how we can explore ‘South–South relations’ thus becomes, first, a matter of how and with what effect we ‘know’, ‘speak of/for/about’, and (re)act in relation to different spaces, peoples and objects around the world; subsequently, it is a process of tracing material and immaterial connections across time and space, such as through the development of political solidarity and modes of resistance, and the movement of aid, trade, people and ideas. It is with these overlapping sets of debates and imperatives in mind, that this handbook aims to explore a broad range of questions regarding the nature and implications of conducting research in and about the global South, and of applying a ‘Southern lens’ to such a wide range of encounters, processes and dynamics around the world.³

To this end, and building upon the perspectives outlined above, the contributions in Part I of this handbook critically explore diverse and critical ways of conceptualising, researching and developing new forms of knowledge from and about ‘the South’ and ‘South–South relations’, highlighting ways of resisting rather than (re)producing unequal power relations and modes of exploitation. With these modes of analysis in mind, Part II then examines past, present and future opportunities and challenges of different models of SSC and solidarity, including internationalism, pan-Arabism and pan-Africanism. In turn, Part III explores key debates vis-à-vis SSC in the field of international development, while Part IV analyses Southern-led responses and modes of engagement in processes of displacement, security and peace. Part V brings the previous discussions and debates to bear on a diverse range of connections and modes of exchange, including South–South feminist activism, the position of youth in diverse transnational settings, and the migration of people (including for education and health) and of art across the South.

Part I: Conceptualising and studying South–South relations

The contributions in Part I of the handbook trace multiple ways of studying, knowing and responding to a diverse range of encounters within, across and beyond the global South, while simultaneously delineating and critically analysing the very constitution, and contestation, of the contours and content(s) of ‘the South’ itself. We start from the premise that intellectual, political, social, economic and cultural dynamics are simultaneously permeated in, and yet have the potential to resist and overcome, diverse forms of structural inequalities and marginalisation. Indeed, we propose that it is through critical modes of analysis that are historically situated and attentive to a multiplicity of positionalities, spatialities and directionalities of engagement that it becomes possible to more meaningfully understand, and respond to, myriad challenges and opportunities in the 21st century.

The seven chapters in Part I set out key theoretical, (inter)disciplinary and methodological approaches to the study both of the South and of diverse relationalities between people across and beyond the South. It opens with Sujata Patel’s chapter on the prospect of developing ‘global theories’ of knowledge that are ‘relevant, inclusive, pluralistic and diverse’. Entitled ‘Sociology through the “South” prism’, Patel’s chapter engages in a dynamic conversation with Raewyn Connell’s field-defining *Southern Theory*, to offer key insights into the aims of and relationships between decolonial, postcolonial and indigenous perspectives to research.

Throughout the chapter, Patel critically traces the tensions and potentialities of approaches which variously aim (in the case of decolonialists) to ‘create alternate universal theories, concepts and practices moored in a non-Eurocentric episteme’ and those which ‘focus their gaze on the academic production of knowledge’. The latter include postcolonialists aiming to ‘reconceptualise perspectives within the Northern academy’ and proponents of the importance of recognising indigenous knowledge and developing locally and/or regionally specific modes of analysis. Patel concludes by stressing ‘a need to simultaneously combine strategies from different intellectual locations (as these have been constituted in the 19th and 20th centuries) to organise global social theories and perspectives and to communicate these across localities, regions and language groupings’. While framed around the prospect of developing inclusive forms of Sociology from the South, Patel’s chapter provides invaluable insights that are relevant far beyond the remit of one particular discipline.

Chapter 3, by Dominic Davies and Elleke Boehmer, echoes and builds upon Patel’s discussions by focusing intently on the history and aims of postcolonial theories, both with regard to its position within Northern (and in particular Anglo-American) academia, and as a theoretical approach that is simultaneously based upon and critiques the constitution of the world into ‘the West’ and ‘the rest’. In addition to critically tracing postcolonial conceptualisations of ‘the South’ (and highlighting the parallels between the ascension of both), Davies and Boehmer argue that through its commitment both to incorporating ‘subaltern’ voices and form of knowledge, and to resisting the structural barriers that have historically led to their exclusion, postcolonial theories are quintessentially modes of exploring and promoting South–South intellectual and political encounters. Postcolonialism, they posit, is not beholden to the Northern academy (where it maintains a ‘radical’ rather than an ‘assimilated’ position), but rather is itself constituted by a ‘practice of constantly seeking to interrogate global cartographic categories and structures of power, precisely by forging links “among” and “between” others’. This means, they conclude, that ‘[t]he postcolonial aim, in other words, is for practitioners and critics to be in intellectual partnership with epistemologies grounded in “South–South relations,” sharing conceptual ground while also reflecting critically upon them.’ Where Patel focuses primarily on sociology and the social sciences more broadly, throughout their chapter, Davies and Boehmer highlight the significance of postcolonial approaches within the field of comparative literature and the humanities. Crucially, they also centralise the importance of (self-)critical methodologies through which scholars might be able to destabilise hierarchies of power and systems of exclusion while simultaneously being within and re-constituting those same systems.

Chapter 4, by Amber Murrey, pushes us further by positing that, although a focus on Southern and postcolonial theories might enable us to ‘shift the gaze’ toward hitherto marginalised and excluded speakers and thinkers, they are incomplete since they do not directly tackle the colonial racial hierarchies that sustain these very processes of marginalisation and exclusion. As such, Murrey argues that it is only through a ‘feminist decolonial orientation’ which pivots on a critical evaluation of racial and geographical inequalities that it becomes possible to truly overturn the ‘coloniality of knowledge’. Tracing historical and contemporary projects to decolonise knowledge – including the widespread invocation to decolonise curricula and universities tout court – Murrey powerfully evokes the need to develop modes of both North–South and South–South collaborations and solidarities that directly counter ‘an academic silencing of racial inequality in the scholarship on Southern theories’. Not confronting such silencing, she argues, ‘risks contributing and reconsolidating (rather than effectively challenging) the centrality of the white gaze in global critical theory’. Drawing on Mignolo (2000) and de Sousa Santos (2014), she concludes that ‘[p]luriversity and the ecology of knowledge are frames for imagining beyond, against and outside of oppositional North–South paradigms’,

proposing that ‘rather than South–South or North–South partnerships, friendship might be more fundamental for anti-racist theories from and with the South(s)’.

Just as Murrey reflects on the ‘politics of the mundane in the academy’ – including questions such as authorship, citation patterns, the language of publication and politics of career development and everyday encounters in the academy – so too do these questions come to the fore in the following two chapters, by Sari Hanafi and Gordon Mathews.

Focusing, respectively, on knowledge production and collaboration in the fields of Sociology in the Middle East and North Africa and Anthropology in South Asia, Hanafi and Mathews powerfully trace the nature and limits of South–South academic relations in these regions. In his chapter, Hanafi ‘provide[s] a critique of postcolonial scholars and knowledge producers that overstate the role of imperialism and generate an oppositional binary with the West’, arguing that in regions such as the Middle East and North Africa it is essential to complement postcolonialism with what he refers to as a ‘post-authoritarian approach’. He advocates for the development of a post-authoritarian approach as ‘a political project concerned with reconstructing and reorienting local knowledge, ethics and power structures.’ By focusing on ‘the development and social and intellectual changes inside of the Arab world’, Hanafi argues that a series of major challenges remain in the local and regional arena of knowledge production, including a need to more rigorously trace the relationships between social phenomena and the political economy of specific Arab states, and the multifaceted forms of self-censorship performed by scholars in the region. By highlighting the combination of a lack of academic freedom for scholars living under conditions of authoritarianism, and scholars’ decisions not to prioritise production and publication of knowledge in their local language (in this case, Arabic), Hanafi in turn sets out to propose ways to develop ‘not only new epistemologies but also healthy working conditions conducive to dynamic and critical research practices’.

