

**International Relations (IR) in Pakistan: Exploring
Eurocentric Biases & Alternative Homegrown Knowledge
Production**



By

Mahnoor Hayat Malik

Registration Number: 00000317981

Supervised by

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad

(2021)

**International Relations (IR) in Pakistan: Exploring
Eurocentric Biases & Alternative Homegrown Knowledge
Production**



By

Mahnoor Hayat Malik

Registration Number: 00000317981

Supervised by

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad

(2021)

International Relations (IR) in Pakistan: Exploring Eurocentric Biases & Alternative Homegrown Knowledge Production

By

Mahnoor Hayat Malik

Registration Number: 00000317981

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MS Peace and Conflict Studies

Supervisor

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Supervisor's Signature: _____

Department of Peace and Conflict Studies
Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)
National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)
Islamabad
(2021)

THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the final copy of the MS thesis titled “International Relations (IR) in Pakistan: Exploring Eurocentric Biases & Alternative Homegrown Knowledge Production” written by Ms. Mahnoor Hayat Malik (Registration No. 00000317981) of Centre for International Peace and Stability has been vetted by the undersigned, found complete in all respects as per NUST Statutes / Regulations, is free of plagiarism, errors and mistakes and is accepted as partial fulfillment for the award of MS/MPhil degree. It is further certified that the necessary amendments as pointed out by the GEC members of the scholar have also been incorporated in the said thesis and have been found satisfactory for the requirement of the degree.

Supervisor: _____

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

CIPS, NUST

Date: _____

Head of Department: _____

Dr. Muhammad Makki

CIPS, NUST

Date: _____

Associate Dean: _____

Dr. Tughral Yamin

CIPS, NUST

Date: _____

DECLARATION

I certify that this research work titled, “International Relations (IR) in Pakistan: Exploring Eurocentric Biases & Alternative Homegrown Knowledge Production,” is my own work. This work has not been presented elsewhere for assessment. The material that has been used from other sources has been properly acknowledged / referred.

Signature of Student

Mahnoor Hayat Malik

Registration Number: 317981

CERTIFICATE FOR PLAGIARISM

It is certified that this MS thesis titled “International Relations (IR) in Pakistan: Exploring Eurocentric Biases & Alternative Homegrown Knowledge Production” by Ms. Mahnoor Hayat Malik (Registration No. 00000317981) has been examined by me. I undertake that:

- a. The thesis has significant new work/knowledge as compared to the works already published. No sentence, equation, diagram, table, paragraph, or section has been copied verbatim from previous works. All material used has been duly referenced.
- b. The work presented is the original work of the author (i.e. there is no plagiarism). No ideas, processes, results, or words of others have been presented as the author’s own work.
- c. There is no fabrication of data or results. The thesis has been checked using TURNITIN (a copy of the originality report attached) and found within the limits as per HEC plagiarism policy and instructions issued from time to time.

Signature of Supervisor

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS)

National University of Sciences and Technology (NUST)

Islamabad, Pakistan

PLAGIARISM REPORT

MS Thesis

ORIGINALITY REPORT

9%	7%	6%	4%
SIMILARITY INDEX	INTERNET SOURCES	PUBLICATIONS	STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	www.cosspak.org Internet Source	1%
2	www.cambridge.org Internet Source	1%
3	journals.sagepub.com Internet Source	1%
4	Submitted to University of Birmingham Student Paper	<1%
5	academic.oup.com Internet Source	<1%
6	fgsisc.files.wordpress.com Internet Source	<1%
7	Ahmed W. Waheed. "Constructing 'Pakistan' through Knowledge Production in International Relations and Area Studies", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020 Publication	<1%
8	irap.oxfordjournals.org Internet Source	



Digital Receipt

This receipt acknowledges that Turnitin received your paper. Below you will find the receipt information regarding your submission.

The first page of your submissions is displayed below.

Submission author: Mahnoor Hayat Malik
Assignment title: Plagiarism Detection (Sep 2021) Part 1 (Moodle TT)
Submission title: MS Thesis
File name: 105422_Mahnoor_Hayat_Malik_MS_Thesis_727154_11842275...
File size: 188.35K
Page count: 52
Word count: 19,971
Character count: 112,353
Submission date: 29-Sep-2021 03:58PM (UTC-0700)
Submission ID: 1661000023

ABSTRACT

This study explains 'why' the Eurocentric worldview continues to dominate the field of International Relations (IR) by providing an introspective point of view on the disciplinary limitation, in the specific case of Pakistan. To unravel the dominating intellectual arrangement and underlying invisibilities in the discipline and critically study the continuing Eurocentrism in the discipline, the research navigates within the ambit of the notion of Eurocentrism. For IR academics in Pakistan, Eurocentrism in the field is, number one, 'externally imposed' due to the structural barriers that are actively working at the international level of knowledge production and marginalizing Pakistani contribution from the field's center, and number two, 'self-imposed' in the form of the continuing 'intellectual dependency' on the existing state of IR. The latter is found to be a consequence of both 'normative' and 'ideometric structural' factors. A serious consequence that a Eurocentric IR holds for Pakistan and the discipline of IR in Pakistan is the dominating representation of 'Pakistan' as a product of Western conventional wisdom in mainstream IR scholarship. Linked to the anti-Pakistan narratives in the core IR scholarship is the significantly alarming role of India that makes the description of 'Pakistan' a combined Western and Indian political and intellectual output in the field. Precisely in this regard, the study further elucidates 'why' such negative interpretations about Pakistan continue to dominate the mainstream IR discourse. While noting that IR scholars and academics from around the world are searching for their own voice and re-examining their traditions to diversify the sources of knowledge that inform IR thinking, on the whole, this research presents what the problem of a 'Eurocentric IR' means 'for' and 'to' the discipline of IR in Pakistan by employing the views of Pakistani IR academics gathered through qualitative interviewing. In the end, this study presents prospects for alternative homegrown thinking in the field of IR in Pakistan.

Key Words: Eurocentric, Eurocentrism, International Relations, IR, discipline

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

Copyright in text of this thesis rests with the student author. Copies (by any process) either in full, or of extracts, may be made only in accordance with instructions given by the author and lodged in the Library of NUST Centre for International Peace and Stability (CIPS). Details may be obtained by the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies made. Further copies (by any process) may not be made without the permission (in writing) of the author.

The ownership of any intellectual property rights which may be described in this thesis is vested in NUST Centre for International Peace and Stability, subject to any prior agreement to the contrary, and may not be made available for use by third parties without the written permission of the CIPS, which will prescribe the terms and conditions of any such agreement.

Further information on the conditions under which disclosures and exploitation may take place is available from the Library of NUST Centre for International Peace and Stability, Islamabad.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity and firstly thank God Almighty for not only providing me with strength but also perseverance in achieving my goals. I would want to acknowledge the support of my parents and Hamza in every step of this memorable journey. This dissertation wouldn't have been possible without the critique and the scholarship of my supervisor Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed for which I'm left with a debt of gratitude. A special thanks to Dr. Bakare Najimdeen and Dr. Imdad Ullah for their time and guidance whenever required. Last but not least, I'm left with nothing other than praise for the work of Prof. Audrey Alejandro, which has given inspiration not only to me but also to countless others.

*Dedicated to Dr. Waqas,
Who inspires me every day!*

ABSTRACT

This study explains ‘why’ the Eurocentric worldview continues to dominate the field of International Relations (IR) by providing an introspective point of view on the disciplinary limitation, in the specific case of Pakistan. To unravel the dominating intellectual arrangement and underlying invisibilities in the discipline and critically study the continuing ethnocentrism in the discipline, the research navigates within the ambit of the notion of *Eurocentrism*. For IR academics in Pakistan, Eurocentrism in the field is, number one, ‘externally imposed’ due to the structural barriers that are actively working at the international level of knowledge production and marginalizing Pakistani contributions from the field’s center, and number two, ‘self-imposed’ in the form of the continuing ‘intellectual dependency’ on the existing state of IR. The latter is found to be a consequence of both ‘normative’ and ‘domestic structural’ factors. A serious consequence that a Eurocentric IR holds for Pakistan and the discipline of IR in Pakistan is the dominating representation of ‘Pakistan’ as a product of Western conventional wisdom in mainstream IR scholarship. Linked to the anti-Pakistan narratives in the core IR scholarship is the significantly alarming role of India that makes the description of ‘Pakistan’ a combined Western and Indian political and intellectual output in the field. Precisely in this regard, the study further elucidates ‘why’ such negative interpretations about Pakistan continue to dominate the mainstream IR discourse. While noting that IR scholars and academics from around the world are searching for their own voice and re-examining their traditions to diversify the sources of knowledge that inform IR thinking, on the whole, this research presents what the problem of a ‘Eurocentric IR’ means ‘for’ and ‘to’ the discipline of IR in Pakistan by employing the views of Pakistani IR academics gathered through qualitative interviewing. In the end, this study presents prospects for alternative/homegrown thinking in the field of IR in Pakistan.

Key Words: Eurocentric, Eurocentrism, International Relations, IR, discipline

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE	i
DECLARATION	ii
CERTIFICATE FOR PLAGIARISM.....	iii
PLAGIARISM REPORT.....	iv
COPYRIGHT STATEMENT	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
DEDICATION.....	viii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
CHAPTER 1	2
INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 Statement of Problem.....	5
1.2 Research Questions	5
1.3 Research Objectives	5
1.4 Significance of Study	6
1.5 Conceptual Framework	7
1.6 Literature Review	7
1.7 Research Methodology.....	9
1.8 Thesis Outline	12
CHAPTER 2	13
EUROCENTRISM IN THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	13
2.1 Defining <i>Eurocentrism</i>	14
2.2 How is IR a Eurocentric Discipline?.....	16

2.3 Navigating beyond the Eurocentric Boundaries of the Discipline: Possibilities & Limits	19
CHAPTER 3	23
A EUROCENTRIC ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN PAKISTAN: NORMATIVE FACTORS	23
3.1 Nature of the Discipline	24
3.2 Academic Works and Orientations	26
3.3 Teaching Practice	29
3.4 Intellectual Inferiority Complex in Pakistani Academia	32
CHAPTER 4	34
A EUROCENTRIC ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN PAKISTAN: STRUCTURAL FACTORS	34
4.1 External Barriers	35
4.2 Domestic Barriers	39
4.2.1 State-centric Research Culture	39
4.2.2 Research Demand of Higher Education Structure	40
4.3 “Failed State” Discourse on Pakistan	42
4.3.1 Domination of Western Narratives	42
4.3.2 The Concealed Indian Factor	45
CONCLUSION	49
BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX A	66
APPENDIX B	67

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

HEC Higher Education Commission

IR International Relations

IRT International Relations Theory

US United States

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Researchers increasingly began studying International Relations as a blinkered discipline (Waheed, 2020) following the inceptive investigation of IR as an American social science made by Stanley Hoffman (Hoffman, 1977). Since then, growing criticism has emerged against the overall Western character of the discipline (confined not just to the United States but also inclusive of Europe) (Bilgin, 2010). This criticism targets the Western-centric nature of IR's main theories, methods, leading publications and also recognizes the marginalization of non-Western voices and experiences from the discipline's core (Acharya, 2000; Tickner, 2003; Acharya & Buzan, 2010). Scholars have therefore urged for the transcendence of IR's disciplinary boundaries (Acharya, 2011a; Acharya & Buzan, 2007a; Acharya & Buzan, 2007b; Chen, 2011; Mignolo, 2009; Aydinli & Biltekin, 2018; Peters & Wemheuer-Vogelaar, 2016; Blaney & Tickner, 2013) by incorporating the geo-epistemological differences to achieve a truly globalized and pluralistic discipline (Peters & Wemheuer-Vogelaar, 2016).

In responding to the growing calls for moving beyond the present limits of IR, Acharya (2016) advocates for a "Global IR" that is "truly inclusive", that recognizes multiple and diverse foundations, and transcends the divide between the "West and the Rest", Chen (2011) talks about the democratization of the discipline through its decolonization, Mignolo (2009) has urged the marginalized to take on "epistemic disobedience" in IR, while others have identified the need to rethink IR by developing indigenous national schools of IR (Acharya, 2011a; Chen, 2011). The real challenge, however, lies in reaching some agreement on a fixed problem and then proceeding forward. Nonetheless, the original cause has everyone's agreement: "that the current parochialism and ethnocentrism of "International Relations" as a field of study, especially its dominant theoretical approaches, are unacceptable and perhaps untenable" (Acharya, 2011a, p.620). With IR scholars from around the world searching for their own voice and re-examining their traditions so as to diversify the sources of knowledge that inform IR thinking (Wang, 2009; Inoguchi, 2007; Smith, 2017; Ayoob, 2002), it is imperative to study what the problem of Western intellectual hegemony in IR means 'for' and 'to' the discipline of International Relations in Pakistan.

Under the British colonial rule, in deciding what type of education system had to be developed in the subcontinent, the overall idea of Lord T. B. Macaulay, member of the Supreme Council of India was operationalized who held at that time:

We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of person, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect.

(Sabir & Sabir, 2010, p.37)

This points at the colonizer's standards of education in an administrative colonial era that included the mastery of the English language and assimilation of the colonizer's knowledge by the colonized. In a postcolonial landscape, where "epistemic" colonialism (Alejandro, 2019, p.1) or the colonality of knowledge (Fonseca, 2019) prevails; concerning Pakistani academia, the field of social sciences, in particular, this 'colonization of mind' has strengthened in the absence of an administratively colonized world. Since its nascency, Pakistani academia - the field of social sciences (Zaidi, 2002) and more specifically, the discipline of International Relations - has found itself under a strong intellectual stranglehold of the West (Cheema & Rais, 2001). Social sciences in Pakistan through the establishment of Western-modeled institutes adhere to Western principles and methods of investigation that accede to Western intellectual hegemony. This signifies a parasitic relationship with the West in terms of knowledge production (Sabir & Sabir, 2010), which acts as an intellectual restraint that considerably impedes critical or alternative thinking. This indicates the dismal state of social sciences in Pakistan. In this regard, Akbar Zaidi makes a bold claim:

If one were to pose the following question to a variety of Pakistani social scientists: 'has any Pakistani social scientist, in any of their fields in the last three decades, developed, reconstructed, reformulated, expanded upon, disputed or rejected, any theory or theoretical formulation, qua theory, or even in the specific context of Pakistan?' the answer would probably be a simple 'no'. Or perhaps, one, or two, or at best three, names would be mentioned by some of them... What would be contested though is whether indeed, any of these handful have actually contributed anything original...or whether they too have merely restated a problem.

(2002, p.3644)

Concerning the discipline of international Relations - a sub-field of social sciences and the focus of this study – with the rising agenda of disciplinary transformation through the decolonization (Fonseca, 2019) and pluralization (Wemheuer-Vogelaar & Peters, 2016) of knowledge, it is both the need of the hour as well as an opportune moment to address the

existing confined thinking patterns in the field by realizing country's distinct historical experiences, culture, geopolitical circumstances, and 'ways of knowing' and by developing alternative and indigenous understandings of world politics. In his study on International Relations in Pakistan, Rasul Bakhsh Rais has placed emphasis on the unique historical and geopolitical context of Pakistan and its distinctive foreign and security policy interests within a shared regional space. He further notes that "while fundamental concepts that have defined theorizing in International Relations may have a degree of universality, the specificity of each state and its regional environment and problems would require an extended and varied theoretical outlook. That in case of Pakistan...is missing" (2005, p.12).

This confirms that the discipline of International Relations in Pakistan has yet to contribute to the ongoing disciplinary evolution that is ostensibly receptive to alternative thinking in the field. This research investigates why Pakistani IR continues to be Eurocentric while navigating within the ambit of the notion of *Eurocentrism*. As there is a notable influence of Western intellectual thinking on both the research and pedagogical practices in the field of International Relations in Pakistan (Cheema & Rais, 2001), this research examines both domains so as to detect and reveal the gravity of the problem at a broader disciplinary level in Pakistan. It is further noteworthy that knowledge produced by the Pakistani scholarly community and more importantly, the indigenous knowledge that also counters the Western narratives in the field is largely absent in Pakistan (Waheed, 2020). Crucially, as world politics has been established as a mere product of Western-oriented and Eurocentric intellectual subjectivities (Fredua-Mensah, 2016), this unleashes considerable ramifications on the identity of Pakistan and the discipline of International Relations in Pakistan, where knowledge *on* 'Pakistan' is based on anti-Pakistan narratives (Waheed, 2020). With this being the case, it is necessary to make an investigation into the seemingly handicapped knowledge production patterns and orientations in the field of IR in Pakistan.

