



Can the Global South Speak?

Tarik ElFalih^{1*} 

Nadir El Morabit² 

Amine Ben Faress³ 

^{1,2} Abdelmalek Essaadi University, Faculty of letters and Human Sciences Tetouane, Morocco

³ Sidi Mohammed Ben Abdellah University, Faculty of letters and Human Sciences, Saiss Fes, Morocco

* tarik.elfalih@gmail.com

Citation: ElFalih, T., ElMorabit, N., & Ben Faress, A. (2026). Can the Global South speak? *Faculty of Arts Journal – Misurata University*, (22), 133–147. <https://doi.org/10.36602/faj.2026.n22.07>

Received 21- 07 - 2026

Accepted 12- 08 - 2026

Published Online 13- 08 - 2026

Abstract

This research examines the function of cultural and intellectual production from the Global South as a site of epistemic resistance and narrative sovereignty within the enduring structures of colonial modernity. Utilising decolonial theory and postcolonial critique, it contends that literature, cinema, digital activism, and academic interventions jointly contest the epistemic hierarchies that elevate Western perspectives as universal. This study examines works such as Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart*, Gabriel García Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude*, Asghar Farhadi's *A Separation*, Gavin Hood's *Tsotsi*, Malala Yousafzai's activism, and India's #MeToo movement to demonstrate how Global South actors reconstruct marginalised histories, reconfigure representational frameworks, and advocate for epistemologies rooted in lived experience. The article integrates theoretical perspectives from Quijano, Spivak, Santos, Mignolo, Grosfoguel, Sen, and Nakata, situating these cultural practices within a broader context of epistemic fairness and pluriversality. It contends that knowledge production in the Global South seeks not just to integrate into existing frameworks but also to actively transform the global knowledge architecture.

Key words: *Global South; Decoloniality; Coloniality of Power; Epistemic Justice; Narrative Sovereignty; Epistemologies of the South; Postcolonial Resistance; Cognitive Justice; Pluriversality.*

1. Introduction

Colonialism did not end with the formal dissolution of European empires. Its epistemic effects remain embedded in the institutions, categories, and standards through which knowledge is produced, circulated, and recognised. In global academic and cultural fields, Western epistemologies continue to be treated disproportionately as universal, while knowledge grounded in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and Indigenous contexts is often received as local, particular, or merely experiential. The research problem addressed in this article therefore concerns a persistent asymmetry of epistemic authority: how can cultural and intellectual production from the Global South challenge the structures that determine whose knowledge is considered legitimate, whose narratives become authoritative, and whose experiences enter global discourse?

Although postcolonial and decolonial scholarship has extensively examined coloniality, subalternity, epistemic violence, epistemicide, and delinking (Quijano, 2000; Spivak, 1988; Santos, 2014; Mignolo, 2011), much of this literature treats literary production, cinema, digital activism, and academic intervention as distinct domains of analysis. Less attention has been given to how these forms operate together as interconnected practices of epistemic contestation. This study addresses that gap through a comparative, interdisciplinary reading of selected literary works, films, activist cases, and theoretical interventions from different regions of the Global South. Rather than asking only whether marginalised subjects can speak, it examines the conditions under which their

speech, images, stories, and concepts acquire interpretive authority.

The study is significant because it connects cultural representation to the wider politics of knowledge. It argues that literature, cinema, digital testimony, and scholarship do more than correct stereotypes or add excluded voices to established frameworks: they can alter the terms through which history, identity, development, justice, and credibility are understood. The article's original contribution lies in bringing these heterogeneous forms into a single analytical framework centred on the relationship between counter-archival practice, narrative agency, and epistemic transformation. This framework makes it possible to trace both a common decolonial impulse across different media and the tensions created by institutional, commercial, and digital systems that continue to mediate Global South visibility.

Accordingly, the study has three objectives: to examine how selected forms of Global South cultural and intellectual production contest inherited epistemic hierarchies; to compare the narrative and representational strategies through which literature, film, and digital activism reclaim interpretive authority; and to assess how these practices contribute to a more plural conception of knowledge. It addresses three research questions: (RQ1) How do selected literary, cinematic, and digital texts from the Global South challenge colonial and Eurocentric regimes of representation? (RQ2) What forms of narrative and epistemic agency emerge across these different cultural domains? (RQ3) To what extent do these

interventions move beyond inclusion within dominant knowledge systems toward the transformation of the criteria by which knowledge is recognised and validated? The discussion proceeds from the theoretical foundations of coloniality and epistemic violence to cultural production, digital activism, writing, and decolonial scholarship, before considering the broader implications for epistemic justice and pluriversality.

