

**INTELLECTUAL IMPERIALISM: A CASE STUDY OF O-LEVELS HISTORY CURRICULUM IN PAKISTAN**



**AUTHOR**

AZKA DURRANI

**REGISTRATION NUMBER**

203609

**THESIS SUPERVISOR**

DR. AHMED WAQAS WAHEED

**DEPARTMENT**

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY

ISLAMABAD

**INTELLECTUAL IMPERIALISM: A CASE STUDY OF O-LEVELS HISTORY CURRICULUM IN PAKISTAN**

SUBMITTED BY: AZKA DURRANI

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

Thesis Supervisor:

Dr. AHMED WAQAS WAHEED

Thesis Supervisor's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY  
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCES AND TECHNOLOGY  
ISLAMABAD

## **DECLARATION**

I certify that this research work titled "Intellectual imperialism: A case study of o-levels history curriculum in Pakistan" is my own work. The work has not been presented elsewhere for assessment. The material that has been used from other sources has been properly acknowledged/referred.

## **PLAGIARISM CERTIFICATE (TURNITIN REPORT)**

This thesis has been checked for Plagiarism. Turnitin report endorsed by Supervisor is attached.

Signature of Student

Azka Durrani

Registration Number

203609

Signature of Supervisor

Dr. Ahmed Waqas Waheed

## ABSTRACT

In the past two decades, scholarship in International Relations has sought to understand how representations of Third World states are discursively formed. After initially outlining the contributions of post-colonial theory to International Relations, this thesis demonstrates that despite an agreement of the scholarly community that the global south needs to be viewed beyond a primitive orientalist lens, and discursively freed from labels like 'rogue state' 'terrorist state' 'repressive states' etc. the hegemonic discourse of world politics remains unchanged. The thesis provides a detailed exploration of how despite being geographically located in the global south, history students enrolled in Cambridge education system are unable to cognitively function in non-western modes of thinking and practice which is symptomatic of intellectual imperialism. Due to the internationalization of education in globalized world, some texts are circulated more commonly and read predominantly by students as a part of their course work. The failure of competing alternative discourses to challenge prevailing euro centrality of these texts is left unobstructed. This study demonstrates the socio-psychological effects of 'curriculum of dislocation' by conducting an analysis of the curricular text of Modern World history-Cambridge International system IGSCSE, an international examination board famous in the global elite circles of third world countries. By examining various underlying signification practices of these historical discourses circulating in knowledge corridors, the thesis reveals how prior to decolonization of IR, it is crucial to decolonize history itself. Only then can new ways of thinking be developed for understanding global securitization concerns and just ways of representing global realities.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	<b>1</b>
Chapter 1.....	<b>10</b>
Chapter 2.....	<b>27</b>
Chapter 3.....	<b>44</b>
References.....	<b>50</b>

## Introduction

The understanding of the global south is generally being done through the auspices of institutions in the global north. This global division is done academically, the need of which arises from the understanding of the roots causes of conflict and disparities between states. It can be facilitated by economic, geographical or political considerations. In search of finding the roots to an understanding of academic divide, however, can prove to be difficult. In order to understand that division, one needs to prove the existence of such a divide which reveals itself from viewing the circulation of knowledge through a post-colonized entity's lens and the mindful acceptance of knowledge generated in the north. The world witnesses an era of globalization of academia; a common global understanding of the world systems is the aim for the working of liberal institutions. The problem arises where the internationally produced 'texts' or 'discourses' end up eradicating chunks of vital representations. Those partial inclusions and exclusions of knowledges, specifically in academic history is problematic, particularly for global south. Also, it is not just the knowledge itself but the caricature of the subjects it signifies. The process itself creates a confusion in understanding the working of the south, particularly for those who are interested in its development or study of its subjects in general. We can assume then that the division between North and South is based over a knowledge-power nexus where the power is involved in exploiting the representation of one unit over the other. (Campbell, writing security, 1998; Doty R. L., *Imperial encounters: The politics of representation in North-South Relations*, 1996)

The subconscious absorbency of knowledge, generated in the west, is explained through the structural orientation of the colonized mind. The students and sages alike, take history and understanding of global politics that stems from it, as given and a fact which does not need additional explanation. This tends to create an aura of passive acceptance in the nascent learners (of south) to accept North's hegemony as unparalleled and absolute. The subconscious power for mind treats native/indigenous knowledge as embryonic, never questioning as to why it is embryonic in the first place (Alatas S. F., 1972). On the subject of indigenous production of knowledge, they are given the pretext that since the global south was unable to produce historic literature of their own, the north was bound to fill that void for the sake of the colonized. The intellectual sees his own country through the lens of its former imperial masters. The global divide of the North-South becomes vivid to the student, he accepts the marginalization of the south as a deserving act. The re-iterating and re-positioning of selective historical events is done in such a

way that it becomes the more signifying and world changing face of the entire global history. The post-colonial student through the subconscious absorbency of history finds himself not as the irrelevant other but an irrelevant-self.