In explaining the prevalence of Eurocentrism in the discipline of IR across the South Asian region, for Behera (2008), this is partially due to the power that Western institutions exercise and how this enables them to sustain Western knowledge as dominating knowledge and partially because of the "intellectual dependency" on this knowledge. This research is an attempt to 'contextualize' the problem of a Eurocentric IR concerning IR as a field of study in Pakistan by employing an indigenous Pakistani perspective. This study is a seminal inspection of structural and normative factors that contribute in making IR a Eurocentric area

of study in Pakistan. With the discipline of IR undergoing an expansion/diversification, it is important to ask questions such as: why does Pakistani IR comply with the status quo in the discipline and why does it not come up with alternative/ homegrown thinking to analyze world politics? To answer these questions, this study is primarily based on the perspectives of doctoral Pakistani IR academics obtained through interviews with these individuals. The study acknowledges the key role academics play in addressing disciplinary shortcomings, especially when they entail adverse effects for indigenous sourced thinking. This research is a much-needed step that can lay the foundation for the development of alternative IR frameworks and thinking drawn from Pakistan's unique context. In the end, 'why' is there a "...successful diffusion of the Anglo-American cognitive style and professional stance" in the discipline of IR (Olson & Onuf, 1985, p.18) particularly in the context of Pakistan, is answered through this research within its investigative capacity.

1.1 Statement of Problem

With IR academics and scholars from around the world criticizing the field of IR for being Eurocentric and engaging in efforts to diversify the knowledge, experiences and voices that inform IR thinking, it becomes important to explore how Eurocentrism in the field is viewed by Pakistani IR academics and scholars.

1.2 Research Questions

- 1) Why are Pakistani IR academics only marginally taking part in international knowledge production processes?
- 2) Why do IR academics in Pakistan not engage in counter-hegemonic struggles against the Eurocentric thinking in the field of IR
- 3) Why do these academics not develop alternative/ homegrown thinking to analyze world politics?

1.3 Research Objectives

The objectives of this research include the following considerations:

- i. To provide an introspective point of view on the disciplinary limitation of a 'Eurocentric IR' by searching for reasons behind the prevalence of the Eurocentric bias and dominating world view in the field in the specific case of Pakistan;

- ii. To identify the negative interpretations of Pakistan in international scholarship (as a consequence of a Eurocentric IR) and its effects on the image of Pakistan and to understand why this discourse remains Eurocentric by employing a Pakistani perspective;
- iii. Lastly, to find out if the discipline remains Eurocentric in Pakistan because Pakistan has little to contribute to the field of IR, or because the power dynamics of the discipline are such that Pakistani voices are not heard.

1.4 Significance of Study

This study is an important contribution to the existing literature on the subject of the Eurocentric discipline of IR as it presents views from a Third World perspective, precisely a Pakistani perspective. Further, it is crucial to note that in Pakistan's context, the research available mainly problematizes the field of social science and social science research (Zaidi, 2002; Inayatullah, Saigol, & Tahir, 2005; Hashmi, 2001; Haque, et al., 2020; Kumari, 2017). There is a dearth of literature that recognizes the Western influence in social sciences (Zaidi, 2002), particularly in the discipline of IR in Pakistan (Cheema & Rais, 2001; Rais, 2005; Waheed, 2017; Waheed, 2020). Literature has mainly addressed the question of "how IR in Pakistan continues to be Eurocentric?" The "how" question entails knowledge production processes both exogenous and endogenous to knowledge production in the field of IR in Pakistan. How it has become easier for Pakistani IR scholars to publish locally in national journals (Waheed, 2020), how the West is continuing to dominate IR teaching and research interests at universities in Pakistan (Rais, 2005) and most importantly, how the West is producing discourse *on* Pakistan and naturalizing its own interpretations (Waheed, 2020) is explained through these processes. *Why* that continues to be so is a question that demands a different approach to the problem under study; one that involves digging deeper into the matter. This is a significant gap in the literature.

Social science research that is of good quality has mainly been produced by Pakistani scholars situated in the West (Zaidi, 2002). This automatically makes these scholars part of the elite Western knowledge hub. Diasporic knowledge cannot be equated with indigenous knowledge. It will still be guided by the hidden Western bias in understanding local (non-Western) realities. This research gains more significance as it employs an indigenous perspective in its inquiry about the continuing problem of a Eurocentric IR in Pakistan. More

importantly, this research and its entailing inquiries are a much-needed first step that would lay the foundation for the development of alternative IR frameworks and thinking drawn from Pakistan's unique context. Lastly, this research will contribute significantly to the discipline of IR. It will also be useful for students and scholars who have an interest in the study of Eurocentrism and the state of IR research and teaching in Pakistan.

1.5 Conceptual Framework

As this research studies the domination of Western intellectual thinking in the discipline of IR and explores both structural and normative aspects linked to the discipline's Eurocentric understanding and analysis of world politics prevalent in Pakistan, it navigates within the conceptual framework of *Eurocentrism*. The notion is based on an amalgamation of critical approaches in the field (post-colonialism, neo-Gramscianism, post-structuralism, and subaltern studies). The concept of Eurocentrism has been understood by various scholars in different ways. "It is a hydra-headed monster and has many avatars" (Wallerstein, 1997). For some, it is analyses that predominantly revolve around the West as its central point of focus. For others, Eurocentrism is an embracement of all Western things (Hobson, 2007). Most commonly, Eurocentrism is understood in European ethnocentric terms. The concept, despite recognizing the Western hyper-agency in world politics, further provides a critical framework for the anti-Eurocentric conceptualization of world politics. In other words, it allows one to be anti-Eurocentric while being situated within a Eurocentric frame (Hobson & Sajed, 2017). The notion is explained in detail in chapter 2, sub-heading 2.1.

1.6 Literature Review

Researchers have questioned the parochialism in the academic discipline of International Relations (Fredua-Mensah, 2016; Acharya & Buzan, 2007a), or its Western-centric nature, especially in the subfield of IR theory (Peters & Wemheuer-Vogelaar, 2016; Chen, 2011). Many have called for the transcendence of IR's disciplinary boundaries (Acharya & Buzan, 2007a; Acharya, 2011a; Chen, 2011; Mignolo, 2009; Lydkin, 2016; Aydinli & Biltekin, 2018; Peters & Wemheuer-Vogelaar, 2016; Blaney & Tickner, 2013) so as to include the non-western voices and approaches in IR (Acharya & Buzan, 2010; Acharya, 2011a).

Numerous studies have mapped the state of IR in the non-Western context and have outlined the Western domination in the field. This has been done in the context of South Asia (Behera, 2009), Pakistan (Cheema & Rais, 2001; Rais, 2005; Waheed, 2017; Waheed, 2020), Latin

America (Tickner, 2009), and Brazil (Cujabante-Villamil, 2019). There is also literature that offers an introspection of the nature and state of the discipline of IR based on the first-hand information obtained through indigenous academics and scholars in the non-West. Such studies have been conducted in the following non-Western spaces: Thailand (Thalang, Jayanama, & Poonkham, 2018), Sri Lanka (Canagarajah 1996), South Africa (Schoeman, 2009) India and Brazil (Alejandro, 2019), and so on.

By employing a mixed (quantitative and qualitative) research methodology including interviews with scholars from Brazil and India, Alejandro (2019) has pointed at a crucial determining factor linked to international academic publishing from Global South, which if found, somewhat rejects the narrative of Eurocentrism in the discipline of IR. The author draws significant attention to the normative aspect that influences publishing practices among Southern scholars; the publication interests and habits of these scholars. In the absence of the contextualization of this aspect, it is simply assumed that if these scholars are not publishing in international IR journals, it is the international gatekeeping practices that are not allowing them to do so. By examining the professional norms of the Indian IR field, Alejandro's research findings have exposed the difficulty in producing counter-hegemonic discourse in India due to reasons such as the disinterest of Indian IR scholars in local theorization.

Through their cross-national efforts, Acharya and Buzan have contributed to the critique on the Western-centric character of IR theory and its insulation from most of the world's history. The two have attempted to understand the apparent absence of a non-Western theory and how the existing gap between Western and non-Western experiences can possibly be overcome. Through their project, they aim to "stimulate non-Western voices to bring their historical and cultural, as well as their intellectual, resources into the theoretical debates about IR" (Acharya & Buzan, 2007b, p.286). With having realized the urgent need to diversify the discipline of IR, talks of alternative and homegrown thinking in IR are taking place in non-Western spaces including China (Wang, 2009) and Japan (Inoguchi, 2007). South African students and academics are engaged in campaigns to decolonize the university curriculum (Heleta, 2016) that is "white" and "Eurocentric" (Department of Education, 2008) leading to the marginalization of the black population in the academic sphere (Heleta, 2016). Fonseca (2019) has attempted to assess the limits and possibilities of local theorization in Turkey, Brazil, India, Japan, Iran, China, and South Africa and has noted the substantial influence of Eurocentric imaginaries on knowledge production in the stated contexts. Chen (2011) has

closely studied the absence of a non-Western IR theory in the Asian context. According to the author, one may contend that what is actually problematic is not the ostensible absence of a non-Western IRT in Asia. Instead, how Western IR is only slightly aware of the non-Western approaches to thinking about and doing world politics is the real problem.

Particularly, in the case of Pakistan, Zaidi (2002) has attempted to understand why social sciences and social science research are found to be in a dismal condition in the country. Naveed and Suleri (2015) have underscored the lack of indigenous knowledge production (theoretical or empirical) in Pakistani universities. Separately, a research conducted by Ali, Tariq and Topping (2013) on the academic activities in public sector universities in Pakistan has revealed the dissatisfaction of most of the students with the quality of university curriculum. Nonetheless, the research has shown satisfaction of most of the teachers and students with their university's performance in research. Rais (2005) contends that Pakistani IR experts, just like other South Asian experts, increasingly borrow from Western social sciences. Waheed (2017) has studied how and why the "realist" tradition dominates the field of IR theory in Pakistan to the detriment of theoretical alternatives. In another work, Waheed (2020) goes one step further to study the dominating role of the Western scholars in producing literature *on* Pakistan in core IR journals and how this leads to the West naturalizing its own "truth" about Pakistan while silencing certain representations of Pakistan's identity.

1.7 Research Methodology

With limited literature available on the theme of Western- or Eurocentric discipline of IR in Pakistan (Cheema & Rais, 2001; Rais, 2005; Waheed, 2017; Waheed, 2020), there is a serious need to pay attention to the problematic nature of the discipline and to contribute to the dearth of knowledge by adopting an indigenous perspective. Keeping this in view together with the main 'why' question aimed at gathering the unexplored explanations behind the continuing ethnocentrism in the field of IR in Pakistan, this study is guided by an exploratory approach.

This research mainly employs the perspectives of IR academics in Pakistan. The problem of Eurocentric thinking prevalent in the discipline of IR cannot be captured fully if kept insulated from the understanding of the problem by those individuals who are professionally responsible to address disciplinary flaws and their adverse effects on homegrown thinking.

The existing works that are focused on the theme of Western- or Eurocentric discipline of IR in Pakistan and are restricted to an inward-looking investigation of the problem have primarily utilized the method of thematic analysis involving the reviewing of the university curricula of IR programs or the data on the topics of Ph.D. and Mphil theses submitted to IR departments in different Pakistani universities (Cheema & Rais, 2001; Rais, 2005). The views of Pakistani IR academics regarding the problem gathered through qualitative interviewing, makes this research methodologically significant as well.

This study makes use of semi-structured qualitative interviews with IR academics in Pakistan from different Pakistani universities that are offering IR programs or programs in the sub-field of IR such as Peace & Conflict Studies and Defense & Diplomatic/Strategic Studies, etc. and also those IR academics who are teaching IR courses as compulsory subjects in other programs in Pakistani universities. Qualitative interviewing is a data-gathering method that is largely used in qualitative research in the field of social sciences. This approach further utilizes the interpretive framework to treat the data gathered not as an objective reality about a situation but as subjective views of the respondents, which are context-bound. The exploratory character of the qualitative data allows the researcher to collect answers about a question about which not much is known (Nathan, Newman, & Lancaster, 2019). This study being seminal in its inquiry is primarily based on this method. The qualitative data collected is interpretively analyzed to explain the problem under study.

Qualitative semi-structured (and also unstructured) interviews make use of verbal communication to gather data about the experiences, attitudes, and beliefs of research respondents (Nathan, Newman, & Lancaster, 2019). This is very much relevant to this research as it seeks to gather the views of Pakistani IR academics concerning the problem of a Eurocentric IR and generates a discussion based on the research and publication experiences and inclinations of these academics as well as their orientations in the pedagogical practice in the field. Based on the objectives of this research, the participants for the interview are doctoral IR academics in Pakistan. It should be noted that in understanding why Eurocentric thinking continues to inform the field of IR in the country, this research in its inquiry pays significant attention to the research patterns of doctoral IR academics in Pakistan based on their academic contributions at the domestic and international levels of knowledge production. Precisely, as the professional progression of doctoral academics is tied to their research output as they are incentivized to engage in research practice in the form

of publications through the performance-based system that the higher education structure has maintained in the country (Waheed, 2020, p.139-160), the active participation of these academics in the knowledge production processes makes them the most relevant sample for this study.

With only two interviews initially scheduled with Pakistani doctoral IR academics, the researcher used the “snowball networking” technique to increase the sample size (Moore & Stokes, 2012). Starting with the third interview, the respondents connected the researcher to a source they knew who was relevant to this study. The snowball technique helped in gathering more respondents and every next respondent who was approached trusted the researcher as (s)he knew the previous source who had recommended him/her for an interview. This type of sampling follows the “logic of nonprobability” in which information-rich cases are chosen with the primary aim of understanding not generalization (Nathan, Newman, & Lancaster, 2019).

In qualitative research sampling deals with the “richness of information” as the selection of respondents is done while keeping in view the aim of exploring opinions and various representations of a problem, not to count these opinions as is done in quantitative research. It is not the sample “size” that is used for the generalizability purpose but sample “adequacy” in exploring a problem that the researcher is focused on. It is the concept of *saturation* that determines the sample adequacy in qualitative research. The term has originated within the grounded theory. “In grounded theory the notion of saturation...means that categories are fully accounted for, the variability between them are explained and the relationships between them are tested and validated and thus a theory can emerge” (O'Reilly & Parker, 2013, p.192).

In this research, the saturation point was achieved in the data gathered through qualitative interviews with twelve Pakistani doctoral IR academics. The interviews were conducted in-person or virtually via the Zoom platform. They were tape-recorded after securing the respondent’s consent and transcribed by the researcher. These respondents are from different universities in Islamabad (capital city of Pakistan), Peshawar (capital of the province of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa), and Karachi (capital of the province of Sindh). They have shared their views and opinions on the subject matter as well as their relevant professional experiences. Their explicit consent for participation in this research has also been obtained. The researcher has been very careful in accurately incorporating the summary interview content or direct

quotations in this study. That being said, these academics cannot be held responsible for how their insights and remarks have been used by the researcher. Their views should also be kept independent from the institutes where they were employed at the time of this research.

1.8 Thesis Outline

This study first introduces the concept of Eurocentrism and then unpacks how IR is characterized as a Eurocentric discipline when the question is about the global knowledge production processes and outputs. It then presents prospects for moving beyond the current ethnocentric boundaries of the discipline. Further, it examines why the discipline of IR continues to be Eurocentric in Pakistan in both the research and pedagogical practices of IR academics in the country by employing normative reasoning. Next, the study probes into global structural impediments and domestic structural factors whose active functioning results in the prevalence of Eurocentric thinking in IR in Pakistan. Linked to the structural reasoning at both the global and domestic level is an ultimate worrisome outcome that ‘Pakistan’ and the discipline of IR in Pakistan have to face.

CHAPTER 2

EUROCENTRISM IN THE ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Discourses are encompassing of power relations. They entail what can be said, thought, who can speak, and with what authority. This understanding of discourse is central to Foucauldian analysis (Ball, 1990, p.2). Only after identifying certain power relations prevalent within discourses, can one understand how disciplines, in turn, determine certain conventions and customs, which are required to be followed through scholarly efforts (Said, 1982, pp.7-8). This when applied to the academic discipline of IR means that “IR reinforces analytical categories and research programs that are systematically defined by academic communities within the core, and that determine what can be said, how it can be said, and whether or not what is said constitutes a pertinent or important contribution to knowledge” (Tickner, 2003, p.300). This denotes the presence of a power-knowledge nexus in discourses. Shepherd (2014) emphasizes the link between power and knowledge in disciplines as she argues that “at the heart of every discipline is its knowledge. Knowledge, as we know, is power; at the heart of every discipline, then, is its *politics of knowledge production*”.