2. Methodology

This paper adopts a qualitative, interpretive research design grounded in decolonial and postcolonial theory. It uses critical textual, visual, and discursive analysis rather than empirical fieldwork because the research questions concern the production of meaning, representation, and epistemic authority across different cultural forms. The interdisciplinary design enables comparison across literature, cinema, digital activism, and scholarly discourse while retaining attention to the specific formal features of each medium. The analytical framework draws principally on Quijano's coloniality of power, Spivak's account of epistemic violence and subaltern representation, Santos's epistemologies of the South and cognitive justice, and Mignolo's notion of delinking. These concepts are used as interpretive lenses rather than as variables to be measured.

Case selection was purposive and criterion-based. The literary works and films were chosen because they (a) originate from, or are closely situated within, African, Latin American, Asian, or Indigenous/postcolonial contexts; (b) engage directly with histories or structures of colonialism, racialisation, social

exclusion, or externally imposed representation; (c) employ distinctive narrative or aesthetic strategies that permit analysis of how representational authority is reclaimed; and (d) have sufficient transnational circulation to illuminate the tension between local self-representation and global systems of recognition. On this basis, Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* and García Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude* were selected as contrasting literary counter-archives, while Farhadi's *A Separation* and Hood's *Tsotsi* were selected because they resist reductive geopolitical and racialised visual conventions through morally and socially complex forms of representation. The digital activism cases were selected using parallel criteria of Global South location, public visibility, testimonial or narrative centrality, and relevance to struggles over whose experience is treated as credible knowledge. Malala Yousafzai's advocacy and India's #MeToo movement therefore serve as illustrative cases of digitally mediated narrative agency rather than as representative samples of all Global South activism.

The analysis proceeded comparatively. Each case was read for the relationship among narrative form, historical memory, representation, voice, mediation, and authority. Literary texts were examined for narrative structure, temporality, language, and the reconstruction of marginalised histories; films were analysed for characterisation, visual framing, moral complexity, and the refusal of stereotypical representation; and digital cases were examined through publicly available memoiristic, activist, and scholarly

accounts of testimony, visibility, circulation, and platform mediation. The aim is analytical transferability rather than statistical generalisation. The cases are deliberately illustrative, allowing the study to identify recurring decolonial strategies while also recognising differences among media, regions, and political contexts.

3. Literature review

Any significant interaction with the cultural and intellectual contributions of the Global South must begin by confronting the persistent existence of coloniality within contemporary knowledge frameworks. Even if colonial governments have officially ended, the knowledge hierarchies that were set up during colonial expansion still affect how people think around the world. Aníbal Quijano (2000) elucidates this permanence through the notion of the coloniality of power, claiming that it "has proven to be more durable and stable than colonialism itself" (p. 533). Coloniality persists via political decolonisation by reorganising authority, labour, and knowledge within racialised and hierarchical structures. It makes it okay to think that some areas come up with theoretical frameworks while others provide plain cultural or factual evidence. This difference is most clear in schools and networks for publishing internationally. People often think of Western ways of knowing as impartial, objective, and useful all around the world. On the other hand, people often think of knowledge systems from Africa, Latin America, and Asia as being limited by their own cultures or contexts. Ramon Grosfoguel (2011) emphasises this enduring inequality, stating that "the coloniality of knowledge

continues to marginalise non-Western epistemologies and methods" (p. 5). This marginalisation is frequently tacit, operating through evaluative criteria, funding structures, and disciplinary norms that prioritise certain methodological traditions over others.

The question of acknowledgement goes beyond institutional barriers to address the more significant issue of representation. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's (1988) work is still very important in this area. In her analysis of subalternity, she asserts that "the subaltern cannot speak" (p. 308), a statement that is occasionally misconstrued as a repudiation of agency. Spivak elucidates the systemic conditions that render subaltern discourse unintelligible inside dominant epistemic frameworks. Marginalised individuals can articulate their perspectives, although their words are frequently filtered, appropriated, or recontextualised within prevailing frameworks. The issue, therefore, is not silence but the denial of epistemic authority. This denial has important effects on history.