This thesis's central aim is to expand on these problems of global North-South divisions by conducting a discursive study of curriculum devised for international students of Cambridge education system. The discursive analysis roots out the academic biases found within the history's curriculum approved for O-levels (ICGSCE system). The examination of the curriculum explores how the underlying form of academic signifying practices centered on identities in global south misconstrues not just the historical imaging of the former colonial countries but also leads the pathway for future foreign policy conduct. The construction and signification of identities as represented in history books can be later translated into practices of International Relations. The student in question has his subconscious mind infused with the Eurocentric imagination of any event in history and later purports it to other domains of his interaction in academic and practical life. The role of the text is examined two fold then. First, the international impact of circulation of text carrying Eurocentric biases and second, the developing distortions in identities of elite students of global south.

### **Theoretical background**

The premises of this research work falls within two major theories aligned with supporting tertiary theories stemming from disciplines of international relations and sociology.

First, the core theory which forms the backbone of this thesis is broadly explained by intellectual imperialism as coined, defined and introduced by Syed Farid Alatas, recognized for his works on alternative discourse and theory of captive mind. Combining the conceptual underpinning of knowledge production generally and the theory of captive mind specifically, this thesis gives alternative and additional explanation to consequences of Eurocentric bending of discourse and its effects on Pakistani students of O-levels. Because of this captive, Eurocentric (Hobson J. M., 2012) mind set the roots of the problems of indigenous society can never be studied properly. (Alatas S. H., intellectual imperialism; defination, traits and problems , 2000; Alatas S. F., 1972; Alataas, 2011; Alatas S. F., 2006). Second, the deeper theoretical backing of my work stems mostly from post-colonialist and International Relations theorists; my study will also be based on theoretical foundations of scholars from fields of sociology and education. Third, I shall be referring to some



contemporary theorists like Roxanne Doty, for her work on representational practices in discourse and John M Hobson, for euro-centrism in International relations theory. (Doty R. L., *Imperial encounters: The politics of representation in North-South Relations*, 1996; Hobson J. M., 2012)

## **Methodology**

“How we define the nature of epistemic method will be decided ultimately by how we are able to negotiate our interests or aims within this larger order of things” (p.19) (Chun, 2008)

The methodology of this qualitative research centers on a case study. This thesis uses exploratory approach towards the problems of curricular representations of ICGSCE History text book. The method is based on a non-interventional study design because it does not interfere with researchable objects. It is instead explanatory and analytical.

The sample of o-levels book was chosen not randomly but after careful evaluation of what part of the curriculum affects the student’s analytical process to understand any political situation. It presents one main theory (Intellectual Imperialism) and supports it with complimenting theoretical approaches (Post-colonial theory) to represent the research in a more comprehensible way. This research is of an exploratory type which oscillates between theory and epistemology. It attempts to explore previous researches relevant to the thesis by employing International Relations theory, Sociology and curricular studies.

*Discourse analysis as a methodological tool:* The methodological approach towards this study has chosen the method of discourse analysis over critical discourse analysis. There are three reasons for the preference. First, while the CDA and DA both looks at the underlying practices of power which results in domination of one group over the other, CDA heavily employs a cohesive linguistic examination of the text like employing semantic theories and corpus linguistics. On the same lines, DA is not just the study of language itself but is also a way of looking at its use in text, but the text is evaluated in broader socio-political context. Second, the discourse analysis is based more on post-positivist and interpretivist grounds of social science research whereas CDA looks at text in an objective and positivist way. Since this research is based on the post-colonial (or post positivist) research best viable option for methodology is DA. Third, this study is looking at the underlying broader mechanisms of how curricular discourses in academia are articulated and might be interpreted by students for which DA is a more reliable option than CDA in analytical inquiry

of the subject matter. Fourth, CDA has been critiqued in way that the researcher's intentions are rendered more ideological. In opting for discourse analysis, this study avoids the intentional ideological counter attacks on the part of the researcher.