In the discipline of IR, power, which is exercised in the form of “epistemic privilege” by the West, ensures that only the West’s self-centered imaginaries of domination over the “rest” are served (Fonseca, 2019, p.4). The resultant discourse of Western dominance and the power/knowledge that it reinforces overlooks the non-Western agency (Alejandro, 2019). What we have then is an unequal knowledge system in which those sitting at the top reap all the benefits (Fredua-Mensah, 2016). So when Thucydides said that “the strong do what they will while the weak do what they must”, this implies that the periphery is irrelevant when it comes to conceiving international politics (Tickner, 2003, p.300). It is noted that the disciplinary directives and their reinforcement through the intricate link between power and knowledge results in a myopic understanding of world politics. “*What* discourse is produced” and “*how* it has been produced” are questions this provides answers to.

The discipline of International Relations forms an interesting object of study in that its seeds of self-preservation and/or biased worldviews are sown right in its tale of origination taking the form of the epistemic myth of “1919” and ontological myths such as that of “1648” and

its strong association with “Westphalia” (Leira & Carvalho, 2018). This chapter unfolds the restricted imagination of the discipline under the conceptual framework of *Eurocentrism* to outline what this means for the non-Western voices and experiences in the discipline and to assess the possibility of widening the existing intellectual confines of the discipline by incorporating non-Western approaches to world politics. Whether it is the West that is mainly responsible for marginalizing peripheral voices from the discipline’s core or the non-West that is not considerably taking part in the global knowledge production processes is a crucial inquiry this chapter closely looks into.

2.1 Defining *Eurocentrism*

As the Eurocentric nature of the discipline of IR has come to the fore as a major disciplinary shortcoming of IR, this first requires an in-depth understanding of the notion of *Eurocentrism*. It is particularly important to note at the outset, why this research employs the term ‘Eurocentrism’ instead of its twin concept i.e. *Western-centrism*. The two terms are often used interchangeably and also in a manner where the latter incorporates the former. However, this research considers the ‘West’ as being comprised of “Europe and/or Europe-derived entities” (Grovoqui, 2006, p.4) or as the European colonial diaspora in a post-colonial world (Alejandro, 2019). One may argue that the current world order is led by the US as a superpower and that Western-centrism would be a logical and convenient term to go with but the “US-led West” is also “connected to its European ‘past’ due to the politico-cultural ties that determine the continuation of Eurocentrism in Western-centric ways” (Kuru, 2016, p.357). This denotes the continuation of a nonexistent world that is still very much existent. In retaining the choice of scholars - whether they use the term Euro or Western-centric/ism- in their works, both terms are used in this study with citations provided. This study, in its exploration, however, completely subscribes to the concept of Eurocentrism.

Various scholars have defined Eurocentrism based on different understandings of the notion. Buzan and Little refer to Eurocentrism as “the propensity to understand world history and international politics past and present as if they were merely offshoots of European history and Westphalian forms of international relations” (Buzan & Little, 2000, p.440). Eurocentrism has further been described “as a set of practices – scientific, cultural, political – which overtly (mostly in the era of colonial imperialism) or tacitly (mostly in the postcolonial era) seek to establish and maintain the primacy of post-Enlightenment European political and epistemic culture at the expense of alternative political systems and epistemologies”

(Vasilaki, 2012, p.4) or “the sensibility that Europe is historically, economically, culturally and politically distinctive in ways that significantly determine the overall character of world politics” (Sabaratnam, 2013, p.261).

Alejandro (2019), while drawing from John Hobson’s work, mentions three key aspects of Eurocentric discourses as she identifies the Eurocentric nature of IR: first, the West as a “proactive subject” denotes how the South is deprived of its agency as it is considered as a passive object in comparison to the West that is held as an active subject of world politics; second, the West as “the only one game in town” refers to a teleological self-seeking West as being the center around which world politics naturally revolves; third, the West as the “ideal normative referent” refers to the Western practices and values as universal standards rendering diverse world histories and experiences invalid (pp.3-4). With this being so, Barkawi and Laffey (2006) argue that the discipline is seen “[f]ailing to study the weak and the strong together, as jointly responsible for making history” (p.333). These understandings portray Europe as the starting and ending point of world politics. This, however, provides a very restricted and biased canon for conceptualizing world politics.

The notion of Eurocentrism is based on critical approaches namely post-colonialism, neo-Gramscianism, post-structuralism and subaltern studies – each bespeaks power relations and the infamous relationship between power and knowledge helping explain the underlying invisibilities and dominant arrangements in the field of IR. Critical approaches are predominantly concerned with the agency of the periphery in world politics and they pose a significant challenge to the mainstream IR for its enduring Eurocentric perspective and the exclusion of relations of inequality and dominance between the West and non-West (Hobson & Sajed, 2017) The critical approaches that constitute the framework of Eurocentrism can not only be utilized to understand what ‘Eurocentrism’ in IR means but also how the body of discourse constituting the field of IR can be de- and reconstructed in order to move beyond what is identified as a ‘Eurocentric discipline of IR’. So in being anti-Eurocentric one can remain within the confines of the conceptual grids of Eurocentrism.

However, with the adoption of critical approaches, in being reflexive and engaging with “difference” while holding an emancipatory stance, all of this might get comprised (and it often does) by the “enduringly Eurocentric gaze” one adopts. That is to say that despite studying the West critically, the West is fetishized as a hyper-agential actor in world politics and the non-Western agency is neglected hence reinforcing Eurocentrism (Hobson & Sajed,

2017), which one seeks to counter in the first place. For Kuru (2016), mostly, analyses that grant European (and Western) actors a notable role in the global political order are viewed as being “Eurocentric”. This problem, he argues, becomes more obvious with anti-Eurocentric scholarship, “which demonstrates an unending circle of intra-IR disciplinary blaming and bashing” (pp.352-353). According to him, the main problem with critics of Eurocentric IR is “their tendency to overstate the impact of Eurocentrism as an ideology by confusing it with a more geo-historically situated form of Eurocentric world order”. The former “sees Europe, or a more global West as the only active subject of world politics” and the latter views “Eurocentrism as a picture of the world that derives from the significance of European powers at a certain point in time, basically from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth centuries” (p.352). It is due to this perception that critics of Eurocentrism (anti-Eurocentrics) overemphasize the degree of Eurocentrism in IR.

Contrary to that, Wallerstein holds a favorable view towards the hyper-agential power accorded to Europe in IR as for him, “if we insist too much on non-European agency as a theme, we end up whitewashing all of Europe’s sins, or at least most of them” (Wallerstein 1997, p.102) and “[b]y denying Europe credit [for the creation of the modern world], we deny European blame [for crimes committed against non-Western peoples]” (1997, p.104). Hence to achieve a genuinely anti-Eurocentric envisioning of world politics, the Western autonomy and hyper-agency need to be retained. Stated in this context, “anti-Eurocentrics” can rightly be referred to as “anti-Eurocentric Eurocentrics” (Hobson & Sajed, 2017). Therefore, one can be Eurocentric and critical of the West at the same time and ‘Eurocentrism’ as a conceptual framework captures both aspects quite comprehensively.

2.2 How is IR a Eurocentric Discipline?

In understanding how ‘Eurocentrism’ characterizes the discipline of IR and more importantly, how Eurocentrism in the field is preserved, it is important to unpack whose interpretations, experiences, and interests are privileged in the field and how? A Eurocentric IR is made possible with the West exercising and maintaining its exclusive control over discursive and non-discursive global knowledge production processes (Waheed, 2019). Numerous studies have examined the processes whereby peripheral scholars are prevented from participating in global knowledge production in the discipline of IR (Tickner & Wæver, 2009; Blaney & Tickner, 2017; Tickner, 2013; Waheed, 2020; Waheed, 2019). With intellectual gatekeeping in place, the discipline provides a specific “ideological” canon for conceptualizing IR, as a

result of which, the distinct realities of the periphery are marginalized (Fredua-Mensah 2016). The monopoly of Western agents (publishers, universities, and scholars, etc.) in the screening of passing knowledge and its publication further restricts what forms part of the core scholarship in IR. Moreover, the requirements of standard content structure and writing style, theoretical depth, methodological rigor, and the appropriate use of the English language (Waheed, 2019) are Western standards that are used to determine what is “proper” academic work in the field (Peters & Wemheuer-Vogelaar, 2016). The Western domination of global knowledge production in the field of IR, the West’s biasness towards non-Western contributors, and the Western benchmarks for scholarly works in the field make it difficult for the non-West to make it to the discipline’s core.

It has been discovered through research conducted by Peace A. Medie and Alice J. Kang that Global South scholars (that includes 77 countries) represent around 3% of the articles published in peer-reviewed European and US journals from 2008-2017 (Medie & Kang, 2018). The remaining percentage reflects a dominating Western voice in IR scholarship. It is correct to say that it is the West that produces most or almost all of the knowledge in the discipline of IR. Eurocentrism in the discipline of IR also means that the field is profoundly based on Western experiences that are non-encompassing of the third world realities (Rais, 2005). Tickner and Waever (2009) argue that “key IR concepts, including the state, self-help, power, and security, do not ‘fit’ third world realities and may not be as relevant as others for thinking about the specific problems of such parts of the world” (p.1). For Cheema and Rais (2001), the conceptualization of IR is based on the experiences of industrially developed countries with political stability and military strength and this does not truly reflect Third World realities that are marked by varying power abilities and levels of influence. Fredua-Mensah (2016) outlines how Eurocentrism is embedded in IR theories and how dominant paradigms of IR, such as traditional realism, prove to be problematic in their application in the periphery’s context (in Africa’s context, to be precise). In this regard, concerning the realist paradigm, the author points at the theory’s entailing notions i.e. anarchy, sovereignty, and power that, in epistemological terms, are drawn from the experiences of Great Powers presenting the world of *realpolitik*. This suggests the growing irrelevance of ‘standard’ IR concepts and theories or what is rather maintained as ‘universal truths’ in IR, in capturing and explaining non-Western realities.

For the most part, Western-centric discourse overlooks the non-Western agency in IR (Alejandro, 2019). Nonetheless, where the non-European or Third World is brought into the analyses, it is done in a way that either fails to interact with the Third World on authentic terms or only treats the Third World as an adjunct to the range of ideas created in connection with the First World and holds the Third World in a position inferior to Western existence and practices. Take, for instance, the discursive creation of the “Third World” in comparison to the “First” or “developed” World whose prescriptions (in the form of development) when followed ensures membership in the latter ‘world’ categorization (Escobar, 1984) or the representation of the Third World as “underdeveloped” in the discourse on “development” (Escobar, 1992, p.412), and similarly, the creation of and discourse on the “Orient” (Escobar, 1992, p.413). This knowledge production, which is characterized by the Western hegemonic interpretations of the non-European/Third World, is an attempt by the West to exercise its domination over the Third World (Escobar, 1984).

Behind the active production of Western knowledge are parochial, self-serving intellectual, and political interests. One should bear in mind that the academic discipline of IR, from the start, has revolved around European interests and problems. The creation of the discipline, in 1919, in a European setting to prevent war such as Europe had just witnessed (Nye, 2008) substantiates the aforementioned argument. IR was also used as a policy science with a partial commitment to solving issues regarding imperial control and the governance of colonies (Barkawi, 2010). It is further noteworthy that where Western approaches pay attention to the non-West as a focal point in the analysis, these approaches remain irrelevant to the realities of non-Western societies as greater focus is still rewarded to Western threat perceptions and interests. This can be noted mostly in the analyses on “sage bush wars”, “low-intensity conflicts” and “guerrilla wars” (Bilgin, 2008) in IR literature. Concerning the theoretical component, when Cox (1986) informs that “theory is always *for* someone and *for* some purpose” (p.207), this critical theory mantra when applied to the discipline of IR supports the assertion that “IR theory is (almost) always for the West and for the Western interest” (Hobson, 2012, p.16). Because the discipline of IR primarily serves the interests and concerns of its initiators who are also those situated at the top of both world and global knowledge systems, it is not difficult to make sense of whose knowledge dominates the field and whose does not.

What further demands attention is that notwithstanding the advent of critical IR theory that has altered the theoretical landscape of the discipline of IR in a considerable manner (Hobson & Sajed, 2017) with critical theorists increasingly grappling with the discourse of Western dominance, it is observed that this counter-discourse also emanates from the center and prevails in the disciplinary margins providing the “oppressed” the conceptual and discursive tools to make sense of the very oppression they endure (Alejandro, 2019). As this discourse “is basically framed within cultural discourse originating from the West”, for Acharya and Buzan, it does not form an “authentic” alternative to mainstream IR (Bilgin, 2010, p.822). Critical theory is hence “Western-centered” and not all-inclusive of global geographies (Wemheuer-Vogelaar & Peters, 2016). This is consistent with a previously mentioned argument that it is the West that has the advantage of producing most of the discourse in the field. Ironically, here we are concerned with the counter-hegemonic discourse in IR. Now, the question is: what is the non-West doing on its part to contribute to the core scholarship in IR? One should keep in mind that in the absence of any substantial ‘scholarly’ contributions to core IR scholarship, one only has a weak case of launching complaints against the present nature of IR. These dissatisfactions need to be voiced through scholarly works that are also ‘accessible’ to those on whom the blame of committing an ‘epistemic violence’ is pinned.

2.3 Navigating beyond the Eurocentric Boundaries of the Discipline:

Possibilities & Limits

In line with the ‘post-Western’ aspiration to move beyond the existing boundaries of IR as a field of study, scholars have become critical of existing IR knowledge and have shifted their focus towards the understudied dynamics of and point of view from the Global South. Accordingly, their efforts have culminated in critical terrorism studies (Jackson, Smyth, & Gunning, 2009; Jackson, 2007) and critical security studies (Watanabe, 2019; Bilgin, 2004). Other scholars, in their critical interaction with Eurocentric IR discourse, have adapted existing IR knowledge according to their local context of study. For instance, South African scholars have revisited the concept of *middle power* (initially developed in the context of traditional middle powers in the industrialized Western world including countries such as Canada, Australia, Norway, and Sweden) by adopting a local lens and by critically examining the literature on middle powers developed mainly by scholars such as Andrew Cooper and Robert Cox so that the concept is revised and adapted for emerging middle powers in the South. Realism has also been modified to suit Third World’s unique security plight by

Mohammed Ayoob. The analytical output is called *subaltern realism*, which “draws upon the experience of subalterns in the international system” (Ayoob, 2002, p.40).

Further, Chinese scholars are talking about a reformist China using its potential to develop an “IR theory with Chinese characteristics” (Wang, 2009), for instance, by utilizing traditional notions such as *Tianxia* (all-under-heaven), which is quite famous among Chinese government-affiliated scholars and public intellectuals (Chen, 2011). Japanese scholars are shedding light on distinct theorists and theories of IR existing in Japan before the Second World War (Inoguchi, 2007). Theoretical innovations from Africa are also coming to the fore. The new analytical frameworks for categorizing states in the international community (applicable to South Africa as well as countries like China and Chile) include Deon Geldenhuys’ *isolated* and *deviant state* frameworks. Thomas Tiekou has offered an important alternative worldview of *Ubuntu* that explains the collectivist behavior of the African state in the international system (Smith, 2017).

Scholars are also assessing the possibility and limits of non-Western, homegrown alternatives to IR envisioning. In the broader Asian context, different contributors to Acharya and Buzan’s (2010) volume, suggest through their work, the interest of the Asian states in having theories suitable to their experiences but that Asian scholars are yet to come up with indigenous approaches to IR. Mostly, the works produced by Asian scholars are atheoretical. Nonetheless, theory-testing has grown to some extent. But since the theories, which are tested have originated from the West, the production of indigenous theoretical knowledge remains absent in Asia’s context. In the South Asian context, Behera (2008; 2009) notes that the epistemological boundaries of the discipline of IR are set by the core knowledge claims and the value system of the realist tradition. The underlying positivist enterprise makes irrelevant any critical assessment of major disciplinary concerns in IR or the deconstruction of key IR concepts. Concerning the cases of Brazil and India, Audrey Alejandro (2019) deconstructs the narrative of Western dominance in IR and reveals the difficulty in producing counter-hegemonic discourse in the Global South while citing reasons such as the disinterest of Global South scholars in local theorization. Such works, despite being deficient in proposing an alternative to IR, offer important perspectives on the challenges in formulating non-Western IR theories and contribute significantly in terms of pushing the debate on ‘non-Western approaches to IR’ forward.

On the contrary, a group of notable IR scholars such as John Mearsheimer (2016) explicitly disagree with the growing calls for widening IR scholarship (in particular IR theory). For these scholars, too much pluralism would result in a “divided discipline that not only fails to speak with one voice, but cannot even agree on what we should be studying, focusing on, or seeking to explain” and hence pluralism “masks the fact that we have an incoherent field” (Schmidt, 2008, p.298). Relatedly, for neorealism’s forefather, Kenneth Waltz, “[i]t would be... ridiculous to construct a theory of international politics based on Malaysia and Costa Rica...” This is because when great powers are supplanted by countries like Malaysia and Costa Rica as “authors of IR theory”; this would give rise to a new set of problems and research agendas (Tickner, 2003, p.301). Following that, Snyder (2008) has underscored the universal application of mainstream theoretical paradigms (realism and liberalism) compared to non-Western alternative knowledge, whose applicability is restricted to the place of origin only (e.g. the Chinese alternative of *Confucianism* being applicable only to the Chinese civilization). Bilgin (2008) argues that there is greater usefulness in recognizing how non-Western experiences and views have been incorporated into the so-called Western approaches for imagining world politics (and vice versa).