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014) defines the systematic suppression of alternative knowledge systems as epistemicide, referring to the destruction or devaluation of non-Western epistemologies through colonial domination (p. 92). Modern Western epistemology achieved global pre-eminence by asserting itself as the sole arbiter of rationality, while concurrently discrediting rival epistemologies as irrational or antiquated. Santos emphasises that knowledge is socially constructed and historically situated rather than universally intrinsic (p. 112). The knowledge gained from personal

experience, collective struggle, and local cosmology must not be overlooked, as doing so would perpetuate epistemic injustice.

In response to these systems, decolonial theorists advocate for not only inclusion but also epistemic transformation. Walter Dignolo (2011) supports the approach of "delinking," which entails breaking connections with Western epistemic universality to create alternative futures (p. 23). From this point of view, modernity and coloniality are two sides of the same coin; the promises of progress that modernity made were related to exploitation in the past. So, for change to happen, we need to look at the knowledge assumptions that are built into modern companies. Dignolo asserts that Western thought has traditionally relied on dualistic distinctions, such as nature vs culture and subject against object, which emerging decolonial epistemologies seek to surpass through relational thinking (p. 45). This relationality corresponds with Indigenous and Global South cosmologies that emphasise interdependence rather than dominance.

The consequences of these theoretical initiatives infiltrate policy and development discourse. Amartya Sen's (1999) critique of growth-centric development paradigms exemplifies how scholarship from the Global South can reshape global metrics. Sen contends that "economic growth cannot be the sole criterion for evaluating a nation's success" (p. 14). Sen redefines development by focusing on substantive freedoms like education, health, and political involvement, rather than just economic growth. His study demonstrates that epistemic resistance

transcends cultural critique and reconfigures the normative foundations of global governance. These thinkers together explain how knowledge and power are deeply connected. Coloniality persists through epistemic hierarchy; epistemic violence constrains recognition; epistemicide suppresses diversity; and decoloniality seeks to reconfigure the landscape for knowledge creation and validation. In this framework, artistic and intellectual contributions from the Global South emerge not as peripheral observations but as transformative interventions. Literature, film, activism, and academics function as venues for the restoration of narrative sovereignty and the advancement of epistemic justice.

4. Cultural Production as Counter-Archive: Literature and Cinema

Because coloniality also operates through representation, cultural production becomes an important arena in which inherited accounts of history and identity can be contested. Colonial archives not only recorded events but also influenced perceptions. Colonised societies were depicted as primitive, sluggish, or illogical, hence legitimising imperial control through notions of civilisational hierarchy. In response, literary and cinematic productions from the Global South have functioned as a counter-archive reasserting historical agency, re-centring marginalised cosmologies, and challenging the epistemic authority of Eurocentric narratives. Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* (1958) remains foundational in this perspective. Achebe's intervention was not just thematic but also

epistemological. Colonial literature frequently portrayed Africa as a domain lacking historical depth and moral complexity. Achebe fights against this erasure by making precolonial Igbo society more complicated and organised. The story shows how laws, rituals, communal speech, and spiritual cosmology shape society.

Igbo proverbs, storytelling traditions, and communal practices serve not just as decorative cultural elements but also as repositories of knowledge. Achebe's narrative structure supplants colonial anthropology as the primary interpreter of African existence, restoring interpretative authority to Indigenous frameworks.

Achebe is known for not romanticising. The book shows internal unrest, rigid gender norms, conflict between generations, and the fragility of honour with sharp clarity. Colonial encroachment does not bring about salvation; instead, it causes disturbance. Missionary Christianity and British rule break up old social ties and weaken community structures. The work serves as a literary decolonisation of history.

It opposes the colonial view and tells the story of Africa from its own point of view. Gabriel García Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude* (1967) performs a comparable intervention within the Latin American context. García Márquez does not use the linear historiography that is common in European modernity. Instead, he uses a cyclical temporality in which memory and myth are mixed together. Macondo is a perfect example of how Latin America has been affected by colonial and economic pressures.