Further analysing ‘the intellectual and academic world of South–South relations’, Mathews carefully, and (self-)critically, examines the extent to which anthropology –which ‘throughout the twentieth century remained, to put the matter crudely, as a discipline through which mostly rich white people studied poor black and brown people’ – has taken steps to become ‘increasingly global’. Through a focus on the roles of the World Council of Anthropological Associations and subsequently the World Anthropology Union, Mathews traces the development of contemporary forms of Southern and/or ‘South–South’ anthropologies. With contemporary anthropology ‘consisting not just of the global North studying the global South, but rather of everyone studying everyone else’, however, Mathews notes the restrictions still faced, and at times embraced, by anthropologists from across the global South, who find that they ‘must intellectually imitate the ways of the global North in order to survive’. Echoing but transcending Hanafi’s focus on local scholars and epistemologies, Mathews argues that

for anthropology of the global South to overcome its current Anglo-American straitjacket, it cannot only focus on the local in its own local language, but must, at least to some extent address the global South as a whole and the world as a whole, even if the only language in which this can be done today is English.

By highlighting one of the key paradoxes underpinning such an approach – ‘the language of the global North’s intellectual Anglo-American core enabling the global South to transcend that Anglo-American core’ – Mathews prompts the urgency of continuing to explore and enact ways of knowing, and writing, about the world in ways that transcend entrenched power inequalities in all areas.

With Hanafi and Mathews having set out the significance of both local and global modes of knowledge production through a particular focus on two regions, in Chapter 7 Thomas Muhr advocates for the application of socio-spatial methodologies to help us better understand the particularities of and relationalities between particular 'regions' and regional projects of SSC. Muhr's chapter, which focuses on the geographies of regionalisms and cooperation in and across the Latin America-Caribbean space, enables us to revisit the question of the role of geography in demarcating particular territories as 'belonging' or 'being' of (specific parts of) the South. By proposing a socio-spatial methodology embedded within a political economy approach, Muhr brings insights from Human Geography to critique the 'methodological territorialism and methodological nationalism, through which co-existing generations of regionalisms become deterministically construed as ideologically separate, incompatible and/or conflicting projects'. Instead of fixed and static conceptualisations, Muhr centralises the importance of relational ontologies and of focusing on 'transnational processes and relations among political and social forces (state and non-state actors) in the construction and reconstruction of regions in/through space/time'. In so doing, his aim is both to highlight the 'greater commonality, interrelatedness and convergence among different regionalisms in the geographical area than is commonly assumed', and, precisely, to propose the need to apply critical theoretical insights and critical methodologies to challenge 'mainstream' forms of knowledge.

In the final chapter in Part I of the handbook, Janette Habashi further explores the contours and limits of diverse ways of studying people and places situated in what is currently denominated 'the South'. As noted by all of the preceding authors, concrete attempts have long been made to challenge Western/Northern forms of knowledge, including through the development of Southern, postcolonial, decolonial and anti-racist theories, through examining the limits and opportunities of knowledge production from the South, and through setting out methodologies derived from critical theoretical standpoints. In her chapter, however, Habashi sets out 'not to find a method to decolonise research but to articulate the impossibilities for such an intention'. Through a careful articulation of the nature and implications of the continued occupation of Palestine, Habashi argues that 'the current indigenous discourse is a remnant of oppression' and that, 'in reality, decolonising methodology creates an imaginary supremacy of an alternative research methodology that is very much seeded in traditional Western episteme'. Like Hanafi, who focuses on scholars working in authoritarian settings, Habashi's focus on the nature of knowledge production in contexts of ongoing oppression and occupation leads her to stress the complex realities faced by such scholars as 'individuals in the academy' and as 'members of the academy'. She pushes this further to acknowledge the paradoxes, both for indigenous scholars and proponents of decolonising research, of 'claiming individual ownership for collective knowledge'.

In her chapter, Habashi powerfully rejects the foundation of the (re)quest for academics within and across the South, and in particular those living under conditions of oppression, to seek solutions to deeply entrenched power inequalities. She argues that

[e]ncouraging indigenous scholars to search for a solution is part of a colonialist ideology that maintains the illusion that we have choices and power. Therefore, any proposed research alternative from other oppressed scholars or myself is deeply intersected with colonial discourse.

This is not to negate the possibility of finding ways of resisting oppression and inequalities, but rather to recognise the nature – and histories – of diverse constraints, and to move away from individualised attempts to 'seek solutions' and rather to focus on developing collective

understandings and modes of action which, through dialogue and friendship (to echo Murrey, in this volume), might lead to the constructive articulation of new research methodologies.

Together, the chapters in Part I provide pivotal entry points, and ways to read and navigate the multi-layered philosophies, ontologies and epistemologies of the South. They also remind us of the ongoing significance, and co-presence, of diverse temporalities, including the extent to which the ‘post-colonial’ coexists with (rather than following, or replacing) the colonial, with decolonisation being far from complete for the peoples of non-self-governing territories and those peoples and territories under explicit and implicit forms of occupation and control.

Part II: South–South cooperation: histories, principles and practices

Part II of the handbook expands upon this commitment to historically grounded analysis by turning to specific models, approaches and principles of South–South relations, including a historically informed introduction to notions and principles of SSC and competition, and to the Non-Aligned Movement, the Bandung Conference and the Tricontinental. Individual chapters are dedicated to key models of SSC including internationalism, pan-Arabism and pan-Africanism. Together, these chapters trace the histories and ongoing significance of these approaches to inter- and intra-regional relations and diverse forms of mobilisations around the world, initially and persistently against global North domination and more recently for reciprocal social, economic, environmental and cultural development.

This part of the handbook opens with a chapter by Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Kenneth Tafira, who restate the invention of the global South in relation to the global North, before summarising the unfolding of resistance against European colonialism and economic and cultural domination through diverse approaches to South–South solidarity. Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira historicise the invention of the ‘geographical imaginaries’ of the global South as being predicated on a paradigm of difference that began with the European Renaissance and Enlightenment. To illustrate, they evidence the processes (military expeditions, exploitation, enslavement of non-Europeans, economic domination, and masculinised and racialised hierarchies) that promoted Europe as ‘the centre of the world’ and subjected the other parts of the world to ‘subalternisation and peripherisation’.

By documenting the histories of South–South encounters over the long *durée*, Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira’s chapter – and the handbook as a whole – demonstrates that ‘[t]he most resilient politics in the modern world is that of transforming the world system, its global order and economic system of domination, exploitation, subalternisation and peripherisation’ (Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira, this volume). While recognising the quest for freedom beginning with European encounters in the 15th century, they depict the Haitian Revolution of 1791 to 1804 as ‘the ideal beginning of resistance and solidarity politics of self-invention’. They argue that the Revolution – the successful slave revolt in the French Caribbean colony of St Domingue – ‘not only paradigmatically challenged racism, enslavement and colonialism but built solidarity among the enslaved black peoples’. Since the Haitian Revolution preceded the French Revolution (1789–99), a decolonial reading of its history would present it as the first modern revolutionary movement for emancipation and recognition of the rights of human beings, and correct its neglect in the intellectual history of the global North. Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira historically situate the Haitian Revolution as ‘form[ing] an important base from which to articulate resistance and black solidarity-building as part of self-invention within a context of racism, imperialism, colonialism and racial capitalism’.