*Conceptual base of methodology:* The discourse analysis has been chosen not arbitrarily for this study; this has been the best way for research in the post-positivist framework of social science research. After the 'linguistic turn' (of social sciences) of the 1970s, scholars have been trying to figure out how best to study the social and political phenomenon without the employment of scientism or positivist analysis. For this purpose, the methodology employs the blue print for methods as proposed by Jennifer Milliken, Roxanne Doty and Iver Neumann. For analysis of politics and history, this approach of discourse analysis is highly important because it gives the reader an idea of how any social reality was constructed or came into knowledge practices. Construction of the reality, and its re-representation repeatedly throughout discourses solidifies a particular version of truth. This explains why certain texts are given value to when routing for particular foreign policy actions or in the case of this research, texts are included or excluded from curricular courses based on their power value. This methodology is particularly suitable to studies in post-colonial and research work in critical school of thought.

The reasons for choosing Milliken's article as a blue print for this research work are as follows:

1. Her article has been the major work in the past two decades which actually addresses the issue of post positivist analysis in International Relations. She has managed to give a direction to the conduct of research in the "linguistic turn of IR".
2. In order to examine the knowledge-power nexus, Milliken has been able to define discourse analysis and its properties.
3. Finally, she has been able to give out methods for examining the discourse and processes of its scrutinization in order to determine the underlying practices of signification in any given text.

Given these attributes of Milliken's work, I opted for her methods of examining the O-level curriculum for history. Following are the methods I am using to evaluate the underlying practices of hegemonic discourses: the Juxtapositional method, whereby I evaluate the truths constructed by Eurocentricism via addressing the realities it has failed to address. Second, the deconstructive method reveals the polarized nature of the curriculum and third, by the method of studying

subjugated knowledges, the study reveals how alternative discourses can be suppressed and form resistance to other dominant discourses. Milliken's concept of *common sense* is central to this research since this serves as the backbone for explaining what the curriculum entails to do for the student i.e the curriculum creates a common sense by fixing history of IR in a fixed set of knowledge frame which creates political agitation in readers. For instance, the study revealed that Muslims are represented in direct opposition to the west, they are characterized by aggression and their countries shown to have repressive dictatorial leadership. Besides Milliken's analytical strategies to reveal the contingent politics of discourse, Roxanne Doty also provides the methodological framework to assess representational practices within the texts, that helped organize the understanding of the O-level's history's problematic text.

The functions of discourses introduced by Doty are based on the theory of post structuralism. The first trait of evaluation of representational practices is 'naturalization through presupposition', this accounts for background knowledges that creates the truth. Second, 'classificatory schemes' serves the purposes of hegemonic discourses that defines any subject. It facilitates in creation of stereotypes. Third, 'surveillance' and 'positioning' is the process by which subjects came to be known and positioned in the discourse of knowledge. Fourth, negation is practiced denying effective agency to some subjects or geographical spaces. This one is most crucial trait of discourses; by identifying negation, exploitation and marginalization of subjects can be assessed and analyzed. By application of these four principles as a lens to assess the discursive practice, this study has managed to reveal the underlying glitches of the curriculum.

After having a methodological frame of reference for studying discourse, its vital to acquire the tools by which to examine the text. Three such discursive tools has been suggested (Borg & Åhäll , 2012): Predication, Presuppositions and subject positioning, by using these I have underlined selective passages and lines in order to demonstrate the use of certain verbs, adverbs and adjectives that are used to ideologically define the premise of the text. These processes since provide subjects with specific set of properties which through discursive practices becomes fixed. The aim of using these methods is to retrieve what is presupposed and what is ambiguously defined through use of language.

Another way of looking at this methodological tool collection is presented by Iver Neumann who is of the view that if the following conditions are met while conducting an analysis, the discourse

is then best analyzed. He metaphorically calls it a discourse analysis ‘tool kit’. First tool is that of carver, the use of which is to extract texts out of general discourses. Second, an equalizer that tries to understand individual and collective practices through textual discourse. Third, herding dog, which analyzes these practices altogether. Other tools of analysis: slicer, optic device and self-reflecting quill helps analyze the text in its representational, meaning making processes which lies within texts.