The killing of banana plantation workers, which is similar to past massacres in Colombia, shows how imperial economic goals lead to both real and narrative suppression. The article shows how historical erasure works by showing how the government denies the memory of the atrocity. In García Márquez's work, magical realism is not just a style choice; it is also a political tool. By integrating mythic and mystical elements into historical accounts, he subverts the distinction between rationality and imagination that underpins Western epistemology.

The strange has become normal, and the harsh truths about how capitalism exploits people are what really makes sense. Narrative form thus functions as a vehicle for epistemic critique. Achebe and García Márquez demonstrate that writing not only reflects social reality but also conceptualises it. Their works partake in what Santos (2014) describes as a struggle against epistemicide, affirming knowledge grounded on lived experience rather than confining it to external theoretical frameworks. Through narrative reconstruction, these authors create an intellectual framework for different histories and points of view.

The decolonial drive has made its way into films, where visual representation has always supported global hierarchies. Western film industries have frequently depicted the Global South through reductive clichés, like poverty, violence, exoticism, or persistent conflict. These kinds of representations shape how people around the world see things and keep unfair ideas alive. Filmmakers from the

Global South challenge these visual conventions by asserting representational autonomy.

Asghar Farhadi's *A Separation* (2011) offers a nuanced portrayal of contemporary Iranian culture that challenges reductive geopolitical preconceptions. The movie is about family problems, with a couple facing divorce while dealing with economic problems and legal confusion. Farhadi doesn't provide us clear moral choices; instead, he tells a story where each character's decisions are affected by structural limits and moral complexities. This refusal to simplify goes against the idea that non-Western society can be easily sorted or explained.

The film reasserts narrative control by highlighting internal social dynamics over outward political platitudes. Gavin Hood's *Tsotsi* (2005) also looks at post-apartheid South Africa through the story of a young man who is affected by systematic poverty and violence. The film does not present violence as a part of African identity, which is a concept that comes from colonial stories. Instead, it puts violence in the context of historical dispossession and social marginalisation.

The protagonist's gradual moral awakening challenges deterministic narratives and underscores human vulnerability. The movie uses close-up shots and deep emotions to keep people from voyeuristically enjoying other people's pain and instead encourages them to take part in a moral way.

The global response to these films makes the politics of representation more complicated. International awards and

Western distribution channels encourage transnational dissemination, but they also raise questions about mediation and validation. Spivak (1988) stresses that the issue is not just whether marginalised people can speak up, but also if their opinions are heard in the mainstream.

Global South film contests preconceptions: yet, it is interconnected with global frameworks that influence its visibility and legitimacy. Still, books and films from the Global South change the legacy of modernity. These works do not simply integrate disadvantaged voices into established frameworks; they challenge the institutions themselves. They show how Eurocentric history writing is limited, challenge visual hierarchies, and support the truth of many ways of knowing. They support a decolonial movement based on memory, relationships, and self-representation through new ways of making art and retelling stories. These cultural forms therefore do two kinds of work at once: they expose inherited representational hierarchies and construct alternative frames of meaning. It critiques the epistemic violence of coloniality while simultaneously constructing alternative frames of meaning. Storytelling, in both literary and visual formats, is fundamentally connected to political and epistemic self-determination.

5. Digital Activism and the Reconfiguration of Narrative Sovereignty

The competition for narrative authority has transcended literary and cinematic output. Digital platforms are now major places for epistemic disagreement. Social media, online

newspapers, and digital networks have changed the way tales are shared, giving people who are on the outside a better chance to tell their own experiences without having to go through traditional gatekeepers. But the digital world is not fair. Corporate ownership, algorithmic hierarchies, language superiority, and geopolitical disparities structure it. So, even as digital activism opens up new ways for narrative sovereignty, it also keeps certain parts of coloniality alive in new ways.

Digital activism extends these struggles over representation into networked public spaces. It challenges dominant narratives, disrupts the silence surrounding institutional injustice, and establishes alternate repositories of testimony. It makes knowledge. When people talk about their experiences of being left out, hurt, or pushed to the edge in public, they turn their own pain into a criticism of the community. By doing this, they change the rules for what can be said in public. Malala Yousafzai's advocacy for girls' education illustrates the operation of narrative agency in the digital age. After the Taliban attacked her, her story spread quickly through international media. Her memoir, *I Am Malala* (Yousafzai & Lamb, 2013), combines personal stories with political criticism to show how bigger movements for gender equality and access to education have caused people to suffer. Malala redefined education as a fundamental right associated with dignity and civic engagement through online discussions and social media interactions.