Separately, others have warned that the efforts in making IR a pluralistic field of study would result in a mimicry of the epistemological underpinnings of IR theories (Acharya, 2011a) or methodologies and inquiries akin to Western intellectual products (Aydinli & Biltekin, 2018, pp.226-229). Scholars from the ‘opposing’ camp need to be reminded of Acharya’s “Global IR” agenda, which is not aimed at discarding Western-centric IR but rather to make IR more inclusive so that it reflects non-Western voices to the hilt (Acharya, 2016). At instances where the proposed alternatives do not offer lessons to those settings lying outside the boundaries of their origin, these approaches signify the range of existing problems and question the adequacy of Eurocentrism in IR. In doing so, they simply present “examples of other ways of identifying theoretical subjects and starting points” (Kerner, 2018, p.13). Moreover, where slight adaptations of existing IR knowledge are made to suit the non-Western context, these “seemingly minor adaptations of existing concepts or frameworks”, as Smith (2017) argues; contribute significantly to the development of the discipline of IR (p.9).

Despite the growing enthusiasm for a diversified and inclusive field of IR and significant contributions made in this regard, non-Western voices still largely remain absent from the core IR community and mainstream IR scholarship. Concerning the post-positivist critique in

IR, it is seen that three decades after its launch, reflexive IR “remains located at the margins of the margins of the discipline” (Hamati-Ataya, 2012, p. 670). In the past decades, the deconstruction of the myths in IR (1648 and 1919), has been done in several ways but such accounts have not entered the core of the discipline (Fredua-Mensah, 2016). As non-Western scholars have attempted to revisit existing mainstream IR theories to amend and adapt them according to the non-Western context, for instance, Mohammed Ayoob’s *subaltern realism*, their efforts do not make it to the disciplinary core either and are deprived of recognition as legitimate knowledge in the field. Adaptations by Western scholars, on the other hand, enjoy intellectual legitimacy in the discipline. Concerning alternative IR thinking, for example, that emanating from Africa, this knowledge also remains at the fringes of the discipline (Smith, 2017).

CHAPTER 3

A EUROCENTRIC ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN PAKISTAN: NORMATIVE FACTORS

International Relations is discovered as a young discipline in the overall South Asian context. By reviewing available literature, it has been found that it is due to disciplinary and pedagogical factors that there is a weak conceptualization of IR across the region. Mostly, the works generating from South Asia are the adapted versions of the discourse that has originally emerged from the West. (Behera, 2008). Keeping this in view, this chapter precisely focuses on the problem of a ‘Eurocentric IR’ in Pakistan by looking inward and examining the disciplinary shortcoming. At a time when the discipline of IR is being criticized by scholars from around the world for its ethnocentric and provincial character and the resultant exclusion of non-Western presence from the disciplinary core (Acharya, 2000; Acharya & Buzan, 2010; Tickner, 2003), upon learning that most IR academics in Pakistan remain aloof from debates on approaches, methodologies and major controversies in the field of International Relations (Cheema & Rais, 2001), it becomes important to investigate why that continues to be so? Is it because Pakistani IR academics do not recognize Eurocentrism in IR as a ‘problem’? Or is it because a Eurocentric IR has merely become a matter of intellectual convenience for these academics? This chapter addresses such serious concerns at a time when the discipline is seemingly being ‘transformed’ and ‘globalized’.

It is quite unfortunate that concerning IR in Pakistan, “we have not even attempted to comprehend our unique situation and problems...We continue to shape our academic and intellectual interests in this discipline predominantly by resorting to the analytical models, and themes developed by foreign scholars” (Cheema & Rais, 2001, p.178). Not only are we producing scholarly works that subscribe to Western intellectual thinking (Behera, 2009), our pedagogical orientations in the field can also be located within the foreign spectrum (Cheema & Rais, 2001). There is a dearth of literature that provides an inward-looking approach in presenting an account of IR as a Western-dominated discipline in Pakistan’s context (Behera, 2009; Cheema & Rais, 2001; Rais, 2005; Waheed, 2017; Waheed, 2020). While contributing to this literature, the uniqueness of this chapter can be drawn from its character, which is purely ‘normative’. The normative aspect pays close heed to academic realizations, attitudes,

and preferences in the field that when studied; present an important case for *why* IR continues to be Eurocentric (in Pakistan's case). This is addressed in this chapter by examining the intellectual interests of IR academics in Pakistan when they engage in research and publication practices and by probing into the pedagogical choices and patterns in IR at the higher education level in Pakistan.

3.1 Nature of the Discipline

It is first important to familiarize oneself with the understanding of Eurocentrism in IR from the Pakistani perspective. Pakistani IR academics who were interviewed for this study lamented the pervasiveness of ethnocentric biases in the discipline of IR in Pakistan. All academics interviewed were well-aware of the domination of Eurocentric thinking in the field. An assistant professor recognized the “Westernization of knowledge” in IR as a “truth or reality” (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021). In the following excerpt, another assistant professor expressed his views on the prevalence of Eurocentric thinking in the discipline:

When we look at what's being written today, in IR... it's like 95 plus percent Western scholars or Western thought, and even this Western thought is picked up, obviously, by non-Western writers as well. If we read articles on IR, whether it be theory or any other non-theoretical articles, perhaps conceptual or non-factual, it's always these Western theories that come up. You can go straight down the line, typical realistic theories, liberal theories, English school, constructivism, Marxism, feminism, it's all Western, it's all Westernized even deconstructionism, it's just Western thought. And that's totally dominating.

(M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021)

Furthermore, when Behera (2008) points at IR's weak epistemic base in the South Asian context and speaks of theoretical discourse as a much “dreaded and despised” intellectual endeavor across the region, this is partly associated with the continuing ethnocentrism of Western theories that being dissociated from the local context are ill-fit for understanding local problems. Suggestively, this is as true for Pakistan as for any other South Asian country. Having said that, Pakistani IR academics who were interviewed highlighted how Pakistani society, culture, and historical experiences are distinct from the Western context and that IR theories being predominantly ‘Western theories’ address West's problems, not Pakistan's; Western realities, not those representative of Pakistan. The intellectual consciousness of these

academics concerning the incompatibility of Western knowledge and IR theories with Pakistan's context was quite evident in the interviews.

In this regard, a senior lecturer identified critical issues facing Pakistani society including poverty, hunger, and illiteracy. He spoke of these problems as a true depiction of societal realities of Pakistan; realities which should be captured through Pakistani scholarly writings (K. Ahmad, personal communication, June 29, 2021); an assistant professor warned of the failure in conveying problems that Pakistan faces to the West if adherence to the imitation of Western knowledge and theories persists (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021); and an associate professor made a direct reference to the religion of Islam majorly as a way of life in the country and expressed her dissatisfaction with the scope of Western IR theories in capturing Eastern cultural norms and values (M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021).

The plurality of ideas in IR is something that various prominent IR scholars from around the world have welcomed. These scholars have taken a middle position in advocating for an IR in which theories, methodologies, and approaches from the South and the non-West compete and interact with existing knowledge rather than denouncing or demolishing current theories for their Western sources of knowledge be it realism, liberalism, or constructivism (Acharya, 2011b). These scholars talk about the assimilation of all useful knowledge to the extent possible but that this should be done with a critical spirit that does not make us turn away from our intellectual traditions (Alatas S. H., 2000). Additionally, Pakistani IR academics also shared a balanced opinion as regards the enrichment of the discipline through the addition of views from indigenous settings so were amicable towards the idea of achieving a truly pluralistic discipline of International Relations.

According to an assistant professor, although Pakistan has a different culture and distinct societal realities, saying that Western ideas do not apply to the Pakistani context is also not 100% correct. This knowledge can be borrowed but we cannot simply rely on the domestication of this knowledge – something that we continue to do (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021). Another academic drew attention to common conflict patterns around the world while making a point that a lot can be learned from Western experiences such as those of the two World Wars and the Cold War as well as Western literature. However, he further stated that only some part of this knowledge can be borrowed and the remaining half is our responsibility to contribute to (R. Naseer, personal

communication, July 1, 2021). This is also in line with the idea of the democratization of IR through its decolonization that Chen (2011) makes a mention of in his study where the core and periphery learn from one another and accept the coexistence of distinct views in the field.

In the end, one can still not turn a blind eye to the existing state of IR in Pakistan. It is worrisome that West's intellectual ethnocentrism prevails in Pakistani IR. Realism dominates the field of IR theory (Waheed, 2017) and Pakistani academics and scholars have not been able to develop a single theory in the field (M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021) therefore, are mainly situated at the "receiving" end of the knowledge spectrum (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021). It appears that we are supporting the West by still writing within the existing/provided frameworks and not according to our own needs (K. Ahmad, personal communication, June 29, 2021). Despite knowing that existing IR knowledge and frameworks do not represent Pakistani realities and voicing their concerns regarding this in a regretful manner, why Pakistani IR academics are not largely seen translating their concerns about an incongruous, Eurocentric IR into some 'real action' is what the following sections of this chapter inquire about within their defined ambit.

3.2 Academic Works and Orientations

The field of IR theory in Pakistan is found to be dominated by the *realist* tradition. Hence there is a notable obsession with sovereignty that is in turn linked to the security-centricity of the state (Waheed, 2017). Accordingly, the Pakistani scholarly contributions to the field are narrowly confined to the security challenges of Pakistan, Afghanistan, and South Asia (Rais, 2005). Other (state-centric) recurring themes include Pakistan's quest for parity with India in various domains and beyond the South Asian region, they are focused on Pakistan's leadership role among Muslim countries in the world, the link of its strategic geographic position to trade routes to Central Asia (Behera, 2009), and Pakistan's relationship with major world powers (Cheema & Rais, 2001). When asked why the research in the field of IR in Pakistan mainly employs the realist lens in conceptualizing and analyzing world politics, the IR academics interviewed shared their thoughts as follows:

Excerpt 1:

The actual problem is that since 1947, we have been obsessed with security issues...We are realists and there is no doubt about it. Hence that thinking is reflected in our writings...Our strategic challenges have led to our

involvement in one kind of security issue or another... We have either been a part of an alliance, sometimes we have dissociated ourselves from an alliance, sometimes we have been a part of an active war like in Afghanistan, the War on Terror. We have always been involved in security issues and we follow only this one line of thinking. We have never tried to understand the world by keeping our security point of view aside.

(U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021)

Excerpt 2:

Because our national narrative is driven by our traditional security and because we see India as an adversary, we see United States exploiting Pakistan a number of times... So I think that relates to strategic culture... It is true also because we have been through this phase almost during the entire period of our existence, but in the last 30-40 years, Afghan War, crisis with India or whatever is happening in Kashmir, your national narrative has been shaped by these traditional security interests... I think the reality is fortunately or unfortunately, we are located in a region where we have these challenges, which we cannot overlook and that continues to shape our national narrative and thinking.

(A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021)

All academics interviewed agreed to the dominance of realist thinking in scholarly works/ the field of IR theory in Pakistan. This for them is mainly linked to the strategic challenges that Pakistan faces, which also have to do with Pakistan's geographical position as well as its strategic culture to a considerable extent. The realist thought is not only confined to scholarly contributions in the field. Inayatullah (1998) holds that strategic discourse, neorealist discourse dominates the social and political thought and practice in Pakistan in general. It is the nation-state model, its traditional understandings of security, sovereignty, and strategy around which this discourse and thinking revolve. Be it the debates in editorial pages, national conferences, research institutes, or tea parties, they all pay close attention to the comparative strategic role of Pakistan with regard to India, the United States, and so forth. This discourse suffocates the space for any alternative discourse. Hence the discourse largely remains state-centric in nature. Even Islam has been framed in the country within a national, state-oriented context and has been seen prospering as party politics or the creation of a national Islamic republic while completely ignoring its broad-ranging cultural force of progression; for serving the needy.

Crucially, as the foundational positivist enterprise in the realist thought does not provide space for critical engagement with knowledge and discourse in IR, so questions such as how

key concepts of the nation-state, nationalism, and sovereignty could generate different meanings are left unexplored (Behera, 2008). This type of research tests knowledge while relying on empirical means (Maliniak, Oakes, Peterson, & Tierney, 2007) rendering reality as something ‘given’. Not just in Pakistan but the South Asian region at large, the state is treated as a “given” and “unproblematic” polity rather than a “historical product”. The Westphalian model obtained from the European context is utilized to conceive the state and in doing so, the country’s own historical repository of statecraft is sidelined (Behera, 2009). One should acknowledge that “the Western nation-state...had emerged within the largely homogeneous societies of Europe. A mechanical application of the nation-state idea with its monolithic credo and unitary state structures, on the deeply multicultural societies of the South Asia was structurally flawed” (Behera, 2008, p.29).

Realism does not fully capture peripheral realities. If we take the example of Walt’s structural realism, the theory grants greater importance to the system and its structures in comparison to the units and it is the distribution of capabilities at the system level upon which the nature of the unit response is contingent. However, concerning the specific case of South Asian security, the realist understanding appears inadequate. It is noted that “almost all the major competing paradigms of South Asian security are regional in nature, although differing widely in their paradigmatic characterizations and choice of determinants...What then holds them together, is the belief that external powers are drawn in by the regional system of states rather than the other way round. The outside powers...neither constitute the major conflicts nor determine their dynamics. Even qualitative transformation in the nature of the international system, from Cold War bipolarity to post-Cold War multipolarity, did not alter this pattern” (Chatterjee, 2012, p.10). This brings us to an important point of inspection: do Pakistani IR academics think that realism (in its various forms) adequately captures the realities and/or security predicaments of Pakistan? With realism mainly informing the field of IR theory in Pakistan (Waheed, 2017), it becomes important to explore why scholarly explorations in Pakistani IR continue to lie within an ill-fitting and restraining framework.

Many Pakistani IR academics who were interviewed recognized mainstream IR approaches (predominantly realism but also liberalism) as being incapable in explaining all of Pakistan’s problems (U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021; interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021; A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021; M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021; S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021;

M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021). But then the question is: why are these academics not moving towards other theoretical options, let alone homegrown theorization in IR? This according to one academic is because people doing academic work in the field in Pakistan think that “these are the most easily and readily available theories to work on” and also because “... new theories take a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of reading, new ideas...so on and so forth” so again, working with what is available is the easier route they tend to opt for (R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021). Realism is also “easy to work with on the conflictual aspects...” commented another academic while pointing at the main research areas of interest in Pakistani IR (the US and Afghanistan in particular) (W. Ishaque, personal communication, June 21, 2021). An assistant professor regretfully informed that most academics in Pakistan are more interested in just getting their works published and they do not have any interest in coming up with original thinking or genuine work in the field (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021).

These explanations make clear that the increasing resort to realism in Pakistani IR is a matter of ease and convenience. It should further be noted that although most of the academics interviewed do not think that realist thinking sufficiently captures Pakistan’s realities, they do, however, agree to its adoption by many of their colleagues in the field. Hence the overall picture remains quite gloomy. Waheed (2017) argues that most Pakistani academics feel little or no need in coming up or working with IR theories other than realism and that realism, in one form or another, provides these academics an explanatory framework for analyzing Pakistan’s problems. This research substantiates this argument.

3.3 Teaching Practice

The teaching of IR in Pakistan is characterized as a Western-oriented practice. A close study of IR courses offered at Pakistani universities would be suggestive of the incongruence between the study of IR and the economic, political, and strategic realities of the country (Cheema & Rais, 2001). The course content taught to students in the field is mainly dominated by the works of Western authors (Rais, 2005) and comprised of a mixture of the diplomatic history of the two World Wars and the Cold War (Behera, 2009). Resultantly, there is an attunement to the foreign spectrum of knowledge in both the designing of IR courses as well as the selection of reading materials and this can be said to be a result of both conscious and unconscious academic inclinations. Because “much has depended upon the individual interests, skill, and training of a teacher in giving significance and substance to a

course of study” (Cheema & Rais, 2001, p.178), this section looks into ‘why’ in IR teaching in Pakistan, it is primarily the ‘borrowed’/Western knowledge that is imparted to students.