A collective of these tools and methods has been applied in this research in order to understand the circulation of power, the hegemony of discourse and the representational practices involved in molding a subject and identifying it within the larger order of world politics. Since the selected text is O-level’s history of International relations, hence the rationale for choosing International Relations scholar’s methodology for examining the text.

### **Research Questions**

**Q.1** How does the captive mind attempt to explain the social configuration of the student in former colonial countries?

**Q.2** How the representational practices in O-level’s world history curriculum taught in Pakistan impact the students?

**Q.3** How does curricular practices at a specific elite educational level result in creation of a polarized society?

**Q 4** Given the Euro-centricity of history, why is there a need for de-colonial history and by extension a de-colonial IR?

### **Significance**

In post-colonial theory there has been work produced on academic representational practices, Chakrabartay (Chakrabartay, 2000; Chakrabartay, 1992)work on colonial India, Farid Alatas (Alataas, 2011; Alatas S. F., 1993; Alatas S. H., 1974)work on East Asia, Mignolo (Mignolo, 2009) on Latin America, Beltran on Colombia (Beltran, 2018), Conrad (Conrad, 2018) Molji (Moolji S. K., 2018) work in education is based on feminist reading of post-colonial scholarship . These scholars have driven our attention to the need for reforms in academic work produced on third world countries whether in policy texts, academic scholarship or educational curriculums. This

work takes a step further than examining the representational practices in academic discourse and its implication on educating the masses. First, it highlights the case study of Pakistan when it comes to western knowledge production and its impact on Pakistani elite strata of society enrolled in western education systems. Second, previous literature on post-colonial theory has focused more broadly on the discourses of history, few however have touched upon specific curricular practices of Cambridge education system. Third, no study has been conducted by Pakistani scholarship pressing on this issue of internationalization of curricular practices and its impact on Pakistani students specifically. Fourth the method of discourse analysis has not been applied for scrutinization of such organized text before, this study is the first of its kind to address this issue.

The significance of this thesis lies in explaining how the pedagogical enterprise of global south is failing to inculcate original uninfluenced ways of thinking in IR and understanding of world politics. In addition to that the curricular practices are (re)producing stereotypical images of subjects from third world countries. The major beneficiary of this thesis is the postcolonial scholarship working closely with education; those who want to understand the limitations and marginalization of third world entities on international scale and the representational injustices that has not only social consequences but political, psychological and economic. Through the larger theoretical domain of Intellectual imperialism this study tends to find the causes of the captive mind and its split identity manifested within the post-colonial student. It tends to find the causes, the structures and beyond that the methods and discursive sources of constructing half strewn identities and its consequences. This captivity that unfolds itself renders its subjects towards blindfold consumption of ideological knowledge produced in the Eurocentric framework. This research work is not the search for answers to not as to *why* it is happening or *how* it is happening (though theoretically it shall be explored) but *what* will it result into.

### **Structure of Thesis**

**Chapter 1** Discloses the context in which post-colonial theory is linked to the core subject of thesis. From colonization of mind (being, language, culture) leading to creation of a paradigm of intellectual imperialism. The underpinning sociological base of intellectual imperialism is defined and elaborated. After which a definition of the “post-colonial student” is framed (by application of Farid Alatas’ theory of captive mind). The basic explanation goes along the lines of showing how alienation of the student’s native country’s misrepresentation or missing representational

practices leads them to develop a love-hate relationship with their own society. To support that argument, I focus on western hegemony over historical discourse that encloses all those representational practices of the global entities.

**Chapter 2** In this chapter, I begin with expanding on historicizing; the processes involved, the previous provided literature and how is that relevant to what I am about to present as a methodological proof : discourse analysis. The semiotic analysis encompasses three major events/regions: the gulf war, Iran and Iraq, which are the only representations of south. Explaining the power constructed within the discourse, I build my case for ‘construction of a relevant history of the south’.