Her intervention defies the superficial representations of Muslim societies typically prevalent in Western discourse. She opposes

both extreme narratives and Islamophobic stereotypes by focusing on internal dissent and local agency. At the same time, her international fame, which reached its peak with the Nobel Peace Prize, shows how complicated mediation can be.

Western institutional endorsement increased visibility, leading to questions about how voices from the global South gain global prominence. Spivak's (1988) concerns about representation remain: the difficulty is not just in expressing but also in being understood without distortion.

The #MeToo movement in India demonstrates the epistemic potential of digital activism. Datta (2018) observes that social media platforms have become spaces for women to publicly share their experiences of sexual harassment and assault, exposing systemic patterns of gendered violence entrenched in professional and social organisations. Through the collectivisation of testimony, the movement transformed isolated incidents into evidence of systemic patriarchy. Digital stories came together to form a counter-archive that challenges the legal systems and workplace cultures that have historically pushed survivors to the edges.

The epistemic revolution brought about by #MeToo lies in its redefinition of credibility. In the past, women's stories were often ignored under patriarchal systems that valued institutional authority more than personal experience. Online platforms changed this structure by making it easier for people to validate each other. The repetition of shared experiences validated the situation, revealing structural injustice rather than personal

misconduct. In this context, digital activism aligns with Santos's (2014) claim that knowledge emerges from experiential reality and collective effort. The movement exemplifies the principle of cognitive justice: experiential knowledge receives societal acknowledgement. There is a hierarchy in digital activism. Access to platforms, language skills, and digital literacy are not distributed fairly. People who live in cities, are educated, and speak English often get more attention, whereas people who are already in marginalised groups may continue to be overlooked.

Additionally, computational systems prioritise certain forms of content, which affects how often certain tales are told. As a result, the digital world shows signs of what could be called algorithmic coloniality, where corporate infrastructures situated in the Global North have a lot of power over how information is shared around the world. Despite these limitations, networked activism expands the arenas in which institutional narratives can be publicly contested.

It helps spread counter-narratives and build global solidarity. Hashtags are tools that unite different experiences into a single political identity. Digital mediation makes local fights important all across the world. This transnationalization does not erase contextual uniqueness; instead, it contextualises it within broader discourses of justice and rights. You shouldn't forget about the risks that come with being visible. Activists in the Global South sometimes have to deal with threats of violence, harassment online, and government spying. Digital testimony may provoke

opposition from existing institutions of authority. Also, the global media's attention can make complicated local disputes easier for foreign audiences to understand, which keeps simple stories going. Maintaining epistemic integrity in these situations requires careful negotiation. Even so, digital activism is a big step forward for the politics of story sovereignty.

Like books and films, it questions the knowledge hierarchies of colonial modernity. Unlike earlier versions, it works at an unprecedented speed and scale, changing public debate in an instant. Digital platforms turn individual experiences into shared information, giving people who are on the outside the authority to challenge institutional silence and demand accountability.

Digital activism therefore matters not merely as a technological development but as a shift in the production and circulation of public knowledge. It expands the contexts in which subaltern voices might contest dominant narratives. Even though there are still structural inequalities, the digital world is an important place for the Global South to express its power over interpretation and take part in global conversations about rights, justice, and identity.

6. Pen as Sword: Defying Power

Digital activism changes how people see things today, but writing is still an important way to build epistemic resilience and self-affirmation. The rejection of narrative authority during colonial rule was fundamentally connected to the repudiation of entire humanity. People who lived in colonies were generally seen as subjects of knowledge

rather than as theorists. Colonial viewpoints recorded their histories, and their identities were defined by others. From this viewpoint, writing goes beyond just an art form and becomes an ontological statement.