Concerning local knowledge production in the discipline of IR in Pakistan, it is indeed a discomfoting reality that despite the outstanding growth of the discipline of IR with the establishment of new departments in universities over the past few decades, Pakistani scholars have not been able to produce anything in the key areas of the discipline that can be used as a textbook. Over two generations of Pakistani IR academics have been unable to produce any basic level introductory texts in compulsory (program-completion wise) sub-fields of IR for Pakistani students (Rais, 2005). It is argued that the only area that has mainly received the attention of Pakistani academics is the foreign policy of Pakistan but even within this theme, there exists only a single comprehensive and well-documented study, which is S.M. Burke's *Pakistan's Foreign Policy* (1973). However, considering that this book was written some decades ago, it is now found to be outdated. Various other contributions have been made in this area but these works are not conceptually rigorous despite the provision of good historical accounts of the country’s foreign relations (Cheema & Rais, 2001). The interviewees expressed their concerns over the lack of overall indigenous knowledge production in IR, be it in the form of theories, concepts, or models (M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021) and more importantly, the absence of any local knowledge of good quality that can be introduced to students (U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021; K. Ahmad, personal communication, June 29, 2021).

Furthermore, the issue of language is central to not just the discipline of IR but social sciences at large in Pakistan. Social sciences are taught in English at almost all universities. So to read, understand and teach social sciences, knowing the English language is a prerequisite despite noting that only some Pakistanis can understand the language (Zaidi, 2002). An assistant professor raised the language issue in her interview by telling that many students in universities in Pakistan come from rural backgrounds. These are students who can read and write in Urdu. Many have come to her and have shown great interest in studying IR but the problem with them is largely about the use of the English language. In targeting these students, she further told that she has searched through markets, bookshops, libraries, and a lot of other places and was disappointed to find out that there is not a single locally produced IR work of good quality available in the Urdu language. As she continued to express her despondency as regards indigenous knowledge in IR in the Urdu language, she stated:

I found some books in Urdu on the subject of International Relations but they were just pathetic. They have only modified the main concepts of IR or have misconstrued those concepts in their explanation. This is a big issue here...

(U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021)

Other than the issue of language, another problem concerning the teaching of IR in Pakistan is that only basic level education is imparted to students. Where teachers are the providers of the content, again, the task lies upon them to add updated readings in the courses that they are teaching. Upon going through the reading lists of different IR courses, it is revealed that most of the content is irrelevant to contemporary IR. There is a lack of familiarity with contemporary issues as well as works in the field (Cheema & Rais, 2001). Particularly, concerning the issue of the teaching of outdated knowledge by teachers and professors to IR students in Pakistan, in the following excerpt, an assistant professor highlighted the role that “tradition” plays:

...There is a lineage of scholars. They are simply reconstructing what their own teachers taught them. You can imagine that some so-called professors still have the notes they got from their teachers maybe sixty years ago and they still repeat it. I am not blaming them; I am simply talking about tradition. How fanatical we can be to tradition. So if in the 1950s, 60s, and 70s the kind of talks or the kind of ideas or the concepts that were exposed to a particular scholar were on realism, liberalism, neo-realism, neo-liberalism, that has become the message passed on to the next generation...

(B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021)

While commenting on the same problem, an associate professor stated that “rather than coming up with something new, it is easier for me to pick up a developed handout which would be outdated...” (A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021) This knowledge is outmoded, it is informed by conventional thinking in the field, it is dissociated from the critical, post-positivist paradigm of IR, and not to mention, it is primarily Eurocentric in character. Moving on, diplomatic history or foreign policy is given more attention in the teaching of IR in Pakistan. Since students assimilate what they are taught, it is understandable why state-centric topics such as the Pakistani state, bilateral relations, relations and issues of other countries are mostly selected by them in their research in the field in Pakistan (Rais, 2005). This is also a reflection of the obsession of Pakistani IR academics with realist concepts and ways of looking at world politics.

3.4 Intellectual Inferiority Complex in Pakistani Academia

Because IR students in Pakistan are so much exposed to Western scholarship, there is a general understanding that these students are more familiar with works done by Western authors as compared to works authored by Pakistanis. The IR academics interviewed view this as a major problem in the discipline in Pakistan. This, however, does not mean that Pakistani academics are not doing academic work of good quality. Some academics have gotten their works published in international journals with writing quality comparable to international standards (Rais, 2005). Pakistani academics are also working on critical themes and/or with critical approaches in the field and publishing internationally (Ali, Jabeen, & Naveed-i-Rahat, 2011; Waheed, 2020; Malik, 2014). With this being said, it is still noted that it is predominantly the Western knowledge that students are exposed to in the field in Pakistan (Rais, 2005; Behera, 2009; Cheema & Rais, 2001). If the argument is that there are no ‘basic’ or ‘introductory texts’ of good quality authored by Pakistanis to introduce in IR programs in Pakistan then why are other scholarly works produced by Pakistanis also not taught to students at the advanced level of IR programs in the country?

For many Pakistani IR academics who took part in this study, this problem is attributed to the existence of an intellectual inferiority complex that pervades throughout Pakistani academia. Additionally, an academic pointed at the “sense of inferiority” instilled into the minds of the younger generation in Pakistan and even senior Pakistani scholars as part of their social brought up, as a result of which; they think that anything which is written by a foreigner/Western scholar has more credibility so will add more credibility to their work. Hence they do not like to quote their own academics or cite their works (A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021). An associate professor regretfully informed that if in a classroom he would take names such as Mearsheimer, Robert Kaplan, or Alfred Mahan and present their arguments; this would have an “impact” on the students and would be received seriously by them. This, however, is not the case when Pakistani authors and their works are shared in a classroom setting. This professor stated with great disappointment that if a piece of work authored by a foreigner of not even good quality is given to any Pakistani to read and teach, (s)he would do that but (s)he would not do the same with Pakistani works. For him, it was ironic that his book, which is in English and of which a translated version also exists in the Chinese language, is of more interest to people outside Pakistan than those in Pakistan (A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021).

Other Pakistani IR academics who were interviewed highlighted the impressed-by-the-West (in general) factor in explaining the intellectual superiority accorded to the West in Pakistani academia. A senior professor was of the view that Pakistanis are impressed by the West due to the image of the West as a world leader (K. Ahmad, personal communication, June 29, 2021) Hence the Western world is seen by them as an exemplar of perfection, which when followed guarantees everyone success. An assistant professor commented that Pakistanis are so influenced by Western knowledge that they simply pick up on Western theories and Western concepts such as the “clash of civilizations” or the “end of history” as they know about the success they are making in the international market as academic bestsellers (M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021).

Interestingly, Alatas (2003) has identified intellectually dependent societies’ reliance on Western social science and their passive reception of Western intellectual products and thinking (research agendas, problems areas, research methods as well as benchmarks of excellence) as a result of a “shared sense of . . . intellectual inferiority against the West”. As it can be noted, there is a “psychological dimension to this dependency” (p.603). The problem of an intellectual inferiority complex in Pakistani academia against Western knowledge can be captured within the purview of Alatas’ argument. Furthermore, in an attempt to explain why an intellectual inferiority complex exists in Pakistani academia, the inequality in knowledge production in IR, which is recognized as a function of the unevenness in the distribution of material capabilities in the international system (Ayoob, 2002), can be used as a sound explanation. Other than that, the colonizer’s mindset in ruling the subcontinent i.e. “what is ‘English’ is superior and what is ‘Indian’ is inferior” is very much relevant to today’s reality in a post-colonial context (A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021). In a post-colonial Pakistan, the colonial mindset still operates, so much so that for Pakistanis what is ‘English’ is automatically superior, and what is ‘Pakistani’ is automatically inferior.

CHAPTER 4

A EUROCENTRIC ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS IN PAKISTAN: STRUCTURAL FACTORS

Numerous studies point at the structural level processes and the gatekeeping practices through which the periphery scholars are prevented from participating in international knowledge production and publication (Tickner, 2003; Waheed, 2019; Fredua-Mensah, 2016; Tickner, 2013; Canagarajah, 1996). It is the Western academic corporations that publish the ‘core journals’ of social sciences. Those who get their works published in these journals are mostly academics from the West. There is Western domination in the processes of international knowledge production and resultantly, scholarly contributions from the Third World are allowed entry into the elite knowledge community only when the “ideational, structural and linguistic standards of intellectual gatekeeping community” are adhered to (Waheed, 2019).

This intellectual insulation is supposedly doubled for IR academics and scholars in Pakistan who, in addition to global structural barriers, are exposed to structural impediments at the domestic level of knowledge production. This leads to the marginalization of IR academics in Pakistan from the country’s own knowledge production processes (Waheed, 2017; Waheed 2020; Naveed & Suleri, 2015; Cheema & Rais, 2001; Haque, et al., 2020). Consequently, Pakistani academics do not “lead” research agendas in the country (Haque, et al., 2020). This double insulation retards the development of alternative discourse by Pakistani academics and scholars in the field of IR (Waheed, 2020). This gives rise to serious implications for ‘Pakistan’/ its image in international discourse and for the discipline of IR in Pakistan.

This chapter employs global and domestic-level structural reasoning in explaining why the discipline of International Relations and more importantly, the mainstream discourse on Pakistan; is Eurocentric in nature. As the chapter proceeds, it is noted that some of these structural barriers are man-made and some being socially constructed obstruct the development of alternative knowledge in IR. What these constraints further broadly imply is the prevalence of power-relations at various levels of social reality, which concern but are not limited to global and domestic politics, institutional struggles, and so on (Tickner & Waeber, 2009, p.29).

4.1 External Barriers

This section highlights those structural barriers/intellectual gatekeeping mechanisms, which IR academics in Pakistan identify as major challenges when they publish their works internationally. Academic works in the form of research articles submitted to international IR journals form the main focus in revealing the problems these academics face in securing an international publication. It is mention-worthy that journals are considered as the lifeline of a discipline in that they offer scholars the most significant platform for debating issues and methodologies hence forming the “most direct measure of the discipline itself” (Waeber,1999, p.57). Thus contributions to IR journals hold a high status of credible and core scholarship in the field.

The English language has been identified as a significant barrier that leads to the marginalization of Pakistani IR academics from the discipline’s core (B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021; A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021; R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021; M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021). English, which is the *lingua franca* for securing a publication in leading Western journals, forms a major barrier for non-Western scholars in general when they engage in international publication. Because English is a second language and the medium of instruction in the non-Western world, most non-Western scholars lack linguistic proficiency as that of native English speakers. Hence the contributions of these scholars to prestigious international journals are marked with grammatical and structural mistakes. If you look at academic capability in the field, it appears to be synonymous with the use of the English language (Waheed, 2019).

The IR academics who were interviewed for this study complained that it is difficult to express oneself or communicate one’s idea using a foreign language (A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021; R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021). Kaplan (1966) recognizes language as “the effect and the expression of a certain world view that is manifested in the culture” (p.2). He further maintains that “every language offers to its speakers a ready-made *interpretation* of the world...” (p.3). So with the West maintaining the English language as the standard medium of communication through which ideas are also conveyed in the international knowledge system, this lens when adopted by any non-Western scholar would paint a distorted and microscopic worldview.

Other than the use of a foreign (English) language in scholarly works in the field, for some Pakistani IR academics, the time-taking peer-review process of international journals is another problem that they face when they publish internationally (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021; R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021; B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021; M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021). Few academics also highlighted the financial hurdles that Pakistani academics have to face when they publish abroad (A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021; interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021). Academics are required to pay charges up to \$500, \$1,000, or even \$2,000 for getting their articles published in reputable journals. An assistant professor remarked that it is important to acknowledge that Pakistani academics cannot afford such high publishing charges, especially as these academics are not given any funds by the government or the university, for the facilitation of their research (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021). Another academic highlighted the issue of the scope of international journals for IR academics in Pakistan: out of as many as 100 reputable journals, there would be only a handful of journals in which their research scope would fall. This as he explained is because Pakistani academics and scholars are mostly writing on regional topics such as Kashmir or China or issues that are specific to the country such as poverty (R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021).

A very critical issue that was raised in the interviews with IR academics in Pakistan was that of biasness in terms of narrative propagation through discourse in IR. Some academics were of the view that the West follows its own narrative-based-criteria for international publication (W. Ishaque, personal communication, June 21, 2021; A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021; A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021; S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021). One of these academics while citing his personal publishing experience and the experience of his colleagues stated that the “Pakistani narrative” is not acceptable to Western journals as he drew attention to narratives regarding Pakistan and the South Asian region put forward by Pakistani IR academics and scholars through their works. As the West wants academic publications to be tailored as per its own line of thinking, the space for Pakistani perspective in international scholarship is suffocated. The academic further admitted that quality of research also matters and that Pakistani scholarship is infested with nationalist orientations and defected objectivity to some extent but even when “good work” is sent out, there is less likelihood of getting that published internationally (A. Sultan,

personal communication, June 25, 2021). Narrative-based gatekeeping in IR signifies what Pakistani IR academics can and cannot work on.

Another academic stated with great disappointment that if Pakistani academics and scholars are critically writing particularly on India and Kashmir - Israel being an obvious no-go area - their works are never published despite the use of a neutral tone and provision of evidence-based research (S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021). The narrative-based intellectual marginalization that Pakistani IR academics face when they submit their works abroad is made possible through a form of intellectual gatekeeping that can be said to be a result of what Fredua-Mensah (2016) identifies as the Western “conceptualizing based on an ideological position” (p.82) in the field of International Relations. So she accounts that the West maintains and utilizes to shape realities not only for itself but also for the world at large (both the core and the periphery) are the ‘ultimate’ realities and only adherence to such particular framing ensures participation in the processes of international knowledge production.

Separately, few Pakistani academics think that the issue in terms of the ‘acceptability of idea’ prevents their scholarly works from contributing to the international journals (M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021; B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021). This for an assistant professor is about the epistemic hegemony in IR, which establishes certain ideas as “universal” and others as “peripheral”. So whatever is coming from the periphery or is based on the peripheral episteme is not given much space in the so-called “core” (B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021). However, other Pakistani academics entirely shifted the blame on their fellow academics in the country as they held that mostly the research of IR academics in Pakistan is not based on a new idea or a new thought because of which their works are not accepted by Western journals (S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021; U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021; R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021). The excerpt below exemplifies this position and raises a genuine concern linked to the stated problem:

Now I am telling you the ground reality, which I have heard many people here say and have seen people do as well. We do not produce new ideas. We reproduce ideas. The issue here is that we keep ten journals in front of us or we find ten articles on one topic and combine them together to develop our own paper...How can you publish in international journals when this is your approach?

(U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021)

Another challenge that Pakistani IR academics pointed out was the standard methodology requirement for contributing to Western IR journals. Most interviewees underscored noncompliance with an overall scientific method of inquiry in Pakistani research as a major problem because of which contributions from Pakistan do not make it to the core of the discipline (W. Ishaque, personal communication, June 21, 2021; interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021; R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021; K. Ahmad, personal communication, June 29, 2021; R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021; M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021). Precisely, unsatisfactory adoption and execution of research methodology was noted as the biggest flaw in the works produced by Pakistani IR academics (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021; W. Ishaque, personal communication, June 21, 2021; K. Ahmad, personal communication, June 29, 2021; R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021; M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021; B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021). An academic exclaimed that “we do not know how to incorporate methodology in our works” (W. Ishaque, personal communication, June 21, 2021). Another academic spoke about the overall absence of methodology in the research produced by Pakistani academics and scholars:

Sometimes I have seen some journal articles of our colleagues and academicians here...So, the whole idea of methodology is missing. We think that if we are fulfilling the criteria: introduction, abstract, some literature review, then coming to main body, so that's the methodology...If we don't know what we are going to do without copying from another source and just rephrasing it, it means we don't know methodology...

(Interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021)

The weak or missing research methodology in the so-called academic or scholarly works explains the existence of “similarity” that appears in non-Western scholarly works as research is simply “filtered through ‘Western’ concepts and packaged in ‘Western’ categories” (Bilgin, 2008, p.12). This, as one academic observed in the precise context of Pakistan, also makes clear why “we are not generating knowledge” and why “we are just generating information...” (R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021). Because of different intellectual standards maintained by the West as identified in this section, it is quite challenging for Pakistani IR academics to contribute to the mainstream IR scholarship.

It is further noteworthy that Pakistani IR scholars mostly publish in local journals (Behera 2009, Waheed, 2020) and this, to a good extent, has to do with the rigorous screening of knowledge and high academic standards that Western academic channels have maintained. When asked why Pakistani scholarly contributions in IR can mostly be found in local journals, the academics interviewed cited the above-mentioned reasons for their exclusion from the center of the field. Most of the intellectual impediments mentioned in this section restrict the scholarly contributions to national publishing mediums in the broader non-Western context (Waheed, 2019).