**Chapter 3** The chapter also focuses over the thinking processes of the captive mind student after reading of this ‘historicized’ version of modern history. (Smith, 2002; Hobson, 2012; Capan, 2016; Bilgin & Morton, 2002; Woolf, 1982; Tickner, 2002) by explaining the creation of curriculum of dislocation. This chapter attempts to explain why or how the society is getting fragmented , how the discourse produced in the west is giving meanings to certain words like the word mullah and maulvi became closer in meaning to tyrants and the word talib (student) from Taliban became equivalent to a terrorist, malevolent aggressors . How that form of knowledge when absorbed by a particular westernized elite in Pakistan create a cultural and behavior of a student towards their own people, diminishing empathy and understanding for their fellow natives. That historical discourse when fed to people are leading to creation of changing behaviors and choices of intellectuals elite, a sub-set of western cultural is niched in native settings which creates extremity of poles in society. (Said, 1997; Said, 1994) After combining all the dots of relevance between the arguments, the Analysis (which is the part of third chapter) ends at explaining the birth of a separate polarized elitist student of the south which is in other words a separate, powerful identity created by another body of knowledge detached from the South’s reality.

### **Subject content**

1 (a) The thesis tries to explore the domain of prevalence of western domination in academia which is mobilizing segments of society to conform to western standards and materials of calculation whereby creating a class based on educational resources.

1 (b) To understand the subconscious structuring of a post-colonial student.

2. To understand the processes and impact of missing representational/misplaced representational practices found in academic discourse and how that inadvertently renders a hegemonic position to knowledge production centers of north.
3. The concept of how intellectual imperialism stems from the knowledge power nexus.
4. To understand the larger picture of polarity and extremism in third world countries budded through intellectual imperialism; Manifestations, consequences and impact of identity split of the post-colonial student.
5. This thesis tends to answer certain questions and tends to fill the gaps left by previous researchers regarding the effects of captive state of mind, colonization of human thought and knowledge production in history and IR.
6. Representations of 'subjects' and the circulation of knowledge regarding those subjects through history's curriculum.

## Chapter 1

In the following passages , this study will show how theories of structuralism (Galtung, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism"- Ten Years Later, 1980), post-colonialism (Said, 1978; Chakrabartay, Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?, 1992; Singler, 2016; Fanon, 2004), intellectual imperialism (Alatas S. H., 2000) and the idea of governmentality (Burchell, Gordin, & Miller, 1991) combines to define the process of implicit control of an ideal subject of global south- the O-level's history student. There are certain structural (the core-periphery relations) and discursive (power circulated in discourses) phenomenon going on in the world that constitutes the meaning of global events unfolding around us. By means of discourse and discursive practices certain ideas are expressed and made common knowledge. That knowledge circulates from knowledge production centers to educational institutes spread across the world (Medina, 2014). The academic knowledge transmitted henceforth becomes the major leading discourse and is incorporated within the larger 'regime of truth' (Foucault M. , 1980). The knowledge carries some level of ideological baggage which according to the rules of discourse, is inevitable (Neumann,1999). But the effects of that discourse can be wide-ranging. In the first half of the chapter, the structure of the circulation of knowledge is explained. The background and basis of knowledge circulation is explored historically, particularly in the context of post-colonialism (Dabashi, Post-Orientalism, Knowledge and Power in times of terror , 2009). Eurocentricity of the historical discourse has been highlighted by scholars (Dabashi, 2015; Mignolo, Local Histories/Global Designs ; Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border thinking , 2000; Hobson J. M., 2012) which has a decisive, central role in determining the kind of identities formed in the global south. European identity solidifies when introduced to such a discourse but the post-colonial student studying Eurocentric history is unable to relate to his geographical reality (Beltran, 2018). In the second half of the chapter, the concept of intellectual imperialism is introduced in order to explain why alternative discourses are unable compete with the hegemonic discourses produced in the west. Furthermore a psychological captivity is created which Alatas calls the captive mind which furthers the cause of intellectual imperialism and knowledge circulation patterns. In last part of the chapter, the theoretical underpinning mechanisms of how discourse defines the post-colonial subjects through representational practices is described. This chapter reveals how embedded within the educational curriculum are the discourses which manufactures the captive minds (Alatas S. H., 1974; Alatas S. H., 1972; Alatas S. H., 2016) and neo-liberal



citizens (Moolji S. K., *Forging the ideal educated girl : the production of desirable subjects in muslim south asia*, 2018) in the global south.