This resistance is articulated in pan-Africanism – a movement that started in the 1890s among members of the African diaspora in the global North to campaign for the liberation of

African peoples worldwide from all forms of domination and for recognition of the humanity of African peoples (Adi 2018). Pan-Africanism connected people of African descent globally as a concept and a movement, and Biney, later in this volume, examines the ways that pan-Africanism has evolved historically with multiple definitions and tendencies, while still retaining its core objectives: its vision of the principles of dignity, freedom, liberation, equality and justice for people of African descent. These objectives seem paradoxical in the context of a Euro-North American modernity that positions its liberal values as universal.

It is with this historical context in mind that Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Tafira can argue that 'the global South was not only invented from outside by European imperial forces but it also invented itself through resistance and solidarity-building'. Crucially, as Urvashi Aneja notes in Chapter 10, 'the principles of solidarity, sovereign equality, and mutual assistance came to define the parameters for South-South cooperation'. By tracing the history of institutional modes of South-South cooperation, Aneja points out that development cooperation between Southern states 'is a form of solidarity rooted in common historical experiences rather than an obligation stemming from a history of economic exploitation under colonial rule'. In their chapters, Aneja, and in turn Isaac Saney, trace the range of state-based attempts to promote solidarity based on mutuality, complementary and common colonial histories that manifested in the launch of the Non-Aligned Movement at Bandung in 1955 and the Tricontinental in 1966. The latter, as Saney shows in his chapter, was an attempt to build anti-imperialist alliances across three continents (Latin America, Africa and Asia) aimed at overthrowing 'the international global order'.

It is, of course, debatable the extent to which these principles continue to be reflected in contemporary modes of SSC among new economic groupings, such as the BRICS, that have emerged with globalisation, or whether these principles exist purely at the level of rhetoric. In effect, the saliency of these blocs is being questioned from several fronts, and Aneja has encouraged states such as India to 'build alliances and institutions that cut across the binary lens of the North-South divide and to find a balance between its immediate economic and strategic interests and its larger global responsibilities' (Aneja, in this volume).

Indeed, as explored by Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou in Chapter 12, regional groupings such as the League of Arab States, which was built upon pan-Arabism as a discourse and a practice, have often been limited precisely by virtue of their inability to develop connections beyond their specific geopolitical region. Mohamedou's chapter traces the development of the ideology of pan-Arabism from the middle of the 19th century onwards, examining the ways in which it acted as a 'mobilising force' throughout and after the 1970s, and was pursued politically through the League of Arab States. However, he notes that it ultimately persisted 'more as a sentiment than an actual project', arguing that pan-Arabism was never 'politically viable', 'was ultimately inconclusive and remains elusive'. In so doing, Mohamedou examines the ways that pan-Arabism 'was able to grab sporadically the imagination of Arab societies', including in a transmuted form during the so-called 2011 Arab Spring. While having been a significant force at different historical junctures, Mohamedou concludes by focusing on the limitations of pan-Arabism, arguing that 'the most evident limitation of its manifestation as a South-South project' was its inability to 'make significant political connections beyond the Middle East and North Africa'.

Where pan-Arabism remained, or remains focused on/within the MENA region, pan-Africanism is intimately related to the roles and relationship within and between 'diaspora' and 'continental' Africans. As Ama Biney demonstrates in Chapter 13, pan-Africanism is 'simultaneously, a movement, idea and ideology', with its roots in the African diaspora opposition to late 19th-century colonialism in Africa. Pan-Africanism has thrived on solidarity between people of African descent, as they assert their common humanity in the context of histories of racialisation, white supremacy and colonial and neocolonial domination, and expressed

through the concept of *ubuntu* – a term translated as ‘I am a human being through others’. Biney points to the continued relevance of pan-Africanism in the 21st century, as reflected in the increasing popularity of the concept of ‘global Africans’, now used to unite people of African ancestry irrespective of where they are in the world, whether in Asia, the Americas and/or Africa. Indeed, in many ways, pan-Africanism complicates common understandings of North–South, South–North and South–South relationships.

Part III: South–South cooperation: reviewing international development

Building upon the preceding discussions of the history and principles of South–South cooperation (SSC), the four chapters in Part III explore SSC by first examining key debates and examples of South–South cooperation for development and aid, followed by three chapters focusing on Southern approaches to the environment, climate change and agriculture. These chapters, in turn, lay the foundations for, and are complemented by, the following two parts of the handbook which focus (in Part IV) on humanitarian settings – including those characterised by displacement, violence and conflict – and subsequently (in Part V) on diverse forms of connections which are also frequently positioned within the remit of ‘international development’: feminism and gender, youth, migration, health and education.

This focus on South–South cooperation for ‘international development’ is particularly important because Northern development trajectories have been key vehicles for the epistemological and geographical framing of the relationship between the global North and South since the Second World War. In effect, the South is invariably imagined as underdeveloped, catching-up, developing or emerging. Within such a framing, international development agencies and Northern aid donors have organised and supervised tutelage for countries on the path to development: pursued relentlessly, and with limited success, such that development has been perceived (or perhaps ‘recognised’?) as an ideology (Amin 1985; Crush 1995; Escobar 2011). ‘International development’ has been extensively criticised for being unidirectional, with aid and knowledge flowing from North to South, maintaining Southern states and societies in an unequal, supplicatory and exploitative neocolonial relationship that espouses global North historical trajectories as universal, desirable and beneficial.

However, as noted by Emma Mawdsley in Chapter 14, this Northern hegemony and South–South binary, which has persisted since the 1950s, is being destabilised as the 21st century has brought profound changes in the ‘geographies of wealth and poverty, inequality and precarity’. Economic transformation in some global South countries has resulted in the emergence of diverse global South aid donors and has unsettled the global consensus as to who are the givers and receivers, as well as altering the modalities of aid – whether development (see Mawdsley, this volume) or humanitarian (as discussed in Part IV). As a result, Northern donors have often attempted to socialise Southern donors into ‘how to do development properly’ (Mawdsley, this volume), a process that has typically been characterised by Northern indifference to the principles of SSC which remain ‘neglected in policy and scholarly circles’. However, Mawdsley aims to ‘make the case that many Northern donors have moved further “South” than Southern partners have moved “North.”’ Through her analysis of three main areas – ethical framing, poverty/growth, and aid/development finance – Mawdsley traces ways in which Southern actors are ‘socialising’ the North. In effect, while acknowledging numerous caveats – including an interrogation of what is lost from view when we continue to equate ‘Southern actors’ with ‘Southern states’ – Mawdsley highlights a number of significant ways in which Northern donors and institutions are emulating certain Southern approaches to development assistance.

Planetary transformations arising from climate change, evident in the promotion of the Anthropocene as a new human-induced geological age (Steffen *et al.* 2011; Purdy 2015), are also forcing a rethink of the Northern development trajectory as a universal model, as well as its future sustainability. On a practical and policy level, the discourse on the environmental impact of capitalist development illustrates the contrasting perspectives between the global North and global South (Bassey 2012). Eberhard H. Weber and Andreas Kopf, in Chapter 15, consider 'how the South constructs environment and climate issues as a function of development and is able to speak with a common voice, even when the South is not only internally diverse but is constantly diversifying'. The impacts, and contested discourse, of climate change pose two important challenges for the global South. First the most vulnerable communities, particularly small island states, are based in the global South and are likely to suffer disproportionately from rises in sea level and average temperatures. Indeed, in Chapter 16, Kevon Rhiney examines the significant threat of climate change to agriculture and food security in Caribbean states, to the extent that it makes climate change a national security issue in the region. Second, Weber and Kopf note that as countries in the global South have sought to develop economically and to raise their citizens' quality of life, they are increasingly arguing that global 'environmental protection can compromise their right' to follow a similar development trajectory to the global North; this is especially the case since they bear little responsibility for the current challenge of human-induced climate change. Consequently, Weber and Kopf show how assemblages of state and non-state actors in the global South, using development as leverage, have been able 'to play an increasingly important role in negotiations about the solution to environmental and climate challenges'. In addition, as Rhiney argues, addressing climate change has led to the 'forging [of] strategic and mutually beneficial partnerships and collaborations in research, technology transfer and regional advocacy'.