Writing affirms existence, restores memory, and reinterprets representation. Storytelling is an important part of how people from marginalised groups build their identities. Identity is dynamic, historically influenced by language, memory, and recognition. When dominant narratives enforce reductive categorizations, primitive, underdeveloped, irrational, writing enables communities to independently reconstruct their identities. This approach could be seen as narrative sovereignty, which means being able to define yourself instead of being defined by prevailing frameworks.

Thomas King's *The Truth About Stories* (2003) explains how important storytelling is to Indigenous ways of knowing. King contends that narratives are not neutral conduits of information; they shape individuals' self-perception and their interpretation of their environment. Once told, stories have moral and political consequences. Narrative is fundamentally connected to lived experience. King challenges the hierarchy that puts Western textual thinking above oral cosmologies by putting Indigenous storytelling practices in words. Writing serves as a strategic adaptation that preserves cultural continuity while participating in academic and literary spheres that have historically marginalised Indigenous viewpoints. This emphasis on narrative consistency is especially important in places where

institutional oppression is common. In apartheid South Africa, literature functioned as both evidence and resistance.

Nadine Gordimer's *Burger's Daughter* (1979) examines the psychological and moral problems that people who were part of the anti-apartheid movement had to deal with. Gordimer doesn't try to make people less resistant to heroic abstraction; instead, she looks at the emotional consequences of political devotion, which makes it more real.

Through complex personal narratives, she criticises the dehumanising rationale of apartheid. Athol Fugard's *Master Harold...and the Boys* (1982) also shows how racial ideas get into everyday life. The play's constrained setting emphasises the processes of structural violence inherent in apartheid as they manifest in quotidian interactions.

By dramatizing the painful gap between love and racial hierarchy, Fugard makes clear the psychological processes that keep institutionalised racism going. These works function as counter-archives, preserving real experiences that official state narratives aimed to obscure.

Writing is necessary for articulating intersectional identities. Maya Angelou's, *I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings* (1969) transforms personal experience into collective testimony. Angelou discusses the ways that racism and violence against women affect each other in her autobiography. Her articulation of trauma challenges paradigms that render such feelings ineffable. By recognising injustice, she destabilises its normalisation. The autobiographical structure functions as a political intervention,

illustrating how narrative agency reinstates dignity and subjectivity. These literary interventions align with the comprehensive theoretical critique of epistemic violence as delineated by Spivak (1988).

When the subaltern is muted within dominant frameworks, writing functions as a mechanism to challenge these frameworks. Narrative agency alters the conditions of perception, asserting that disadvantaged experiences are not peripheral but essential to the understanding of modernity.

The epistemological ramifications of writing infiltrate academic discourse. The Global South has gradually established theoretical frameworks that challenge Western intellectual hegemony. Amartya Sen's new definition of development shows how things have changed. Sen contends that “economic growth cannot be the sole metric of a nation’s success” (Sen, 1999, p. 14), hence contesting economistic paradigms that equate progress with GDP growth. His capacity approach redefines development by focusing on substantial freedoms, education, health, and participation, thereby underscoring human dignity. This shift shows how research based on postcolonial contexts can change the standards used to judge things around the world. Martin Nakata (2007) supports the integration of Indigenous knowledge systems into academic disciplines, challenging methodological hierarchies that exclude non-Western epistemologies.

Incorporating Indigenous concepts requires more than mere inclusion; it demands a profound transformation of disciplines.

Oral knowledge traditions, relational ontologies, and community-based epistemologies ought to be recognised as legitimate forms of inquiry. This change directly deals with what Grosfoguel (2011) calls the "coloniality of knowledge" (p. 5). The transformation of academic discourse is intrinsically connected to the broader decolonial movement. Santos (2014) contends that epistemicide has sidelined numerous knowledge systems and promotes cognitive fairness rooted in epistemological variety.

He asserts that knowledge is derived from social conflict and individual experience rather than from objective universality (p. 112). This viewpoint challenges the centralisation of theory in a particular geographic location and affirms the legitimacy of several epistemic traditions. Decolonial studies also dismantles the foundational dualisms intrinsic to Western civilisation. Mignolo (2011) contests the binary distinction between nature and culture, subject and object, asserting that relational thinking offers alternative frameworks for understanding (p. 45).

Grosfoguel (2011) likewise underscores the imperative of reassessing humanity's relationship with the natural world through reciprocity rather than dominion (p. 30).