4.2 Domestic Barriers

4.2.1 State-centric Research Culture

There is an intertwined system of knowledge production in Pakistan that leads to the domination of the *realist* tradition in the field of International Relations (IR) theory to the detriment of other theoretical options. For Pakistan, since the very beginning, the realist understanding of “security” was strongly knitted into its survival instincts. A hostile India with a dominant regional influence posed an existential threat to Pakistan. Resultantly, sovereignty and national security perceptions became entangled too. Institutional factors also account for security-centric inclinations in state governance as well as foreign relations. This is essentially linked to the preponderance of the military in state affairs. The failure of the Muslim League and the ineffective administration of political parties paved the way for the rise of the military as an “effective and incorruptible organization” and its relevance to the country’s policies. The military emerged as a dominating force, particularly, after 1958, following which; Pakistan’s conception of sovereignty was increasingly framed in security-centric terms. As the country fell under military rule, with one ending and the next starting, it was the military’s security-centered vision that became defining of Pakistan as a state (Waheed, 2017).

What further contributes to the prevalence of security-oriented understandings of state and foreign relations in Pakistan is the research in the field of IR that is mostly produced by think tanks and research institutes. By analyzing numerous publications and thinks tanks, it has been found that the top positions are taken by ex-bureaucrats and former army officers. Hence, state preferences are adhered to by virtue of the nature of work of ex-state officials. This means that most IR research falls under the positivist enterprise “taking two sets of

‘givens’ for granted, the infallibility of the state, ‘modeled after the Westphalian nation-state and a thorough internalization of the philosophy of political realism’” (Waheed, 2017, p.10). Thus the focus of this research is on justifying state policies instead of providing alternative knowledge (Waheed, 2017). Abraham (2004) holds that knowledge production “‘has rarely been able to be truly independent of state needs and demands,’ because the social sciences are primarily ‘valued for their utility; applied knowledge to further state goals. If theory came via this path, so be it...’” (p.8). This explains why universities in Pakistan are actively producing intellectual inputs that are relevant to policymaking in the country (Naveed & Suleri, 2015). When IR academics employ the realist paradigm in their works and reinforce the state’s preferences, in return, they are rewarded with state patronage as well (Waheed, 2017). This ensures the circulation of state-oriented thinking in intellectual and political spheres in Pakistan.

4.2.2 Research Demand of Higher Education Structure

It has been mentioned earlier that Pakistani IR academics and scholars mostly contribute to the local publication enterprise (Waheed, 2020, p.139-160; Behera, 2009). In explaining why local publishing has become a common practice among Pakistani IR academics, the global level structural reasoning (as previously explored) has revealed the difficulty for Pakistani IR academics in publishing internationally because of the international barriers/Western gatekeeping mechanisms actively operating in the field of IR. This section, in its abidance to the structural facet of argumentation, further probes into the local publishing trend among Pakistani IR academics at the domestic level of knowledge production.

The interviews with IR academics in Pakistan have revealed that concerning academic publishing inclinations (international or local); Pakistani IR academics feel ‘incentivized’ to publish locally. The major pull factor identified through the interviews is very much linked to how the Higher Education Commission (HEC) is operating in Pakistan and rewarding academic research in the country. The HEC, established in 2002, is a federal independent institution that oversees, regulates, and accredits higher education in Pakistan. The HEC has played an integral role in promoting Pakistan’s research culture, which prior to its establishment, was left to the discretion of the universities. The federal institution, through its Tenure-track System, has connected senior faculty promotions to the number of research publications. This does not come without ramifications; the link between promotions and

publications is disturbing the high-impact quality thresholds of research produced in the country (Haque, et al., 2020).

When asked if any local incentives are being offered to Pakistani academics because of which these academics are pulled towards publishing locally, almost all interviewees spoke of the link between the academics' professional progression/promotion and research publications. While making a comment in this regard, one academic informed that "...in Pakistan, somehow promotions are linked with how many papers you are publishing. So, we are so greedy to get our papers published". The academic further told that local journals being "easy journals" in terms of quality demands and time requirement (as compared to international journals), make it convenient for Pakistani academics to secure more local publications (interviewee, personal communication, June 20, 2021). According to an assistant professor, unfortunately, the nature of academics' productivity in Pakistan is linked to "shortcuts" and because quality does not matter to them as much as quantity and because local journals would fulfill their academic requirement so they would not even bother themselves to publish in international journals (B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021).

Where for some academics, the higher education structure incentivizes local publishing in Pakistan, for others, it is rather seen as a form of "compulsion" on them in their research activities. An academic stated that "... it is not the love for writing as much as the compulsion to write" in Pakistan (S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021). Another academic protested that he is not exactly writing what he wants to write. This is where he finds his profession and the entailing publishing requirements restricting his scope for writing (R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021). An associate professor contended that academics in Pakistan are "forced to publish" and resultantly, the quality of research gets compromised (M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021). Because Pakistan's structure of higher education demands academics and scholars to focus on "quantity" rather than "quality" in their research, this eventually discourages them from taking part in the international circulation of knowledge from Pakistan and in alternative knowledge production or original thinking in the field of International Relations (Waheed, 2020, pp. 139-160).

4.3 “Failed State” Discourse on Pakistan

4.3.1 Domination of Western Narratives

As we are looking at the structural factors that contribute in making IR a Eurocentric field of study, we now pay close attention to the dominating Eurocentric interpretations in IR, precisely the meaning of ‘Pakistan’ that reinforces the disciplinary status quo. Upon engaging with knowledge *on* Pakistan in the mainstream IR discourse, it is alarming to observe that there is a ‘Pakistan’ out there about which we come to know through the Western conventional wisdom (Waheed, 2020). This version of Pakistan is conceived in a bad light and depicted as a “failed state” through discourse. So then, Pakistan is, *inter alia*, “an insecure state” (Fair et al., 2010); a “weak state”; a “garrison state” (Ziring, 2010); a “failing state in many ways” (S.Markey, 2013, p.10); “a state sponsor of terrorism” (S.Markey, 2013, p.105) as well as “the most dangerous country in the world” (Riedel, 2008, p.31). This discourse either identifies Pakistan’s so-called state failure with poor governance (Jha, 2008), points at its possession of nuclear arsenal and a presence of committed Muslim fundamentalists in the country (Root, 2005), or enlists the possible consequences erupting from Pakistan’s state failure such as Pakistan succumbing to Islamic extremists (Kagan & O’Hanlon, 2007). This way, ‘Pakistan’ becomes the Other of the mainstream academic discourse and is spoken into the discipline rather than retaining its independent authority. This section provides introspection of the reasons behind continuing Eurocentrism in the discourse on Pakistan in the discipline of International Relations.

Some IR academics in Pakistan who took part in this study clearly expressed their disagreement with regard to Pakistan’s description and interpretation as a “failed state” in the mainstream IR discourse. One academic in her interview, while affirming the domination of Eurocentric knowledge in the field of IR, explained why she sees the Western interpretations of Pakistan or narratives about Pakistan as being incorrect:

...International scholars hold opinion or they construct knowledge...they paint a Pakistani picture, which is not actually valid or correct sort of a narrative. So, I would say that...I think broadly that is the lack of observation and knowledge. Many of them are not planted in this particular society or in this particular region. So they basically capture and build their analyses through the existing body of knowledge, again, the existing verified or globally published body of knowledge is by the Western publishers.

(R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021)

Another academic also contested the Western information regarding Pakistan in the field of IR by calling it “false information” and this academic also emphasized the domination of Western authors in the field that results in the prevalence of the Western narratives as dominating and impactful discourses in IR:

Christine Fair who is mostly criticizing Pakistan based on false information...When Christine Fair talks, millions of people listen and quote her...And that is why there are narratives of a ‘failing state’, ‘failed state’, ‘fragile state’, or ‘unsafe nukes’ or a ‘garrison state’. There are plenty of terms that are pointed at Pakistan and everyone is publishing and talking about it...I personally believe, it is all based on false information.

(R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021)

The academic further attempted to make a correction to this discourse by referring to Pakistan as a “struggling state”, which is trying to come out of its own challenges mostly linked to the American policies in the region (R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021). However, it remains worrisome that there is only a “...feeble and marginal participation of Pakistani scholars and academics in the processes of international knowledge production...” (Waheed, 2020, p.140) At instances where the marginal visibility of Pakistani IR scholars is felt, it is found that this knowledge is mostly produced by those who are affiliated with the Western knowledge production enterprise leaving only an insignificant percentage of those who write on Pakistan from Pakistan (Waheed, 2020, pp. 39-80). This axiomatically makes these scholars members of the elite Western knowledge hub. Diasporic knowledge cannot be equated with indigenous knowledge. Also as this study employs an indigenous perspective in its exploration of why IR continues to be a Eurocentric discipline and why the mainstream discourse on Pakistan is also mainly an ethnocentric intellectual provision, these scholarly contributions do not hold much relevance to this case.

If we talk about Pakistani knowledge production at local and international levels aimed at countering Western parochial and biased categorizations of Pakistan, the interviewees have regrettably informed that the Pakistani intellectual community is not doing much on its part in this regard (M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021; A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021; U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021; B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021; W. Ishaque, personal communication, June 21, 2021). When the Eurocentric discourse about Pakistan enters into the Pakistani intellectual space, this discourse is refuted only to the extent of removing Pakistan’s association with myopic Western understandings, and the underlying ontological premise of

this discourse is left undisputed (Waheed, 2020, pp. 39-80). IR academics and scholars in Pakistan only adopt a defensive mode and present explanations as to why these associations are not a true representation of Pakistan, as an assistant professor confirmed in her interview (U. Siraj, personal communication, June 19, 2021). For another academic, the Pakistani intellectual community only gives rhetoric-based and emotion-based responses to such assertions, which are straightaway rejected for not being objective and “academic” in nature (A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021). Pakistani IR scholars eschew critical examination in their academic inquiries (Behera, 2009). What is required, as one academic highlighted is to critically dissect concepts such as “failed state” or a “garrison state” by deconstructing and decontextualizing them (B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021).

Why there is no significant counter-hegemonic discourse emerging on Pakistan from Pakistan has to do with the lack of incentives offered to Pakistani academics and scholars for challenging the status quo in the field, as one academic noted (B. Najimdeen, personal communication, June 8, 2021). As academics and scholars in Pakistan are mostly focused on keeping their job positions in the face of the structural impediments at the domestic level of knowledge production (Waheed, 2020, pp.139-160) and their promotions or are preferring to fulfill their academic requirements mostly (A. Ahmad, personal communication, June 30, 2021; R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021), they refrain from critically engaging with the mainstream discourse on Pakistan or challenging the contentious assumptions, based on which this knowledge is produced.

As Pakistani IR academics held in their interviews that they do not see their colleagues in the country generating any knowledge as such to counter the Eurocentric “failed state” discourse on Pakistan, so maintaining that the West is entirely accountable for marginalizing the Pakistani counter-narrative from the core IR scholarship would not be a true assertion to make. Although these interviewees have previously talked about the marginalization of Pakistani academic works from the elite pool of knowledge based on the select-narrative criteria of publication in international journals (Western intellectual gatekeeping/ external structural barrier), in the absence of any substantial and more importantly, critical counter-narrative on ‘Pakistan’ in particular, from an indigenous Pakistani perspective, the meaning of Pakistan is left for the West to determine and stabilize discursively in the field of International Relations.

4.3.2 The Concealed Indian Factor

A good number of Pakistani IR academics think that the anti-Pakistan narratives in IR, specifically the “failed state” narrative and its association with Pakistan also have to do with the role that India plays to support this narrative and independently propagate it as well. This primarily concerns the rising influence of India in terms of its strategic relations at the global level, especially in the West (A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021; R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021); the growing influence of the Indian lobbies abroad (R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021; M. Amin, personal communication, June 27, 2021); India’s rising power in the South Asian region (M. Khan, personal communication, July 2, 2021); and the remarkable production of knowledge and increase in publications at home (in India) (S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021; R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021).

India is increasingly developing its strategic cooperation with the US in numerous domains namely; economic, defense, cyber security, technology, counter-terrorism, and maritime security (Khan M., 2017). At the same time, India is seen forming bilateral strategic partnerships (mainly in the economic but also in the defense domain) with many European countries including the United Kingdom, France, and Germany (Bava, 2012). Crucially, the increasing formation of strategic ties with the Western world as seen by Pakistani IR academics enables and facilitates India to promulgate its political and intellectual narratives abroad. So when we talk about the leading Western IR journals propagating a certain type of narrative against Pakistan or those about the South Asian region, this for an IR academic in Pakistan is rather a “combined” Indian and Western narrative. As an ultimate consequence of this, when Pakistani academics present their perspective or their counter-narrative, this is not acceptable to Western journals because it does not align with the predominant line of thinking in the field (A. Sultan, personal communication, June 25, 2021).

The development and dissemination of anti-Pakistan narratives in the discipline is further closely associated with the growing influence of Indian lobbies abroad, particularly in the United States. Indian Americans have been lobbying American lawmakers and influencing the American foreign policy towards Pakistan as well as the Indo-US relations. The Indian American community draws its strength from not only its financial clout but also its “network power” exercised by both informal and formal institutional mechanisms. The growth of the Indian American community is, by chance, in line with major shifts in geopolitics. As

bilateral relations are gaining more strategic significance, resultantly, this community has gained even more importance and is found to be interacting with both the Indian and the American government (Kapur, 2010). India has one of the most successful foreign policy lobbying groups; the US-India Political Action Committee and the biggest country-specific caucus in the House of Representatives (Carranza, 2016). The Indian American community has been referred to as “India’s U.S.-based lobby” and “the only lobby in Washington likely to acquire the strength of the Israel lobby” (Kapur, 2010, p.199). The influence is such that it appears that the US has kowtowed to India concerning the Kashmir issue (Carranza, 2016). A Pakistani IR academic located the propagation of anti-Pakistan narratives in the field of IR - based on “false” information - within the active functioning of the Indian lobbies in the West. The following interview excerpt presents his views in this regard:

There are many Indians who are rubbing shoulders with the world's best brains and that is why you could see how the Indian lobbies are working and it has far broader implications. Indians have entered into Western diplomatic corps, India has entered into their policymaking circles and they influence very well...They say Pakistan is a ‘failed state’. They are spreading around false information...Today, they debate about it, people start believing it... And they are doing it for their gains...

(R. Naseer, personal communication, July 1, 2021)

India is very much preoccupied with maligning the image of its rival countries, Pakistan to be specific, through its mass propaganda campaigns undertaken by its media outlets, think tanks, and Non-Governmental Organizations. A report published by the EU DisinfoLab, titled “Indian Chronicles” has revealed the Indian disinformation network of 500 fake local media outlets that were operating in 116 countries and nine regions since 2005 aimed at improving India’s image abroad so to ultimately gain the support of international institutions (such as European Union and United Nations) by damaging the international reputation of Pakistan (and also China) (Siddiqui, 2020). With such massive campaigns operating to further Indian interests at the expense of the reputation of other countries (Pakistan particularly) and the dissemination of this discourse abroad, this discourse, which is mainly political, is repackaged and reproduced in the intellectual arena.

This is considerably linked with the element of knowledge production that India is taking forward in its regional and global rise agendas. India is described as “a major power in the making” but is largely viewed as an “emerging” power. It has the status of a limited hegemon in the South Asian region and is actively taking part in numerous regional and global

multilateral institutional arrangements. With the growing recognition of India as an important player by the United States, the rising status of India has significantly been facilitated at the global level (Basrur, 2011). Related to India's status as an 'emerging power', an academic emphasized how India is taking forward an amalgamation of all necessary national elements of power including knowledge production:

...When question comes to India, we say that India is emerging, but see, India is trying its level best to take all the national power elements together...In global literature, what remarkable India has done is, it has created a footprint in all the global level of imprints. India has bought international imprints and has implemented it nationally across the country. Secondly, India has built collaboration with all international institutions that project narrative and which goes across in seconds and minutes, for example, Carnegie, BROOKINGS you just simply name it. Thirdly, India is a literate country and India has a bigger scholarly population. Those who are experts in social sciences are planted abroad. Those Indians are serving India's purpose well, planted in the global international institutions. So they are writing, they are projecting their narrative...

(R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021)

Moreover, when we say that Western knowledge restricts 'Pakistan' to the 'failed state' identity compartmentalization, it is many Indian authors who are substantially contributing to this narrative by producing scientific and 'acceptable' works. The same academic further noted:

...Indians are the ones, those who are foreigners, they have written extensively on Pakistan, projecting Pakistan as a 'terrorist state', 'failed state', a 'weak state'. That literature then has ripple effects or which then is widely read because it is published by the established publishers acknowledged globally, that was then widely read because international community only reads authentic, peer-reviewed, established outputs from the literature.

So, because Indians are actively producing knowledge on Pakistan and they are very much part of the core knowledge hub in IR and have maintained a presence of international publishers at home, when they talk about Pakistan or call it a "failed state", this discourse upon being disseminated through the mainstream publication channels automatically secures the status of legitimate knowledge in the field of IR. While pointing at the discourse produced by the center and center's publishing conventions, A. Suresh Canagarajah writes:

I believe that it is a necessary evil that periphery scholars should use center publications even to resist their dominance. Given the power, spread, and currency of center publications, it is foolhardy not to use them to further

periphery knowledge and interests. Since these are established channels of academic communication, we cannot help but use them even for oppositional purposes.