The uncontested knowledge (re)production processes renders the academic system of global north as a hegemonic domain, inadvertently affirming itself as a multi-cultural academic industrial complex (Hopkins, 2017) or the "intellectual-financial" complex in education (Tikly, *Postcolonialism and Comparative Education*, 1999), worthy of producing a global and national level discourse. The highest ranking pedagogical and research universities and educational hubs are located in the north (Jackson, 2017). This is also evidenced in epistemic privileges of west (Mignolo, 2002). Though knowledge production is not left unopposed globally (Gunaratne, 2009), the positioning of universities internationally recognized and involved in neo-liberal institutional structure (Jackson, 2017) are established in such a way as to establish themselves as the sole originators of unbiased knowledge and academia. It is readily accepted by the post-colonial states since their production capacities are not yet strong enough to challenge the dominating discourses of the north. This leads to epistemic dependence in which the global north finds itself as the producer and disseminator of knowledge and south becomes the passive absorber. This institutional hegemony establishes itself when the knowledge production sites generates discourses to an extent that it systematically chooses an assertive position within that symbiotic relationship (Eduardo, 2006). In order to spread and maintain discourses on south, the north generates knowledge relevant to the south so that the universities and research remains relevant to the global south and are actively consumed in the south. The global south, on the other hand is lacking in its indigenous knowledge production prowess, it relies on other knowledge production sites. Therefore, knowledge production structure maps itself out with west at its origin (Slater D. , 2004).

The global south finds itself facilitating north in establishing that academic hegemony over itself. This relationship unfolds systematically which marginalizes third world scholarship (Keim, 2011; Merlainen, Tienari , Davies, & Thomas, 2008). Like the hegemony of finance and trade, a hegemony of discourse is created. This is where post-colonial theory and theory of structural imperialism overlaps to explain as to how south helps in creating that hegemonic enterprise of the north. The roots of these developments started in colonial times when a man from the south, if interested in quality education, had to go to west for studies. This irrevocably created a culture of

education in which western education system was preferred to indigenous centers of education (Hall C. , 2008). In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, those centers of education disseminated into a network of semi-independent institutes. Some educational centers (mostly secondary and higher) such as those associated with the evangelical movements and Christian church, like the convent schools system under the Catholic board of education remained reputable in the subcontinent, specifically Indian and Pakistan, (Allender, 2010) for educating the masses (Dodson, 2007; Bellenoit, 2016). Their intent might have been religious, educational or promotion of civilizational values (Whitehead, 2006; Shukla, 1996), it inescapably disrupted the local systems of education and the mindset of people towards indigenous education systems. When the natives of those post-colonial countries started preferring western systems to local ones for their children, this phenomenon started facilitating western institutes for instance as we see now that the elites opt for educational platforms like the British council (Bowden, 2009). This way a network was established, that of British Sahibs and Indian *Munshis* (Acharya, 2014), within which a one-way flow of knowledge dissemination began which marginalized third world scholarship. Since the structures of governance and bureaucracy and businesses were entrenched in an imperial system, academia too was fluxed within (Rao, 2014; Allender, Understanding education and India: new turns in post colonial scholarships, 2010; Peters, 2017). The local discourse started vaporizing in the light of an overbearing western influence.

Given west's (Europe and America) central position of economic, political and military prowess, their version and representation of South's realities is readily accepted on a global scale; one dominant discourse creates multiple discourses confirming to the west (Galtung, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism"- Ten Years Later, 1980; Alatas S. F., 2011) This structure of conformity, however did not present itself as it is. It was historically generated and regenerated discursively. The west's version of truth was constructed based on their Eurocentric conception of the world (Idemudia, 2011; Memmi, 1974; Said, 1978). West's association with scientific racism (Hobson J. M., 2012; Hira, 2012) at that time coupled with the territorial expansion under the banner of civilization (Bowden, 2009). The subjugation of mass populations in colonies created dependencies on west. One of them being academic dependency (Alatas S. F., 2011). Since the local structures of education deformed or abandoned to make way for western education systems in colonial countries (Ghosh, 1995; Bartle, 2006). Shenela Moolji writes in her book (Moolji S.

K., Forging the ideal educated girl : the production of desirable subjects in muslim south asia, 2018),

“Furthermore, a cursory glance at Macaulay’s famous Minute on Education (1835) shows that English models of schooling were introduced to create a cadre of people who could serve as cultural intermediaries between the British and their Indian subjects as well as staff the colonial bureaucracy”.