These perspectives correspond with Indigenous and Global South cosmologies that underscore interdependence and ecological balance. These measures collectively demonstrate that the Global South is not merely enhancing Western paradigms; it is fundamentally altering them.

Writing, whether it's fiction, autobiography, or theory, may be both a critique and a way to build something new. It shows the hierarchy of knowledge while also making new ways of thinking.

The whole effect of these occurrences is a continuous change in the way people around the world talk about ideas. Even though there are still unfair practices in institutions, differences in funding, biases in publishing, and linguistic dominance, the rise of scholarship from the Global South shows that we are moving toward pluriversality.

The goal is not to turn the hierarchy upside down, but to break the monopoly on knowledge. Knowledge evolves into a dialogical process rather than remaining unilateral. Writing thus operates simultaneously as cultural preservation, self-definition, and theoretical intervention. Marginalised communities claim interpretive authority via narrative sovereignty. Intellectuals from the Global South challenge universalist claims and advocate for cognitive equity through scholarly participation.

These approaches converge in the pursuit of a more inclusive and relational global knowledge framework, characterised by the coexistence of several epistemologies without hierarchical subordination.

7. Conclusion

This study has argued that the problem posed by coloniality is not simply the exclusion of Global South voices but the unequal organisation of epistemic authority itself. Across the cases examined, literature, cinema, digital activism, and scholarship

function as different but related sites in which marginalised histories are reconstructed, representational conventions are challenged, and experiential or locally grounded knowledge is asserted as intellectually consequential. Achebe and García Márquez show how narrative form can work as a counter-archive; Farhadi and Hood demonstrate how visual complexity can resist reductive geopolitical and racialised frames; and the cases of Malala Yousafzai and India's #MeToo movement reveal how testimony can reorganise public credibility while remaining dependent on uneven digital and institutional infrastructures.

Taken together, these cases support the article's central claim that Global South cultural production is not adequately understood as a request for inclusion within an unchanged knowledge order. It can also contest the standards through which knowledge, experience, and representation are authorised.

Theoretically, the findings extend decolonial discussions of coloniality, epistemic violence, and cognitive justice by showing the value of analysing cultural forms together rather than in disciplinary isolation. The comparison suggests that counter-archival practice and narrative agency provide a connective mechanism between cultural representation and epistemic transformation: communities do not only recover suppressed content; they also intervene in the forms, genres, media, and institutions through which meaning becomes credible. At the same time, the analysis complicates any simple movement from silencing to sovereignty.

International publishing, film distribution, prizes, platform algorithms, language hierarchies, and academic gatekeeping continue to mediate which Global South narratives become visible. Pluriversality, therefore, should be understood not as the uncomplicated coexistence of multiple knowledges but as an ongoing struggle over the conditions of recognition.

The study has several limitations. Its corpus is selective and deliberately illustrative, and the small number of cases cannot represent the historical, linguistic, political, or cultural diversity of the Global South. The comparative design also places different media and regional contexts within a shared theoretical framework, which creates analytical breadth at the cost of more detailed attention to each case.

In addition, the discussion of digital activism relies on publicly available texts and secondary scholarship rather than original interviews, platform data, or participant observation. Finally, the category ‘Global South’ itself risks flattening substantial internal differences and should be treated as a relational political and epistemic category rather than a homogeneous geographical identity.

Future research could test and refine the framework through larger comparative corpora, region-specific studies, multilingual analysis, and empirical work with writers, filmmakers, activists, scholars, and audiences. Studies of platform governance and algorithmic visibility would be particularly valuable for examining how digital infrastructures enable and constrain

decolonial voice. Further research could also compare cases that achieve global circulation with those that remain locally or linguistically marginalised, thereby clarifying how recognition is produced across publishing, cinema, academia, and social media. Such work would deepen understanding of the conditions under which narrative agency becomes durable epistemic authority and would help move debates on decolonisation from the question of representation toward the institutional and material reorganisation of knowledge itself.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the shared expertise, constructive critiques, and foundational support provided by colleagues and anonymous reviewers across every stage of this project.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Declaration of AI Use

Artificial intelligence-assisted tools were used to support language editing and structural revision of the manuscript. All arguments, source selection, interpretations, and final scholarly claims were reviewed and approved by the authors, who take full responsibility for the content of the article. No AI tools were used to fabricate data or sources.