While these strategic state partnerships and regional alliances are vital to immediate survival, scholars have also started to reconceptualise the foundations of human–nature relationships in the context of a future affected by climate change, and to trace ways for humans to inhabit the planet without further destruction. In Chapter 17, Lídia Cabral examines the way that these different development approaches play out in Brazil's provision of aid to countries across sub-Saharan Africa. In this paradigm, the Brazilian state is seen to continue promoting the extant development model of large-scale farming, while 'Brazilian non-state actors have worked with their peers in Africa to contest the promotion in SSC of a model of large-scale commodity production for export markets, while demanding alternative forms of cooperation that would strengthen food sovereignty and agroecology'.

This is a clear example that state-led South–South cooperation does not necessarily involve a more ecologically sustainable or social justice-directed development model than that emanating from the North. Nevertheless, South–South solidarity, whether in the form of peasant and food sovereignty movements, such as *la via campesina*, or environmental and social justice movements, have created a political ecology of the global South that has challenged hegemonic global North environmental narratives about the relationship between people, development and the environment (Bailey and Bryant 1997; Peet and Watts 2005; Sundberg 2007; Neumann 2014). Furthermore, the amplification of the need for more environmentally sustainable development arising from climate change and the threat of planetary destruction has led scholars from the global North to look carefully to the ontologies of indigenous communities in the global South (Latour 2004, Escobar 1998) for solutions to live more sustainably. Indeed, unlike the hegemonic capitalist culture of the global North, many cultures in the global South have philosophical traditions that do not dichotomise the relationship between human:nature and subject:object (Foltz 2005), and thus have ecological knowledge that could operate synergistically with global environmental science.

Part IV: South–South cooperation in displacement, security and peace

In contrast to the extensive literature examining the role of South–South cooperation in international development, Part IV aims to fill a longstanding gap of research into the actual and potential significance of South–South cooperation in contexts of displacement, security and peace. In particular, the seven chapters in this part develop detailed analyses of the historical and contemporary significance of Southern actors, and principles of South–South relations through ‘humanitarian’ contexts across the Middle East and North Africa (chapters by Fiddian-Qasmiyeh and Carpi), sub-Saharan Africa (examined by both Omata and Daley), China (in Reeves’ chapter), and the Caribbean and the Americas (explored in chapters by Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Cantor, and Campbell). Overall, the section considers the power imbalances redressed, reproduced and/or reconstituted through Southern-led initiatives in diverse contexts of displacement, conflict and both slow-onset and accelerated forms of socio-economic and political change.

Chapter 18, by Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, examines how, why and with what effect the rich history of Southern-led responses to disaster-induced and conflict-induced displacement has been marginalised from view by analysts, policy-makers and practitioners, or, indeed delegitimised as not truly ‘being’ worthy of being identified as ‘humanitarian’ responses at all. In particular, she draws on her research into Southern-led responses to conflict-induced displacement in the Middle East and North Africa to examine both the multiplicity of *state-led* responses undertaken within an institutional framework of South–South cooperation *and* community-based responses which are less clearly related to the official principles of South–South cooperation. Noting the extent to which Southern actors have often resisted, rejected and developed alternatives to the hegemonic aid regime, she then examines why, and with what outcomes, specific Southern actors have at times been actively mobilised by the ‘international humanitarian community’. Concretely, she focuses on the proposed incorporation of Southern national and regional level actors into the international aid system, as part of the (post-2016) ‘localisation of aid agenda’, while community- and neighbourhood-level responses – including those developed by refugees themselves – continue to be marginalised and excluded. By focusing on both formal and informal, and state- and community-led responses in relation to the localisation of aid agenda, Fiddian-Qasmiyeh argues that exploring diverse *principles* of South–South cooperation – rather than promoting the incorporation of specific Southern *actors* into the ‘international humanitarian system’ – offers a critical opportunity for studies of and responses to displacement. She concludes by highlighting the need, first, for further research into the diverse modalities, spatialities, directionalities, relationalities and conceptualisations of Southern-led responses to displacement; and, second, of continuing to trace, resist and challenge the diverse structural barriers that prevent the development of meaningful responses that meet individual and collective needs and rights around the world.

In her chapter, Caroline Reeves then examines the long history of China’s approach to state-centric philanthropy, and the early years of the Red Cross Society of China in the 1900s. In so doing, Reeves’ chapter contextualises and makes a case for the importance of developing a more nuanced understanding both of a particular approach to ‘state-civic collaborative aid’ and a well-established model of state-centric humanitarianism. In addition to drawing on her historical analysis to challenge the commonly made assertion that China and other Southern humanitarian actors are ‘new’ or ‘non-traditional’ responders,⁴ Reeves also challenges the extent to which development practitioners and humanitarians in the global North have vocally critiqued and rejected Chinese aid interventions specifically, as well as being critical of state-led responses developed by Southern political actors more broadly. Echoing the analysis developed by Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Reeves stresses that humanitarians in the global North often promote a

vision of humanitarianism that is dominated by the figure of the non-governmental organisation (NGO) which is guided by supposedly internationally recognised and universal humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality and independence. However, Reeves (joined by Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, and Carpi, both in this volume) argues that the international humanitarian system's rejection of such forms of state-led responses, on the premise that these are politically motivated rather than 'truly humanitarian', is a fallacy – not least, this is because, under neoliberalism, the states of the global North have increasingly funded humanitarian interventions and have even developed forms of 'military humanitarianism' (Weiss 2004).

Building upon Fiddian-Qasmiyeh's and Reeves' historically grounded analyses of diverse forms of humanitarianism and philanthropy across different scales (also see Frost 2017), the following two chapters focus on the roles played by international organisations – including UN agencies and regional organisations – to promote the development of international, regional and national legal frameworks to protect refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs). In the first of these, Naohiko Omata draws on his experience of having worked with the UNDP and with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), to develop a comparative analysis of the way that South–South cooperation has been conceptualised in different international organisations and implemented through their assistance activities. With particular reference to West African examples, Omata argues that the applicability of SSC differs among UN organisations depending on their institutional mandates, noting the extent to which SSC is often presumed to be essential for development partnerships, but ultimately incompatible with 'humanitarian' situations. Furthermore, while South–South partnerships are increasingly being 'extensively promoted' on the international agenda to 'address common challenges facing the global South', Omata notes that 'there is a paucity of research that systematically investigates the concept and implementation of South–South cooperation within these organisations'. His chapter sheds light precisely on the potential, but also 'the limitations and risks of over-emphasising the value of South–South cooperation in certain domains', including in refugee protection.