The power shifted to western modes of education and knowledge production sites (Leite, 2010; Akena, 2009; Medina, 2014; Selvaratnam, 1988; Johnson & Hirt, 2012). The colonial histories were re-written by the colonizers (Woolf, 1982) and that also with their orientalist lens (Said, 1978; Said 1993; Said 1997). Meanwhile there were very few notable scholars of former colonial countries who could disseminate knowledge in both English and local languages. The discourse *on* the colonized was read by the colonizers and their generations and other Europeans. That version of history of colonization and their interpretations of the indigenous culture and norms became a discursive “reality” which propagated and promulgated extensively to the extent that the colonized entities themselves started believing in *their* version of the truth (Blaut, 1993; Memmi, 1974).

The internationalization of neo-liberal system of education lead the post-colonial countries to systematically absorb the knowledge produced in the west. The neo-liberal system of education is not devoid of scientific racism (Wacquant & Bourdieu, 1999). It bears the greater goal of *liberating the masses* of the post-colonial countries. It ‘...imposes a mode of rationality based on the market’ (Eduardo, 2006). The pedagogical structures were positioned in a web like network throughout the world in such a way that the core elite schools of those post-colonial countries (periphery) were directly under control of neo-liberal system of education located in the west (core) (Watson, 1985; Galtung, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism"- Ten Years Later, 1980; Tickner A. B., 2013). With the spread of democratic values of governance and the claims of west’s triumphant claims to become the self-appointed leaders of the third world, the educational structures were also internationalized in the name of a more robust globalized and a cosmopolitan world (Tikly, 2001). There were several factors involved in supporting that kind of structure of international education we find today. Lack of indigenous discourses in the post-colonial south paved way for Euro-American discourses to find roots in curriculums taught there. This process was rendered easier

because the medium of communication remained English that favored west (Bannet, 2013; Phillipson, 2018; Phillipson, 2010; Phillipson, 1997; Phillipson, 2008). This made their knowledge more pertinent, easily available and disseminated extensively. In order to participate in the highly globalized world, the elites of those countries learned English language and supported systems of western education to flourish in their native countries. Despite the production of a plethora of scholarly work on decolonization of education (Grosfoguel, Cohen, & Boidin, 2012; Alatas S. F., 2006; Grosfeugal, 2012; Beltran, 2018; Vanessa , Stein, Hunt, & Ahenakew, 2015; Koukkanen, 2008; Louie, Hanson, Ottman, & Pratt, 2017) the western system of pedagogy and knowledge remains the standard to aim for in the post-colonial countries.

Due to weak educational institutes, post-colonial student grew in a society where the state was struggling in the aftermath of decolonization. Torn between the values and norms taught and inculcated by former colonial masters and those that are generally practiced in society at large (Fanon, 2004; Thiong'o, 1998) lead to creation of deformed identities. The formation of those identities is further made complicated by the neoliberal education system of west (Pupala & Kaščák, Governmentality-Neoliberalism Education; the risk perspective , 2011; Savage, 2017). The education of the elite cadre of society falls within the ambit of this neoliberal education system. This sometimes tends to create problems of extreme polarization within the state (Zaidi, 2011). Whilst the citizens, post-independence, were re-orienting their mind frame to their nascent settings, the elite structures of politics, bureaucracy and pedagogical structures stayed the same i.e rooted strongly within the colonial bureaucratic framework of the society (Duffler & Frey, 2011). In embryonic societies and developing countries, such pre-established structures ostensibly became the source of enlightened guidance for not only running of the state functionaries but also fixed certain kind of norms and values to its adherents. Those norms and values are usually not what the native cultures generally follows and this is where a reconstruction of new form of identity begins. The elite student educated and nurtured in those neo-liberal institutes finds himself naturally in alliance with those western norms and ideals. He /she might live in a liminal state whereby he/she conforms to western discourses and becomes critical of his/her native settings. This liminal state creates hybrid identities through which the structures of neo-imperialism nurtures slowly manifesting into a transplanted system.