(2002, p.12)

As Pakistani scholarly contributions in the field do not make use of ‘established’ channels of knowledge production for the many reasons previously identified and also as their works are mostly circulated locally, this way, the Pakistani voice does not go out. According to an academic, an additional major issue is that Pakistan does not have that footprint and access to the international literature market in comparison to India (R. Abbasi, personal communication, June 21, 2021). Where Pakistan has an average of publication of 1200 titles annually, India being the 7th largest publisher in the world, published 82,537 titles in 2008 (Haq & Ahmad, 2012). Another academic commented on Pakistan’s inferior position in terms of knowledge production and publication as compared to India:

...If you have to publish a book here, you don’t have many publishing houses, only as few as two or three. There is Oxford, which partially caters to Pakistan and partially to its international policy, Sang-e-meel, and Vanguard. Mostly there is glorified press, not publishing houses...Now, it is interesting to note that private ventures of publishing houses are increasing, where we can publish our books but their international reputation is still questionable. If we compare it to our neighboring country; India, it not only has indigenous publishing houses like Rupa and Pentagon. Moreover, Sage, Routledge, Macmillan, Penguin...all of them have an Indian presence. So they have a way of achieving a greater outreach, we don’t have all that.

(S. Malik, personal communication, June 28, 2021)

CONCLUSION

The notion of *Eurocentrism* is best suited for unwinding the existing status quo in the discipline of International Relations. Eurocentrism outlines IR as an ethnocentric field of study and explains how the West maintains its intellectual hegemony in the global knowledge production processes and intellectual outputs. It is also the most relevant concept that can be used as a critical framework by the non-West to conduct a reflexive intellectual exercise by looking inward and diagnosing the disciplinary shortcoming in the indigenous context and eventually think and move beyond the current disciplinary boundaries. Much has been written on the Eurocentric nature of the discipline of IR and the inapplicability of Western concepts, frameworks, theories, and methods to the non-Western context, and the need for the field to diversify with the incorporation of non-Western voices and experiences.

In assessing the possibilities of achieving a pluralistic field, it can rightly be said that non-Western/peripheral scholars are seen making notable efforts to contribute on their part to the core of the discipline by critically interacting with mainstream IR knowledge and/or developing alternative lenses for conceptualizing world politics but despite these attempts, they remain at the disciplinary margins. That being said, one should in their complete analysis of the disciplinary intellectual arrangement have deep knowledge of those non-Western spaces, which continue to conform to the Western thinking in the field and are not seen making any substantial efforts in liberating local IR disciplines from the monopoly of the Western intellectual products. This has been explored in the particular context of Pakistan in this study. For IR academics in Pakistan, Eurocentrism in the field is, number one, ‘externally imposed’ due to the structural barriers that are actively working at the international level of knowledge production and marginalizing Pakistani contributions from the field’s center, and number two, ‘self-imposed’ in the form of the continuing ‘intellectual dependency’ on the existing state of IR. The latter is found to be a consequence of both ‘normative’ and ‘domestic structural’ factors.

The external (international) processes of knowledge production in IR and the entailing structural barriers and gatekeeping practices form a major hurdle for Pakistani IR academics when they contribute to mainstream scholarship in the field. International publication requirements in terms of language, methodology, time, and money greatly discourage

Pakistani IR academics from contributing to the core IR scholarship. Finding journals where their research scope matches and where their narratives and ideas are accepted have further been identified as crucial challenges they face when they publish internationally. The difficulty in getting academic works published abroad leads to an inclination among Pakistani IR academics towards local publishing.

Concerning the 'normative' predispositions, the discipline of IR remains Eurocentric in Pakistan because it is left unchallenged by Pakistani IR academics in both their research and teaching practices. A Eurocentric IR mainly provides these academics 'ease' in their professional duties. Despite recognizing the inadequacy of the realist thought in capturing Pakistan's realities and security predicaments, there remains strong compliance with this mainstream theoretical approach in the scholarly works produced by these academics. IR academics in Pakistan teach Eurocentric knowledge to students due to the absence of local scholarship of good quality. The content that these academics teach to students in IR programs is also outdated because they do not deviate from the so-called 'tradition' or move beyond teaching what they were taught by their professors. Consequently, IR students in Pakistan are regurgitating Western knowledge because that is what has mostly been taught to them. IR students in Pakistan are mostly familiar with the names of Western authors and their works in comparison to Pakistani authors who have contributed to the field. This is linked to the overall intellectual inferiority complex against the West, which is deeply embedded in the Pakistani academia and which further deepens the Western intellectual domination in the field of IR in Pakistan.

The structural impediments operating at the domestic level of knowledge production in Pakistan discourage Pakistani academics from engaging in critical approaches in IR or coming up with alternative ways of viewing world politics. Overall, it is the state-centric research culture that is dominating in Pakistan in terms of setting the research agendas for the most relevant knowledge producers. Pakistani IR academics comply with 'what' the state thinks and 'how' the state thinks. Identified as another domestic-level (structural) factor impeding creative thinking and alternative knowledge outputs in the discipline in Pakistan is the research publication demand of the higher education structure in the country. The IR academics in Pakistan are either 'incentivized' to publish locally or 'forced' to publish locally so as to secure professional progression. Both lead to research production that is poor in quality.

As identified in this research, a serious consequence that a Eurocentric IR holds for Pakistan and the discipline of IR in Pakistan is the dominating representation of ‘Pakistan’ as a ‘failed state’ in the mainstream IR discourse. For Pakistani IR academics, this discourse is incorrect in its assessment and portrayal. Having said that, the Eurocentric discourse about Pakistan remains critically and academically unchallenged by the Pakistani intellectual community hence allowing the naturalization of the Eurocentric meaning of Pakistan in the mainstream scholarship. Linked to the anti-Pakistan narratives in the core IR scholarship is the significantly alarming role of India that makes the description of ‘Pakistan’ a combined Western and Indian political and intellectual output. The Indian contribution to anti-Pakistan discourse (i.e. “Pakistan – a failed state”) is linked to the regional and global rise of India, the increasing influence of Indian lobbies abroad, and greater knowledge production by Indians at home with the utilization of mainstream publishing channels. Because Pakistan does not have that kind of outreach in the global literature market and because Pakistani scholarly works do not critically assess this discourse, what is then left undisputed are ‘combined’ Western and Indian interpretations of Pakistan in the field of International Relations.

In the end, it is reiterated that the hegemon cannot be over-blamed without performing self-examination of non-Western settings. Where the West can be held responsible for not allowing the non-Western voices from reaching the discipline’s core, the non-West also shares the blame in making IR Eurocentric by ‘letting’ Eurocentrism in the discipline ‘prevail’. Where there are limitations in pluralizing the field through the incorporation of non-Western voices, there is still room for possibilities that needs to be explored first. By conducting an inward-looking assessment to make plain the aforementioned dilemma attached to ‘a Eurocentric discipline of International Relations’ in the (non-Western) context of Pakistan, it appears that the discipline of IR in Pakistan is both a ‘victim’ of the Western intellectual hegemony and an ‘enabler’ of the continuing domination of Eurocentric knowledge in the field of IR.

Pakistan does not have to imitate Eurocentric ways of thinking about world politics. Pakistan has its unique cultural context and distinct political-economic history. These are, quite fortunately or unfortunately, even realized by many academics in the country but have not been taken forward beyond that point. If IR is to be truly democratized, the task lies upon both the West and the non-West; the former needs to abandon its resort to the gatekeeping practices in the field and to welcome non-Western ideas and approaches in the core IR

scholarship, and the latter needs to contribute substantially on its part in the form of creative, original and homegrown thinking in IR. If this is not achieved, the discipline of IR would remain a domain of 'particular' with 'one-way-diffusionism' of knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, I. (2004). The Changing Institutional-Intellectual Ecology of Knowledge-Production in South Asia. *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Knowledge and Research*. Paris.
- Acharya, A. (2000). Ethnocentrism and Emancipatory IR Theory. In S. Arnold, & J. M. Bier (Eds.), *Displacing Security* (pp. 1-18). Toronto: Centre for International and Security Studies, York University.
- Acharya, A. (2008). Identity without Exceptionalism: Challenges for Asian Political and International Studies. In N. C. Behera (Ed.), *International Relations in South Asia: Search for an Alternative Paradigm* (pp. 74-89). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd.
- Acharya, A. (2011a). Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 39(3), 619-637. doi:10.1177/0305829811406574
- Acharya, A. (2011b). *AmitavAcharya on the Relevance of Regions, ASEAN, and Western IR's false Universalisms*. Retrieved August 4, 2021, from theory-talks.org: <http://www.theory-talks.org/2011/08/theory-talk-42.html>
- Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(4), 647-659. doi:10.1111/isqu.12171
- Acharya, A. (2016). Advancing Global IR: Challenges, Contentions, and Contributions. *International Studies Review*, 18(1), 4-15.
- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2007a). Conclusion: on the Possibility of a Non-Western IR Theory in Asia. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3), 427-438. doi:10.1093/irap/lcm017
- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2007b). Preface: Why is there no Non-Western IR Theory: Reflections on and from Asia. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3), 285-286. doi:10.1093/irap/lcm011

- Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (Eds.). (2010). *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Adler, E., & Bernstein, S. (2005). Knowledge in Power: The Epistemic Construction of Global Governance. In M. Barnett, & R. Duval (Eds.), *Power in Global Governance* (pp. 294–318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems. *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, 28(1). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24492998>
- Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences. *Current Sociology*, 51(6), 599–613. doi:10.1177/00113921030516003
- Alejandro, A. (2019). *Western Dominance in International Relations? The Internationalisation of IR in Brazil and India*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ali, A., Tariq, R. H., & Topping, K. J. (2013). Perspectives of Academic Activities in Universities in Pakistan. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 37(3), 321-348. doi:10.1080/0309877X.2011.645454
- Ali, L. A., Jabeen, F., & Naveed-i-Rahat. (2011). Islamic Tradition and Feminism: A Comparative Study of Theoretical Perspective. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(6), 157-167. Retrieved from http://www.ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol._2_No._6%3B_April_2011/17.pdf
- Alker, H., & Biersteker, T. (1984). The Dialectics of World Order: Notes for a Future Archeologist of International Savoir Faire. *International Studies Quarterly*, 28(2), 121–142.
- Altbach, P. G. (1977). Servitude of the Mind? Education, Dependency, and Neocolonialism. *Teachers College Record*, 79(2), 187–204.
- Aydinli, E., & Biltekin, G. (Eds.). (2018). *Widening the World of International Relations: Homegrown Theorizing*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ayoob, M. (2002). Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case for Subaltern Realism . *International Studies Review*, 4(3), 27-48. doi:10.2307/3186462

- Ball, S. J. (Ed.). (1990). *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Barkawi, T. (2010). Empire and Order in International Relations and Security Studies. In R. Denmark (Ed.), *The International Studies Encyclopaedia* (pp. 1360–1379). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329-352.
- Basrur, R. (2011). India: A Major Power in the Making. In T. J. Volgy, R. Corbetta, K. A. Grant, & R. G. Baird (Eds.), *Major Powers and the Quest for Status in International Politics: Global and Regional Perspectives* (pp. 181-202). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bava, U. S. (2012). India and the European Union: From Engagement to Strategic Partnership. *International Studies*, 47(2-4), 373-386.
doi:10.1177/0020881711104700419
- Behera, N. C. (2008). International Relations in South Asia: State of the Art. In N. C. Behera (Ed.), *International Relations in South Asia: Search for an Alternative Paradigm* (pp. 1-50). New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd.
- Behera, N. C. (2009). South Asia: A “Realist” Past and Alternative Futures. In A. B. Tickner, & O. Wæver (Eds.), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World* (pp. 134-157). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Behera, N. C. (2010). Re-imagining IR in India. In A. Acharya, & B. Buzan (Eds.), *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia* (pp. 92-116). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bhambra, G. K. (2007). Multiple Modernities or Global Interconnections: Understanding the Global Post the Colonial. In N. Karagiannis, & P. Wagner (Eds.), *Varieties of World-Making: Beyond Globalization* (pp. 59-73). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Bilgin, P. (2004). Whose ‘Middle East’? Geopolitical Inventions and Practices of Security. *International Relations*, 18(1), 25–41. Retrieved from 10.1177/0047117804041739
- Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking Past “Western” IR? *Third World Quarterly*, 29(1), 5-23.
doi:10.1080/01436590701726392

- Bilgin, P. (2010). Looking for ‘the International’ beyond the West. *Third World Quarterly*, 31(5), 817-828. doi:10.1080/01436597.2010.502696
- Bilgin, P., & Herz, M. (Eds.). (n.d.). *Critical Security Studies in the Global South*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blaney, D. L., & Tickner, A. B. (2013). Introduction: Claiming the International Beyond IR. In A. B. Tickner, & D. L. Blaney (Eds.), *Claiming the International* (pp. 1-24). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Blaney, D. L., & Tickner, A. B. (2017). Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 45(3), 293–311. doi:10.1177/0305829817702446
- Blaney, D., & Tickner, A. (2012). *Thinking International Relations Differently*. London: Routledge.
- Buzan, B., & Little, R. (2000). *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1996). “Nondiscursive” Requirements in Academic Publishing, Material Resources of Periphery Scholars, and the Politics of Knowledge Production. *Written Communication*, 13(4), 435-472. doi:10.1177/0741088396013004001
- Carranza, M. E. (2016). *India-Pakistan Nuclear Diplomacy: Constructivism and the Prospects for Nuclear Arms Control and Disarmament in South Asia*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield .
- Chatterjee, P. (1986). *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cheema, P. I., & Rais, R. B. (2001). The State of International Relations in Pakistan. In S. H. Hashmi (Ed.), *The State of Social Sciences in Pakistan* (pp. 177-182). Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences.
- Chen, C.-C. (2011). The Absence of Non-Western IR Theory in Asia Reconsidered. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 11(1), 1-23. doi:10.1093/irap/lcq014
- Clapham, C. (1999). Sovereignty and the Third World State. *Political Studies*, 47(3), 522–37. doi:10.1111/1467-9248.00215

- Cox, R. W. (1986). *Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory*. In R. O. Keohane (Ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cujabante-Villamil, X. A. (2019). The Discipline of International Relations in Brazil: An Analysis from the Sociology of Science. *Revista Científica General José María Córdova*, 17(26). doi:10.21830/19006586.417
- Darby, P. (2008). A Disabling Discipline. In C. Reus-Smit, & D. Snidal (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (pp. 94-105). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Education, D. o. (2008). *Report of the Ministerial Committee on Transformation and Social Cohesion and the Elimination of Discrimination in Public Higher Education Institutions*. Pretoria: Department of Education.
- Escobar, A. (1984). Discourse and Power in Development: Michel Foucault and the Relevance of His Work to the Third World. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 10(3), 377-400. doi:10.1177/030437548401000304
- Escobar, A. (1992). Reflections on 'development': Grassroots approaches and alternative politics in the Third World. *Futures*, 24(5), 411-436. doi:10.1016/0016-3287(92)90014-7
- Fair, C. C., Crane, K., Chivvis, C. S., Puri, S., & Spirtas, M. (2010). *Pakistan: Can the United States Secure an Insecure State?* RAND Corporation.
- Fonseca, M. (2019, September). Global IR and Western Dominance: Moving Forward or Eurocentric Entrapment? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 48(1), 45-59. doi:10.1177/0305829819872817
- Fredua-Mensah, K. A. (2016). Intellectual Gatekeeping—The Metatheoretical Challenges of Incorporating Africa into International Relations Theory. In I. Peters, & W. Wemheuer-Vogelaar (Eds.), *Globalizing International Relations: Scholarship Amidst Divides and Diversity* (pp. 81-106). Springer Nature.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Grovogui, S. N. (2006). *Beyond Eurocentrism and Anarchy: Memories of International Order and Institutions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall, & B. Gieben (Eds.), *Formations of Modernity* (pp. 276–320). Cambridge: Polity.