Focusing more intently on regional legal frameworks for refugee protection, David Cantor in turn, examines the ways that governments in Latin America and the Caribbean have worked together to proactively 'review new challenges facing refugees in the region and to define a common framework of principles, plans and programmes in response'. Building upon the 1984 *Cartagena Declaration on Refugees* – itself developed several years after the African Unity's 1967 *Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa*, precisely aiming to fill gaps remaining within the so-called 'international' 1951 Geneva Convention pertaining to refugees – Cantor notes that the processes undertaken within and across Latin America and the Caribbean 'represent an unparalleled example of regional state-based humanitarian cooperation in the refugee field'. By tracing the development – both historical and conceptual – of the post-1984 Cartagena framework, Cantor carefully delineates 'distinctive components of this unique model of humanitarian cooperation on refugees'. While acknowledging the pivotal role played by the Cartagena framework and process and this highly visible example of inter-State cooperation on refugees, however, Cantor concludes by reflecting on the complexities and limitations of such an approach, arguing that 'its contribution to our understanding of South–South approaches is not without complexities'.

Moving away from a focus on the roles played by, and the relationship between, Southern states, regional organisations, civil society networks and key 'international' UN agencies, in Chapter 22 Estella Carpi examines both 'the actual' and 'imaginary' 'encounters between humanitarian providers and their [local citizen and refugee] beneficiaries' in Lebanon. Based on her longstanding ethnographic research in Beirut and Akkar, Carpi examines 'the attitudes and thinking that have characterised the Lebanese humanitarian economy during the Israel–Lebanon

July 2006 war and the Syrian refugee influx into Lebanon from 2011'. In particular, she explores the tension between the humanitarian aid system's 'philanthropic spirit' as it is enacted in the South, and local (including refugee) responses to what she denominates 'Southism'. Carpi proposes Southism, 'both as a concept and a mode of analysis which indicates a structural *relationship* between different sets of providers and beneficiaries, rather than a mere act of assisting the South with a philanthropic spirit'. Inter alia, she examines how the North 'captures' the South as a key form of capital and (echoing Fiddian-Qasmiyeh's earlier chapter) constitutes the South as a space requiring 'appropriate' forms of intervention. Simultaneously, and in line with many conceptualisations of 'the South' outlined above,⁵ she also demonstrates how 'the Southist intent' to care for 'the South' 'partially transcends physical geographies', including through the role of 'local' (in this context, Lebanese/Middle Eastern) humanitarian workers. Through this 'de-geographicised notion of Southism', Carpi argues that

Southism does not merely make the global South, or Southern elements in the North, its special *place* – as [Edward] Said does with the Orient – but it is, rather, employed by Northern and Southern actors to reassert, solidify and legitimise the Northern humanitarian presence and actions.

With the preceding chapters in this section having discussed responses to refugees and IDPs in particular, a related issue is how South–South cooperation can or should function with a view to decolonising cooperation and regional governance in security, including as a challenge to traditional North–South security relations. This question is explored by the final two chapters in the section, by Yonique Campbell and Patricia Daley, respectively.

Global policies relating to national and regional security (from the threat of war) have, since the Second World War, been dominated by countries in the global North, especially those which have been institutionalised as the permanent members of the UN Security Council (the USA, China, France, Russian Federation, the United Kingdom) and ten non-permanent members which are voted in every two years. During the Cold War, decisions on whether a crisis posed a threat to regional and global security and whether to intervene militarily were dominated by ideological differences between capitalist and communist states, with countries from the global South pressured to support either position. It is in this context, including the threat of nuclear war, that the South's Non-Aligned Movement was particularly significant (see Daley, Chapter 24). Despite this, the battlefields for the proxy wars between the superpowers took place in the independent territories of the global South. Since then, the security of the global North has dominated the global security agenda and Northern military interventions in the South have tended to support the national interests of Northern countries, even after the ending of the Cold War, which some have argued has seen the re-emergence of the colonial order (Gregory 2004; Harvey 2003).

The ending of the Cold War should have provided the opportunity for South–South cooperation on regional security governance; however, the military dominance of global North countries, and, since 2011, the West's 'war on terror', continues to influence the security agenda of countries in the global South. In her chapter, Yonique Campbell examines attempts by Latin American and Caribbean states to develop their autonomy from the USA's security paradigm – in effect to “decolonise” cooperation and regional governance in security’ through the establishment of new regional and sub-regional organisations that address security issues pertinent to the region, such as the high level of violence perpetrated by organised crime and narco-terrorism. Campbell argues that the success of SSC in the region will depend on the development of shared norms, but also consensus about the region's relationship with the USA.

Importantly, there is still considerable room for a debate as to what security actually means for the people(s) of the global South. Peace is seen as the outcome of better security, and yet in Chapter 24, Patricia Daley shows how the mechanisms for peace have been defined by the global North since the Second World War, producing a paradigm, now commonly known as the ‘liberal peace’, based on militarisation, liberal democracy and neoliberal capitalism as the only way to ensure peace. In her chapter, Daley looks at how the peace that newly independent post-colonial states in the global South wanted in the 1950s and the 1960s differed from that of the liberal peace. Essentially, newly independent postcolonial states sought to define a non-violent peace that focuses on development and the recognition of the humanity of people in the global South, following years of colonial exploitation and impoverishment. Cold War geopolitics, as well as economic dependency on the global North through the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, and through humanitarian assistance, made it difficult for states in the global South to implement their conceptualisation of peace and to take leading roles in the peace process. However, even with limited resources, initiatives, such as those taken by African states, challenge the hegemonic peace of the global North, and provide alternatives to that pushed by liberal institutions. Daley contends that despite some successes, ‘South–South cooperation on peace has been largely muted, or, in fact, insufficiently researched’.

Part V: South–South connections

Building upon Parts III and IV, which have addressed key challenges and trends in relation to international development and humanitarianism, the final part of the handbook shifts to explore in greater detail a range of forms and scales of connection touched upon throughout the previous chapters, including particular attention to the mobilisation and mobility of people, ideas and objects within and across the global South.

As indicated in Parts III and IV, North–South and South–South perspectives on, and approaches to, development and humanitarian initiatives are highly heterogeneous, as exemplified by the diverse perceptions and modes of engagement developed by women, feminist and LGBTIQI movements around the world. Indeed, as Fiddian-Qasmiyeh notes in her chapter, extensive critiques have by now denounced the extent to which Northern-led development *and* humanitarian policies alike

have often been justified as being a moral imperative for Northern actors to ‘save brown women from brown men’ (Spivak 1993, p. 93), reproducing ‘them’ and ‘there’ as inherently violent, oppressive and oppressed people and spaces while ‘we’ and ‘here’ are positioned as democratic, free and empowered (see Abu-Lughod 2002; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2014b).

In effect, scholars, practitioners and policy-makers alike have long been critiqued for universalising Northern gender relations and for misinterpreting the nature of gender and sexual identities, and gender relations in the global South (Narayan 1997; Oyewumi 1997; Cole *et al.* 2007; Connell 2007, 2014a, 2014b; Daley 2015; Moltlafi 2018; Medie and Kang 2018). So, too, have they often misunderstood and misrepresented the diverse positions, positionalities, performances and modes of resistance developed by people across the South, including on the basis of intersecting identities (gender, race, class, age, religion, sexuality, . . .), and in relation to diverse structures of oppression (patriarchy, misogyny, racism, heteronormativity, transphobia, (neo)colonialism, . . .) (e.g. see Anzaldúa 1987; Basu 1995; Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2014a; Lugones 2007; Mohanty 1984, 2003; Moghadam 2005; Trinh T. Minh-ha 1989; also see Murrey, Chapter 4 in this volume). This includes the commonly made assertions that repressive practices, policies and legal systems

vis-à-vis gender and sexuality are inherent to 'the South', rather than acknowledging the extent to which colonialism and neoliberalism are at the root of repressive and patriarchal legal systems that institutionalise gender inequality and violence and, for instance, criminalise same-sex relations, around many parts of the world (Abbas and Ekine 2013; Falquet *et al.* 2010; Murray and Roscoe 1998; Rai and Waylen 2014; Radhakrishnan and Solari 2015).