References

- Achebe, C. (1958). *Things fall apart*. Heinemann.
- Angelou, M. (1969). *I know why the caged bird sings*. Random House.
- Datta, A. (2018). #MeToo and the feminist politics of social media in India.

- Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 24(4), 496–507.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2018.1515442>
- Farhadi, A. (Director). (2011). *A separation* [Film]. Asghar Farhadi Productions.
- Fugard, A. (1982). *Master Harold...and the boys*. Knopf.
- García Márquez, G. (1967). *One hundred years of solitude* (G. Rabassa, Trans.). Harper & Row.
- Gordimer, N. (1979). *Burger's daughter*. Jonathan Cape.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political economy: Transmodernity, decolonial thinking and global coloniality. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(1), 1–36.
<https://doi.org/10.5070/T411000004>
- Hood, G. (Director). (2005). *Tsotsi* [Film]. Moviworld.
- King, T. (2003). *The truth about stories: A native narrative*. House of Anansi Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.
- Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages, saving the disciplines*. Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533–580.
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). University of Illinois Press.
- Yousafzai, M., & Lamb, C. (2013). *I am Malala: The girl who stood up for education and was shot by the Taliban*. Little, Brown and Company.

هل يمكن للجنوب العالمي أن يتكلم؟

أمين بن فارس³ 

نادر المرباط² 

طارق الفليح¹ 

^{2,1}جامعة عبد المالك السعدي كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية تطوان، المغرب

³جامعة سيدي محمد بن عبد الله كلية الآداب والعلوم الإنسانية سايس فاس ، المغرب

* tarik.elfalih@gmail.com

نشر إلكتروني في: 2026-08-13

تاريخ القبول: 2026-08-12

تاريخ التقديم: 2026-07-21

ملخص البحث

يتناول هذا البحث الإنتاج الثقافي والفكري في الجنوب العالمي بوصفه فضاءاً للمقاومة المعرفية والسيادة السردية في مواجهة البنى المستمرة للحدثة الاستعمارية. وانطلاقاً من نظرية إنهاء الاستعمار (اللااستعمارية) والنقد ما بعد الاستعماري، يجادل البحث بأن الأدب والسينما والنشاط الرقمي والتدخلات الأكاديمية تمثل معاً ممارسات مقاومة تتحدى الهيمنة المعرفية التي تركز الرؤية الغربية باعتبارها مرجعاً كونياً للمعرفة. ويعتمد البحث على تحليل نماذج مختلة، منها رواية «الأشياء تتداعى» لتشينوا أوشيبي، ورواية «مائة عام من العزلة» لغابرييل غارسيا ماركيز، وفيلم «انفصال» لأصغر فهادي، وفيلم «تسوتسي» لغافن هود، إلى جانب نشاط ملالا يوسف زاي وحملة #MeToo في الهند، للكشف عن الكيفية التي يستعيد بها فاعلو الجنوب العالمي التوليف المهمشة، ويعيدون تشكيل أنماط التمثيل، ويطورون أنساقاً معرفية تنطلق من الخبرات والتجارب المعيشية. كما يوظف البحث إسهامات أنيبال كيجانو، وغاياتري سيفاك، ويوفانتورا دي سوزا سانتوس، ووالتر مينيولو، ورامون غروسفوغيل، وأملرتيا سين، ومارتن ناكاتا، لوضع هذه الممارسات الثقافية ضمن إطار أوسع يتصل بالعدالة المعرفية والتعددية الكونية (Pluriversality) ويخلص البحث إلى أن الإنتاج المعرفي في الجنوب العالمي لا يقتصر على المطالبة بالاندماج في البنى المعرفية السائدة، بل يسعى إلى تفكيكها وإعادة تشكيلها، بما يفتح المجال أمام نظام معرفي عالمي أكثر عدالة وتعددية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الجنوب العالمي؛ اللااستعمارية؛ الاستعمارية السلطة؛ العدالة المعرفية؛ السيادة السردية؛ إستيمولوجيات

الجنوب؛ المقاومة ما بعد الاستعمارية؛ العدالة الإدراكية؛ التعددية الكونية.