- Hamati-Ataya, I. (2012). Reflectivity, Reflexivity, Reflexivism: IR's 'Reflexive Turn'— and Beyond. *European Journal of International Relations*, 669-694.
- Hamati-Ataya, I. (2014). Outline for a Reflexive Epistemology. *Epistemology and Philosophy of Science*, 42(4), 46–56. doi:10.5840/eps201442470
- Haq, I., & Ahmad, P. (2012). Knowledge Economy from the Pakistani Perspective. *Library Philosophy and Practice*. Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188078352.pdf>
- Haque, N. U., Mahmood, M., Abbas, S., Lodhi, A., Rab, M., & Jones, C. S. (2020). *The University Research System in Pakistan*. Pakistan Institute of Development Economics.
- Hashmi, S. H. (Ed.). (2001). *The State of Social Sciences in Pakistan*. Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences.
- Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of Higher Education: Dismantling Epistemic Violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1-8. doi:10.4102/the.v1i1.9
- Henderson, E. (2013). Hidden in Plain Sight: Racism in International Relations Theory. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 26 (1), 71–92.
- Hobson, J. M. (2007).
Is Critical Theory always for the White West and for Western Imperialism? Beyond Westphalian towards a Postracist Critical IR. *Review of International Studies*, 33, 91-116. doi:10.1017/S0260210507007413
- Hobson, J. M. (2012). *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: Western International Theory, 1760-2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobson, J. M., & Sajed, A. (2017). Navigating Beyond the Eurofetishist Frontier of Critical IR Theory: Exploring the Complex Landscapes of Non-Western Agency. *International Studies Review*, 19(4), 547–572. doi:10.1093/isr/vix013
- Hoffman, S. (1977). An American Social Science: International Relations. *Daedalus*, 106(3), 41–60. Retrieved from <https://www.amherst.edu/system/files/media/0084/Hoffman.pdf>
- Holsti, K. (1985). *The Dividing Discipline: Hegemony and Diversity in International Theory*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. London: Touchstone.
- Ikenberry, G. J., & Mastanduno, M. (2003). Images of Order in the Asia-Pacific and the Role of the United States. In G. J. Ikenberry, & M. Mastanduno (Eds.), *International Relations Theory and the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 421-439). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Inayatullah, S. (1998). Imagining an Alternative Politics of Knowledge: Subverting the Hegemony of International Relations Theory in Pakistan. *Contemporary South Asia*, 7(1), 27-42. doi:10.1080/09584939808719828
- Inayatullah, Saigol, R., & Tahir, P. (Eds.). (2005). *Social Sciences in Pakistan: A Profile*. Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences.
- Inoguchi, T. (2007). Are there any Theories of International Relations in Japan. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 7(3), 369–390. doi:10.1093/irap/lcm015
- Jackson, R. (2007). Constructing Enemies: ‘Islamic Terrorism’ in Political and Academic Discourse. *Government and Opposition*, 42(3), 394-426. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44483203>
- Jackson, R., Smyth, M. B., & Gunning, J. (Eds.). (2009). *Critical Terrorism Studies: A New Research Agenda*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jha, L. (2008). Pakistan a Failed State: Frank Pallone. *Hindustan Times*. Retrieved March 31, 2021, from <http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/pakistan-a-failed-state-frank-pallone/article1-356611.aspx>
- Kagan, F. W., & O’Hanlon, M. (2007, November 18). Pakistan’s Collapse, Our Problem. *New York Times*. Retrieved March 31, 2021, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/18/opinion/18kagan.html>
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 16(1-2), 1-20. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x
- Kapur, D. (2010). The Indian Diaspora and Indian Foreign Policy: Soft Power or Soft Underbelly? In D. Kapur, *Diaspora, Development, and Democracy: The Domestic Impact of International Migration from India* (pp. 185-209). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Kelley, R. (2000). A Poetics of Anticolonialism. In A. Césaire (Ed.), *Discourse on Colonialism* (pp. 7-28). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Kerner, I. (2018). Beyond Eurocentrism: Trajectories towards a Renewed Political and Social Theory. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, XX(X), 1-21.
doi:10.1177/0191453717752768
- Khan, M. (2017). Growing India-US Strategic Cooperation: An Analysis. *Strategic Studies*, 37(4), 97-117. Retrieved from https://www.issi.org.pk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/6-SS_Mahrukh_Khan_No-4_2017.pdf
- Kumari, R. (2017). *Review of Research Performance in Higher Education Sector in the Last Decade*. Commissioned by the Higher Education Commission and the World Bank. Retrieved November 2, 2020
- Kuru, D. (2016). Historicising Eurocentrism and Anti-Eurocentrism in IR: A Revisionist Account of Disciplinary Self-reflexivity. *Review of International Studies*, 42(2), 351-376. doi:10.1017/S0260210515000315
- Leira, H., & Carvalho, B. d. (2018). The Function of Myths in International Relations: Discipline and Identity. In A. Gofas, I. Hamati-Ataya, & N. Onuf (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of the History, Sociology and Philosophy of International Relations* (pp. 222-235). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from <file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/LeiradeCarvalho2018.pdf>
- Lydkin, I. (2016). A Model of International Relations (IR) Theory Production: Russian Cases of Worlding. In I. Peters, & W. Wemheuer-Vogelaar (Eds.), *Globalizing International Relations: Scholarship Amidst Divides and Diversity* (pp. 55-80). Springer Nature.
- M Kahler. (1993). International Relations: Still an American Social Science? In L. Miller, & M. Smith, *Ideas and Ideals: Essays on Politics in Honor of Stanley Hoffmann* (pp. 395-414).
- Malik, S. (2014). Women and Weapons: Redressing the Gender Gap. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 70(5), 12-16. doi:10.1177/0096340214546830
- Maliniak, D., Oakes, A., Peterson, S., & Tierney, M. J. (2007, August/ September). The International Relations Discipline, 1980-2006. *American Political Science Association*.

- Retrieved from https://www.wm.edu/offices/global-research/_documents/trip/the_international_relations_discipline_2007.pdf
- Mearsheimer, J. (2016). Benign Hegemony. *International Studies Review*, 18(4), 147–149.
- Medie, P. A., & Kang, A. J. (2018, July 29). *Global South Scholars are Missing from European and US Journals. What Can Be Done About It*. Retrieved October 27, 2020, from theconversation.com: <https://theconversation.com/global-south-scholars-are-missing-from-european-and-us-journals-what-can-be-done-about-it-99570>
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7-8), 159-181.
- Molefe, T. (2016). Oppression Must Fall: South Africa’s Revolution in Theory. *World Policy Journal*, 33(1), 30-37. doi:10.1215/07402775-3545858
- Moore, N., & Stokes, P. (2012). Elite Interviewing and the Role of Sector Context: An Organizational Case from the Football Industry. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 15(4), 438-464. doi:10.1108/13522751211257105
- Nathan, S., Newman, C., & Lancaster, K. (2019). Qualitative Interviewing. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences* (pp. 391-410). Singapore: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_77
- Nauman, S. (2017). Lack of Critical Thinking Skills leading to Research Crisis in Developing Countries: A Case of Pakistan. *Learned Publishing*, 30(3), 233-236. doi:10.1002/leap.1091
- Naveed, A., & Suleri, A. Q. (2015). *Making ‘Impact Factor’ Impactful: Universities, Think Tanks and Policy Research in Pakistan*. Islamabad: Sustainable Development Policy Institute. Retrieved November 2, 2020, from http://www.thinktankinitiative.org/sites/default/files/Pakistan%20TT-university%20study_Final%20June%2022.pdf
- Nye, J. S. (2008). International Relations: The Relevance of Theory to Practice. In C. Reus-Smit, & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (pp. 648-660). New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Olson, W., & Onuf, N. (1985). The Growth of a Discipline Reviewed. In S. Smith (Ed.), *International Relations: British and American Perspectives*. New York: Blackwell.

- O'Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2013). 'Unsatisfactory Saturation': A Critical Exploration of the Notion of Saturated Sample Sizes in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research*, 13(2), 190-7. doi:10.1177/1468794112446106
- Peters, I., & Wemheuer-Vogelaar, W. (Eds.). (2016). *Globalizing International Relations: Scholarship Amidst Divides and Diversity*. Springer Nature.
- Qureshi, M. N. (2001). 'Whither History? The State of the Discipline in Pakistan. In S. H. Hashmi (Ed.), *The State of Social Sciences in Pakistan* (pp. 109-128). Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences.
- Rais, R. B. (2005). Teaching of International Relations in Pakistani Universities. In Inayatullah, R. Saigol, & P. Tahir (Eds.), *Social Sciences in Pakistan: A Profile* (pp. 9-30). Islamabad: Council of Social Sciences.
- (2009). *Report of the Workshop on International Studies in India*. Singapore: Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore.
- Riedel, B. (2008). Pakistan and Terror: The Eye of the Storm. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 618(1), 31-45. doi:10.1177/0002716208316746
- Root, H. L. (2005). Pakistan: The Political Economy of State Failure. *The Milken Institute Review*, 7(2). Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/politiceconomyofstatefailure.pdf
- Roy, S., & Nilsen, A. G. (2016). Globalizing Sociology: An Introduction. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 29(3), 225-232. doi:10.1007/s10767-016-9221-y
- S.Markey, D. (2013). *No Exit from Pakistan: America's Tortured Relationship with Islamabad*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sabaratnam, M. (2013). Avatars of Eurocentrism in the Critique of the Liberal Peace. *Security Dialogue*, 44(3), 259-278.
- Sabir, I., & Sabir, A. (2010). Academic Dependency of Intellectual Labor: The Case of Social Sciences in Pakistan. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 5(6), 31-42.

- Said, E. W. (1982, September). Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community. *Critical Inquiry*, 9(1), 1-26.
- Schmidt, B. (2008). International Relations Theory: Hegemony or Pluralism? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 36(2), 295–304.
- Schoeman, M. (2009). South Africa: Between History and a Hard Place. In A. B. Tickner, & O. Wæver (Eds.), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World* (pp. 53-70). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Shepherd, L. (2014, November 23). *Transdisciplinarity: The Politics and Practices of Knowledge*. Retrieved October 23, 2020, from thedisorderofthings.com/: <https://thedisorderofthings.com/2012/11/23/transdisciplinarity-the-politics-and-practices-of-knowledge-production/>
- Siddiq, A. (2007). *Military Inc.: Inside Pakistan's Military Economy*. London: Pluto Press.
- Siddiq, A. (2011). Pakistan's Counterterrorism Strategy: Separating Friends from Enemies. *The Washington Quarterly*, 34(1), 149-162.
- Siddiqui, N. (2020, December 10). Revelations about Indian Disinformation Network Vindicate Pakistan's Stance: PM Imran. *DAWN*. Retrieved August 17, 2021, from <https://www.dawn.com/news/1595035>
- Smith, K. (2017). Reshaping International Relations: Theoretical Innovations from Africa. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace*, 7(2), 81-92.
doi:10.20991/allazimuth.335811
- Smith, S. (1995). The Self-Images of a Discipline: A Genealogy of International Relations Theory. In K. Booth, & S. Smith (Eds.), *International Relations Theory Today*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Smith, S. (2000). The Discipline of International Relations: Still an American Social Science? *British Journal of Politics & International Relations*, 2(3), 374-402.
- Smith, S. (2002). The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: 'Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline'. *International Studies Review*, 4(2), 67–85.

- Snyder, J. (2008). Some Good and Bad Reasons for a Distinctively Chinese Approach to International Relations Theory. *Annual Meeting of American Political Science Association*.
- Spivak, G. (1994). Can the Subaltern Speak? In P. Williams, & L. Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader* (pp. 66-111). New York: Harvester/Wheatsheaf.
- Thalang, C. n., Jayanama, S., & Poonkham, J. (Eds.). (2018). *International Relations as a Discipline in Thailand: Theory and Sub-fields*. Routledge.
- Tickner, A. (2003). Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 32(2), 295–324. doi:10.1177/03058298030320020301
- Tickner, A. B. (2013). Core, Periphery and (Neo)Imperialist International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 627–646. doi:10.1177/1354066113494323
- Tickner, A. B. (2009). Latin America: Still Policy Dependent After All These Years? In A. B. Tickner, & O. Wæver (Eds.), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World* (pp. 32-52). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tickner, A. B., & Wæver, O. (Eds.). (2009). *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vasilaki, R. (2012). Provincialising IR? Deadlocks and prospects in post-Western IR theory. *Millennium*, 41(1), 3-22.
- Wæver, O. (1998). The Sociology of a not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations. *International Organization*, 52(4), 687– 727.
- Wæver, O. (1999). The Sociology of a not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations. In P. J. Katzenstein, R. O. Keohane, & S. D. Krasner (Eds.), *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics* (pp. 47-87). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Waheed, A. W. (2017). State Sovereignty and International Relations in Pakistan: Analysing the Realism Stranglehold. *South Asia Research*, 37(3), 277-295. doi:10.1177/0262728017725624

- Waheed, A. W. (2019). 'Knowing' Pakistan: Knowledge Production and Area Studies. *Third World Quarterly*, 41(4), 707-724. doi:10.1080/01436597.2019.1699401
- Waheed, A. W. (2020). *Constructing 'Pakistan' through Knowledge Production in International Relations and Area Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wallerstein, I. (1997). Eurocentrism and its Avatars: The Dilemmas of Social Science. *Sociological Bulletin*, 46(1), 21-39.
- Wang, Y. (2009). China: Between Copying and Constructing'. In A. B. Tickner, & O. Wæver (Eds.), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. London: Routledge.
- Watanabe, A. (2019). *Japanese Geopolitics and the Western Imagination*. Springer Nature.
- Wemheuer-Vogelaar, W., & Peters, I. (2016). Introduction: Global(izing) International Relations: Studying Geo-Epistemological Divides and Diversity. In I. Peters, & W. Wemheuer-Vogelaar (Eds.), *Globalizing International Relations: Scholarship Amidst Divides and Diversity* (pp. 1-27). Springer Nature.
- Zaidi, S. A. (2002). Dismal State of Social Sciences in Pakistan. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37(35), 3644-3661. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4412553>
- Ziring, L. (2010). Weak State, Failed State, Garrison State. In T. V. Paul (Ed.), *South Asia's Weak States: Understanding the Regional Insecurity Predicament* (pp. 170-194). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEWEES

Table A.1 Name, designation and institute of interviewees

No.	Doctoral IR academics in Pakistan	Designation & Institute
1.	Dr. Bakare Najimdeen	Head of Department Peace & Conflict Studies, National University of Sciences & Technology, Islamabad
2.	Dr. Uzma Siraj	Assistant Professor, Federal Urdu University, Islamabad
3.	Interviewee (Anonymous)	University in Islamabad
4.	Dr. Waseem Ishaque	Assistant Professor, Department of International Relations, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad
5.	Dr. Rizwana Karim Abbasi	Head of Department International Relations & Peace and Conflict Studies, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad
6.	Dr. Adil Sultan	Acting Dean and Head of Department, Department of Aerospace Sciences and Strategic Studies, Air University, Islamabad
7.	Dr. Musarat Amin	Associate Professor, Karachi
8.	Dr. Salma Malik	Assistant Professor, Department of Defence & Strategic Studies, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad
9.	Dr. Khurshid Ahmad	Senior Lecturer, Department of International Relations, University of Peshawar
10.	Dr. Azhar Ahmad	Associate Professor, Humanities and Social Sciences Department, Bahria University, Islamabad
11.	Dr. Rizwan Naseer	IR academic, Karachi
12.	Dr. Mansur Khan	Assistant Professor, Department of Aerospace Sciences and Strategic Studies, Air University, Islamabad

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire

Interview Type: Semi-structured

Respondents: Doctoral IR academics in Pakistan

- 1) When you write, why do you write and who do you write for/ what are your ambitions for academic writing?
- 2) Do you write journal articles as well or have you done some academic work that has been published somewhere? What are some of the topics that you have worked on and also if you could tell me about the theoretical frameworks or the conceptual frameworks that you have used in these works?
- 3) There is literature out there that talks about a marginal presence of Pakistani voice in international journals. Pakistani scholarly contributions in IR can mostly be found in local journals. How do you see this inclination among Pakistani IR academics and scholars towards local knowledge production and publication enterprise? Your comments, please?
- 4) What do you think are the problems that Pakistani IR academics and scholars face when they try to publish internationally?
- 5) By interacting with friends from different IR departments, I have come to know that generally, in IR programs in Pakistan, students are quite familiar with Western approaches/theories and concepts in comparison to non-Western, indigenous or homegrown alternatives and thinking in IR. Mostly, it is Western authors whose knowledge is imparted to students here, in comparison to Pakistani authors and their works in the field. Don't you think this is problematic? Especially concerning the local realities of Pakistan which are different from the Western context?
- 6) If we look at the scholarship that Pakistani IR academics and scholars are producing, it is mostly focused on Pak-US relations, Pak-India relations or Pak-China relations. These studies mostly adhere to the 'realist' or 'liberal' thinking in IR. Why do these works mainly subscribe to mainstream paradigms and thinking in the field? Do you think these theories adequately capture Pakistan's realities and security predicaments?
- 7) There are authors outside Pakistan who write on/about Pakistan and create a 'certain' representation of Pakistan, which may not be true. For instance, Pakistan is discussed as a 'failed state' under the labels of a 'garrison state'; a 'weak state'; a 'fragile state'; a 'state sponsor of terrorism' or 'the most dangerous country in the world' by Western authors. What are we as part of the Pakistani intellectual community doing to counter West's biased and ethnocentric narratives about Pakistan?