At the same time, however, Southern feminists have often been rejected from different standpoints, including through the claim that feminism is a Northern import that runs counter to local cultures, and indeed is 'seeped in and [reinforces] unequal power relations' (Medie and Kang 2018, p. 38). As Sohela Nazneen notes in Chapter 25, however, the preoccupation with the Northern origins of feminism and the sometimes heated debates between Northern and Southern feminists, has directed attention away from the dynamic Southern regional feminist networks and alliances that have grown since at least the 1980s. Indeed, there is an extensive and long history of writing, and acting, to promote social justice by and for women and gender-non-conforming individuals across what is currently conceptualised as the global South. In practice, Southern activists have developed significant intellectual arguments to challenge both dominant (and dominating) voices from the North and also those within the South who seek to maintain oppressive practices (see Connell 2014a, 2014b; Lugones 2007; Mama 2011). Nazneen discusses the need to extend and study those spaces within the South where 'regional flows of ideas and norms take place that critically influence national movements and policy and shape regional and global initiatives', while recognising that even though the North–South power relations are no longer dominant for feminists, new areas of tension and forms of inequalities are emerging based on resource access within the South, between diaspora and home country feminists, elite and grassroots feminists, and between nationalist feminists.

As approaches to diverse feminisms (in the plural) continue to expand, we also note the increased attention to masculinities beginning in the last decade of the 20th century (Connell 1995). As critical scholars have noted, global South masculinities have long been constituted as deviant and deviating from hegemonic white male masculinities, and development agencies have, in turn, sought to intervene across the global South to promote a particular model of 'gender relations' without attention to the colonial legacy of white male racialised patriarchal systems and militarised masculinities (Connell 2014a, 2014b, 2016; Daley 2008; Madlala-Routledge 2008). With young men in the global South countries perceived as possessing or being susceptible to violent masculinities, development agencies have persistently conceptualised them as a group in urgent need of modernising influences (Cleaver 2002; Honwana and Boeck 2005; Honwana 2012). This forces the question as to whether masculinities and youth, both previously excluded from being of scholarly concern, will follow the same intellectual trajectory as feminism. Can SSC, and its concomitant principles, provide the space to challenge ongoing attempts by development institutions in the global North to define, frame and transform Southern masculinities and the category youth?

Indeed, youth in the global South have collectively become targets of development policy interventions and are being subjected to diverse forms of 'triangular cooperation' (as outlined earlier in this introduction). Southern countries are encouraged by Northern aid donors to see youth as a problem to be solved – either a threat or an opportunity – 'a demographic dividend' arising from having much younger population profiles than countries in the global North (UNDP/DFID 2010; Honwana 2005). Youth have been targeted as the route to end poverty, as potential agents of economic transformation through their perceived capacity to adopt new leadership practices and technology transfers, especially digital technology, and they are being repackaged as entrepreneurial neoliberal subjects (Jeffrey *et al.* 2008; Jeffrey and Dyson 2013; Bersaglio *et al.* 2015; Gough and Langevang 2016). In Chapter 26, Grace M. Mwaura shows how most forms of South–South

youth cooperation are still funded by the North and yet, echoing Omata's reflections on the lack of evidence vis-à-vis the impacts and outcomes of SSC, she notes that a lack of research means that there is no 'assess[ment] of the utility of such relationships, some of which have often existed in the form of time-bound programmes'. This North-South perspective also eludes the dynamics of South-South youth initiatives as promoted by countries such as China, or initiatives developed independently of states in the areas of culture, sport, transnational political activism and education. In turn, Mwaura asks

What is the utility of South-South relations in a context of idolised Western cultures? Does 'Turning East', or in this case, 'Turning South', imply emancipation from the North or does it signal alternative opportunities for young people to create livelihoods.

In effect, a key area of youth policy intervention is education – a key focus for 'triangular collaboration' – where transnational migration for education has grown rapidly in the last two decades, with mobility, South-North and South-South, occurring at the same time as Southern education systems have been subjected to privatisation and attempts at external governance by aid donors and the World Bank.⁶ Thomas Muhr and Mário Luiz Neves de Azevedo, in reviewing the literature on Latin America and the Caribbean's engagement with South-South education relations, identify 'two broad camps': 'a mainstream approach, embedded in liberal and (neo)realist international relations theories; and a critical theory approach, associated with counter-dependency thinking'. However, the case studies of the Cuban originated *¡Yo, Sí Puedo!* global South literacy cooperation programme, and of BRICS-sponsored educational initiatives show that 'South-South principles of solidarity, mutual benefits and efforts of self-reliance are very much practised', despite attempts at the national level to integrate global South countries (China, India, South Africa) into 'global North-dominated higher education markets'. Nonetheless, Muhr and de Azevedo call for greater research into the hybridity of South-South educational cooperation.

In this vein, Johanna L. Waters and Maggi W.H. Leung's chapter draws our attention to multi-directional trends in South-South higher education mobility and argues for a specific focus on China's bid to be 'a powerhouse in global higher education linkages', by making China a *destination* for students, as well as *funding* higher education projects abroad, as it does in diverse African countries. By examining China's educational cooperation with African countries, they argue that there appears to be a mix of Chinese cultural, neoliberal, and global South solidarity principles and practices informing China's educational cooperation that ought to be studied further. Beyond the state, transnational forms of educational mobility are encouraged by the private sector, and yet the motivations, experiences and aspirations of individuals, such as those in African countries, who are taking advantage of new spaces of educational opportunities in India, Malaysia and other states within the continent, such as South Africa, largely remain outside the preoccupation of contemporary research.

More research might, as Muhr and de Azevedo argue, highlight the hybrid nature of Southern aspects of knowledge transfer to reveal that, while adopting some universalising Northern educational practices such as higher education institutional rankings, Southerners are mobilising to reassert the 'mutual interests' and 'collective development' of Southern states as being central to their educational goals. Together, these chapters thus emphasise the difficulties of de-linking from Northern dominance under the current global economic systems, as Southern initiatives are co-opted and mainstreamed, yet they also point to examples of difference and cooperation that should be investigated further for lessons of national and collective self-reliance. Moreover, as Waters and Leung conclude, 'scholarship needs to expose the spatial and social diversity

characterising contemporary international higher education, which should include a discussion of the potential epistemic pluralism that an alternative to Eurocentric knowledges might bring' to countries of the global South.

The final three chapters in the handbook further contextualise the nature, experiences and impacts of South–South migration and mobility (Crush and Chikanda), before delving in more detail into 'medical tourism' both as a form of migration and as a mode of international cooperation (Ormond and Kaspar), and concluding with critical reflections on the important history, present and potential of South–South cultural and artistic flows and exchanges (Rojas-Sotelo).

In their chapter, Jonathan Crush and Abel Chikanda indicate that South–South migration has increasingly come to the forefront of policy agendas as states and organisations have expanded their interest in the potential for migration *within the South* to promote development through different forms (including skilled labour migration, remittances and/or horizontal modes of knowledge exchange). Indeed, as they demonstrate in their chapter, '[t]here is substantial evidence that globally [South–South migration] is almost as voluminous as South–North migration, and for most origin and destination countries in the South it is by far the more important form of migration.' On the one hand, recognising the nature and significance of South–South migration can be viewed as an important corrective to Northern state and non-state discourses which depict the North as a 'magnet' for migrants from across the global South (i.e. incorrectly assuming that global migration is primarily a South–North phenomenon). This corrective could be perceived to be particularly important given that such discourses are used by Northern states and regional organisations to justify the implementation of draconian (and often illegal) measures to prevent certain people from being able to reach the North. On the other hand, however, the increasing policy interest in South–South migration has been paralleled by concerns that Northern actors might precisely be instrumentalising and co-opting Southern people and dynamics (in this case, migrants and migration flows) to achieve the aims established and promoted by Northern states and institutions – this raises the question of whether mobilising the benefits of South–South migration is not itself emblematic of the global North's desire to keep 'Southerners' in the global South. In this way, when Northern states and institutions promote the significance of South–South migratory flows, often invoking the 'fact' that this is an important way to enhance development outcomes across the South, this can be seen as being part and parcel of Northern states' inhumane, racist and racialised systems of border and immigration control (Brachet 2016). In such a context, we return to the question posed by Biney in her chapter on pan-Africanism – 'what reparations for the trans-Atlantic slave trade and colonialism should entail for people of African descent living in the diaspora and those living on the African continent?' – as this is core to acknowledging and enacting different actors' responsibilities for a range of historical and contemporary processes and phenomena, including exploitation, occupation and oppression by colonial and neocolonial powers alike.

With such questions in mind, Crush and Chikanda note that, in spite of increased policy focus, South–South migration and Southern diasporic constellations remain under-researched and require much more detailed and nuanced analysis. In effect, they argue that 'the near absence of South–South movement from the migration literature before the turn of the century does not mean that it had not been occurring in the past; it has and for many decades'. They continue by stressing that:

This blind spot is indicative of the hegemony of the Northern discourse on South–North migration, which has traditionally attracted widespread attention from scholars based in the North and has been assumed to have greater developmental value relative to other migration flows.

Through analysing the bilateral migration database of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA), in addition to other major sources of migration data, Crush and Chikanda take important steps to redress such gaps by tracing key trends in different forms of migration within and between different regions of the global South. Inter alia, they examine the feminisation of South–South migration, and also the ways in which South–South migration has been typologised and conceptualised by different stakeholders. For instance, they note that ‘the typology of South–South migration raises the issue of whether, and to what extent, these different categories of migrant can be classified as members of “diasporas” – indeed, their reflection on this matter echoes many of the points made by Biney (in Chapter 13 of this handbook) with regard to pan–Africanism.

Overall, Crush and Chikanda note that future research is urgently required vis-à-vis South–South migration, and argue that this provides an opportunity to develop more nuanced analyses of the relationship between migration and development since, ‘while most discussions of South–North migration focus on the positive and negative development implications for countries of origin only, it is clear that South–South migration has development consequences for *both* countries of origin and destination (Anich *et al.* 2014)’. In this regard, a key question is the extent to which different forms of South–South migration can be viewed as having the potential to promote core principles of SSC, such as mutual benefit, solidarity and the development of sustainable systems of ‘self-reliance’ within and across the South in ways that challenge structural inequalities (also see Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2015).

Indeed, Chapter 30, by Meghan Ormond and Heidi Kaspar, examines ‘medical tourism’ across countries of the global South as a form of South–South migration that potentially enables people to fill significant ‘health gaps’ that, for diverse reasons, they cannot meet in their countries of origin. In many ways complementing Muhr and de Azevedo’s and Waters and Leung’s earlier chapters on South–South education and scholarship programmes, Ormond and Kaspar’s chapter draws on their extensive research with patients, medical providers, travel facilitators and policy-makers across South, Central and South East Asia, and in the Caribbean. With reference to structural inequalities on global and national levels, Ormond and Kaspar note that ‘widening health gaps’ in the global South – between those who can and cannot afford or access appropriate medical care – have themselves been ‘produced’ by a combination of ‘[d]emographic and epidemiological transitions in global South countries, on the one hand, and the neoliberalisation both of national health systems and international development aid, on the other’.

It is precisely to fill the gaps that have been created and/or widened by neoliberal health and aid policies, that medical tourism across the global South has developed as a major phenomenon, with medical tourists’ ‘transnational movements reflecting and fostering asymmetrical social, economic and political relations that enable actors in some countries to be in a position to address the care deficiencies of people in other countries’. Through detailed attention to the experiences and conceptualisations of people who have themselves sought or provided medical treatment elsewhere in the global South, Ormond and Kaspar argue that ‘medical tourism reconfigures relations between and within source and destination countries’ populations, by establishing novel forms of post-national market-mediated solidarities and forms of aid’. While acknowledging the extent to which such arrangements might enable the development of ‘bonds of social solidarity between states and their subjects’, the chapter also stresses that medical tourism often takes place in ways that ‘largely bypass government-to-government diplomatic and aid relations’. In line with other chapters in the handbook which explore the diverse roles played by non-state actors – including members of local communities providing humanitarian assistance to refugees in the Middle East (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh), transnational feminist activists promoting social justice in South Asia (Nazneen), and non-state actors

across Brazil and Africa working together to develop more ecologically sustainable modes of agriculture (Cabral) – Ormond and Kaspar argue that a focus on medical tourism ‘upends conventional thinking about the geography of care and solidarity’.

The final chapter in this part, and in the handbook, provides a further critical analysis of the role and potential of collaboration and solidarity with regard to the important flows and counter-flows of ideas, people and objects. Turning his attention to the ‘state of the arts of the global South’, Rojas-Sotelo traces cultural and artistic flows and exchanges within, across and from the global South. Echoing the histories and debates traced throughout the handbook, Rojas-Sotelo notes that ‘most of the global South . . . was transformed by modernity/coloniality, their experiences interconnected under global routes of exchange and diverse forms and processes of migration’. Against this historical backdrop, throughout which the arts of the South have simultaneously been ‘treated as primitive, uncivilized, savage and non-refined, but [also] as a source of inspiration for the Western Euro-North American art history’, and as objects to the collected, consumed and commercialised, Rojas-Sotelo examines artistic production in/ from the South with a particular focus on tropicalism, hybridity and bordering. In so doing, he highlights diverse conceptualisations of the South – including Mosquera’s categorisation of ‘the issue of “Third World” or “Art of the South” not as a geographic problem but as a problem of the geography of power (Rojas Sotelo, 2009, p. 163)’ – the significance of race (and whiteness) in processes of artistic cultural production, circulation and consumption, and the development of pluriversal approaches that challenge, resist and fill gaps in existing epistemologies and ontologies, both of the North and the South. Inter alia, he highlights the extent to which ‘decentred authors from the South, have been documenting how a potent cultural trialectic took place: indigenous and black artistic expression fertilised white modernism, just as white art forms helped shape the indigenous and black modernisms in the South’. Within the context of such trialectics and other forms of interconnections and intersections, throughout his chapter Rojas-Sotelo asserts that ‘the margin is where their power resides’, while also noting, with reference to bordering, that ‘[a] *mestizo/liminal and alternative* culture has surfaced from the borders, fractures and crevices, creating a physical and symbolic ethos expressed in the work of the Chicana intellectual Gloria Anzaldúa (1988).’ Indeed, Rojas-Sotelo demonstrates the significance of multiple processes and directionalities of interrelatedness, whether through modes of resistance (against Northern denigration or appropriation of Southern art and artists) or collaboration (with differently positioned and situated artists and audiences). Such modes of collaboration include those showcased, created and nurtured through the Havana Bienalle which, since 1984 ‘has been known as “the Tricontinental art event,” presenting artists from Latin America, Africa and Asia, as well as Southern artists living in the North’.

Indeed, as is powerfully argued by Rojas-Sotelo, and as we have aimed to demonstrate throughout the course of this handbook:

The stories of the peoples of the South cannot be disentangled from those of the global North, as these stories refer to the building of nation-states and the participation of the people of the South in the economies, cultures and epistemic understanding of the world.

In effect, while acknowledging the ongoing exclusion and marginalisation of Southern art and Southern ways of knowing, being and acting, Rojas-Sotelo nonetheless concludes that ‘[a]ll these prominent examples of counter-flows, subaltern, situated and localised cultural production from the South may give a hopeful picture of how the world has become more interconnected, diverse and democratic.’ Advocating for the creation of more diverse and meaningfully collaborative spaces, and for the incorporation of both aesthesis (‘the sensing and feeling in opposition to

the pure formal in aesthetics’) and ‘decolonial aesthetics’ (which have thus far been missing in the discourse of decoloniality), Rojas-Sotelo powerfully argues that ‘[b]y reconnecting cultural and artistic production to life itself, in relational terms, by readapting ways of living, belonging and listening to the past and present, alternative systems of governance beyond modern democracy and late capitalism are possible.’ This aim is part of the overarching project that we believe the chapters in this handbook help us better understand, and work toward.

Concluding thoughts

The idea of the global South might have arisen out of the deeply unequal and exploitative relationships that developed with peoples of the world subjected varyingly to Euro-Northern American imperialism. As noted by our contributors, the South might be a product of the North, but persistent resistance to Northern domination has produced spatial configurations of common experience, mutual interests, and solidarities. The ending of the super-power rivalry of the Cold War and neoliberal globalisation, seeing the rise of Southern economic power-houses, has further challenged Northern hegemony and reconfigured SSC. Consequently, and as the chapters in this handbook demonstrate, the South can no longer be seen as an empty vessel to be filled by modernising influences from the North, despite ongoing attempts by Northern institutions to collaborate and shape these new dynamics. To the contrary, global interactions are highly nuanced in the 21st century: flows of people, capital and knowledge have new, complex geographies.

In the academy, the universalisation of Northern knowledge and its transfer to the South have been challenged by postcolonial scholars (Chakrabarty 2007; Said 1978; Spivak 1988) and by the decolonial movement (Alatas 2006; Alatas and Sinha 2017; Maldonado-Torres 2016; Mignolo 2000; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013; Quijano 1991, 2007; de Sousa Santos 2014; Sundberg 2014; Wynter 2003). This is a movement that recognises that political decolonisation failed to address the coloniality of power. A decolonial approach to South–South relations thus offers opportunities for new research agendas that more explicitly address Northern conceptualisations and interpretations of Southern phenomena, and that open up the academy to new ways of thinking through Southern and indigenous approaches (Tuihawai Smith *et al.* 2018). It critiques assumptions about the unidirectional flow of knowledge that dominates policy frameworks; recognises the existence of indigenous and multiple knowledge systems, and, in so doing, reveals and emphasises the multi-directional flows of knowledge, including from the South to the North. Decoloniality further nuances South–South dynamics beyond binary and geographic assumptions, finding common ground with colonised societies and oppressed groups in the global North (Spillers 1987; Tuck and Yang 2012). Furthermore, it requires ongoing attention to racial and gendered hierarchies (Spillers 1987; Lugones 2010), and sexuality (Lorde 1984; Tamale 2011; Lugones 2007), with and without the reference points coming from the global North.

Learning from the South can only occur if the Northern academy recognises its own dominance in the geopolitics of global knowledge production and the ways in which that dominance undermines and de-legitimises knowledge produced in the global South. Critics from both the global North and South have pointed out how this imagined geography is used to legitimise knowledge produced in the global North or by Northerners on the South (Canagarajah 2002; Briggs and Weathers 2016; Cummings and Hoebink 2017; Medie and Kang 2018). Decoloniality demands a de-centring of global North knowledge through opening up spaces in Northern publications and through genuine collaborations in knowledge production; it demands new forms of transnational collaboration and mutual solidarity, which,

as Sundberg (2007) contends, ‘encourages individuals and collectives to speak for themselves, while walking with others [to produce the] embodied experiences [that] makes alliances between differently situated actors struggling against unequally constituted geometries of power more possible’ (p. 162).

The chapters in this volume all point to new research agendas that are of relevance to the study of the South and the North. One such agenda would be exploring the ‘Southernisation’ of development, in particular how Northern donors and institutions have adopted the discourses and modes of operation of Southern actors, but also new forms of Southern transnational solidarities and cooperation at the state and non-state levels: ‘a de-geographicised notion of Southism that can better capture the complex role of international and local humanitarian workers in crisis settings, as well as the *ad hoc* relevance of nationality within [South–South cooperation]’ (Carpi, this volume). For the Northern academy to remain relevant, it needs to address the silences in the histories and presents of Southern-led models of cooperation and exchange, interactions and Southern relationalities with other Southern actors (state *and* non-state) as well as with actors from across and within different Norths. In turn, greater attention should be paid to how Southern lenses have, and must continue to influence and unsettle the Northern *academy* and institutions (see, for example, Tiostanova and Mignolo 2012; Daigle and Sundberg 2017; Esson *et al.* 2017). In essence, we must simultaneously remain alert and responsive to the potential for the mainstreaming and co-optation of Southern initiatives and approaches, while continuing to strive for meaningful learning from alternative ways of being, knowing and engaging in and with the world.

From a foundational acknowledgement of the dangers of essentialist binaries such as South–North and East–West and their concomitant hierarchies and modes of exploitation, this handbook aims to explore and set out pathways to continue redressing the longstanding exclusion of polycentric forms of knowledge, politics and practice. It is our hope that this handbook unsettles thinking about the South and about South–South relations, and prompts new and original research agendas that serve to transform and further complicate the geographic framing of the peoples of the world for emancipatory futures in the 21st century.

Notes

- 1 For instance, see Bobiash (1992), Woods (2008), Six (2009), Mawdsley (2012), Amar (2012), Weiss and Abdenur (2014), Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2015), Gray and Gills (2016), Morvaridi and Hughes (2018).
- 2 Over 130 states have *defined themselves* as belonging to the Group of 77 – a quintessential South–South platform – in spite of the diversity of their ideological and geopolitical positions in the contemporary world order, their vastly divergent Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and per capita income, and their rankings in the Human Development Index (for a longer discussion of the challenges and limitations of diverse modes of definition and typologies, see Fiddian-Qasmiyeh (2015)).
- 3 Indeed, Connell notes that

‘Southern theory’ is a term I use for social thought *from* the societies of the global South. It’s not necessarily *about* the global South, though it often is. Intellectuals from colonial and postcolonial societies have also produced important analyses of global–North societies, and of worldwide structures (e.g. Raúl Prebisch and Samir Amin).

(see www.raewynconnell.net/p/theory.html, *emphasis in the original*)

- 4 The term ‘non-traditional’ donor is often used to differentiate between states that are (traditional) and are not (non-traditional) members of the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee. While it is clear that they have a long history of philanthropic action, it has nonetheless often been argued that China, India and other postcolonial donors defy the Northern development model because they occupy a *different place* in the history of colonial and postcolonial relations (see Six 2009). For this reason, they are often seen as occupying a ‘dual position’ in the aid world, with their historical and contemporary global position contesting the traditional dichotomy of Southern recipients and Northern donors (*ibid.*, p. 1110).