The third world countries, mostly former colonies, in the late 20<sup>th</sup> century have jogged up to meet the international standards of education. This process created a class of conformists. The elite students in post-colonial countries prefer stable educational institutes allied with the west because the west is having a *defacto* control over the best academic institutes (Jackson, 2017; Mignolo, 2002) which also results in marginalization of third world academia (Canagarajah, 1996) and creates epistemic hierarchies. Therefore western education is *preferred* for imparting quality education in third world countries. Euro-Americanism or Eurocentric fundamentalism (Grosfeugal, 2012) asserts itself through international programs for education in developing countries. Through globalization, international institutes further paved the way for students in post-colonial regions to acquire western form of knowledge (Rizvi). Through that knowledge the post-colonial student, as the direct subject of that discourse, is molded (Akena, 2009). He is fed the Euro-American version of right and wrong, democratic values and liberty etc. The subjects become self-governing individuals acquiring norms and values taught to them through western discourse. The self-governing bodies are the epicenters of control and power as explained by the concept of governmentality. In other words, the subject, post-colonial student, *governs* his actions according to the discourse exposed to. In linking the concept of governmentality to post-colonial theory (Scott, 1995; Pals, 1997) it can be hypothesized that a century ago, the west was occupying lands through colonialism but today it controls the subjects through discourses. The subject in return is nourished by discourse which is designed based on neo-liberal values. When the values become intrinsic to the student, he becomes a conformist to international (read Euro-American) standards. But this argument does not account for the only reason of why post-colonial students conform to west. Psycho-sociologically speaking coloniality is also extended to mental captivity, which Ngugiwa Thiongo calls *the colonial-ity of mind* (Thiong'o, 1998).

As stated above, in nurturing of post-colonial societies, a type of intellectual control is maintained through discourses, academic complexes and captivity of mind. The concept of captive mind as explained by Malaysian sociologist Fareed Alatas, tries to depict how discourse produced in the west and irrevocably consumed in the third world countries (developing countries) paves way for creating special mental structures easier to control. This, Alatas refers to as the *captive mind*. The captive mind has specific traits of a colonized mentality; certain traits may include the mind of the post-colonial as uncreative, fragmented, imitative and subjugated in thought. According to the theory such minds are situated in the global south (post-colonial states). The indigenous mind is

westernized through the captivity of the mind of the colonizers. The captivity occurs due to a long history of passive internalization of colonization and the resultant pedagogical influence of the orient over the occident. It further gets structured by the inevitable intellectual dependency forged by the captive mind fused with hegemonic knowledge production and dissemination as discussed in detail above. This coloniality of minds paves way for greater enterprise of intellectual imperialism which is a way out into understanding the neo-colonization of states and its subjects. The intellectual control takes hold not just of the academia but an 'imitative culture' also forms along with it. This creates an atmosphere of common sense (Milliken, *The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods*, 1999) that this particular form of knowledge coming from west, is more acceptable along with its baggage of norms, values and philosophical reasoning.

After revealing how Euro-American knowledge circulates from global north (center) to global south (periphery), it is imperative to understand why it's easier for that knowledge to hold roots in post-colonial societies. The conditions for epistemic obedience does not simply stem from passive following of knowledge consumption by the students of global south. According to Alatas, there is an additional psycho-sociological aspect (theory of captive mind) to it which is found thriving in third world countries-former colonies. The formation of desirable subjects in global south is done with the help of injected discourses (discourse) facilitated by intellectual imperialism (colonial structure). The concepts of governmentality, captive mind and lack of alternative discourse helps explain the molding the identity of post-colonial student of global south.

The captive mind is the creation of centuries old coloniality of geography: spatial and temporal structures in postcolonial societies. Today it's maintained through different manifestations; coloniality of the bodies and mind (Alatas S. H., 1972). Such a mental-coloniality is maintained through text. Discourse produced in west is constructed by western thought with no or marginalized representation of other sociologies and philosophies. The knowledge circulation patterns (Medina, 2014; Wöhre, Çelik, & Keim, 2016) sustains western discourse, strengthens and solidifies it. At times in third world countries, western education is associated with prestige (Alatas S. H., 2000). This type of understanding arises when the student is exposed to both indigenous and international discourses. This leads to complications. For instance this binary of 'local/international knowledge' itself creates a divide for the student. In a colonial mind set, this

comparison of local versus foreign knowledge creates an idea that western knowledge is rigorous and more theoretically grounded. Because of this division, a student views local or indigenous discourses as something subordinate to western theories or ideas. Also the student is placed naturally at a disadvantage since s/he has to produce academic work in English which for him is not the language in which he thinks or interprets ideas, but has to learn in order to get educated. Because of this s/he *respects* the foreign ideas since ‘learning English’ aided his/her education, nurtured great ideas about the world. The mind becomes ‘captive’ linguistically and conceptually. For third world countries, the captive mind reduces chances of flourishing of original thought processes conducive to indigenous environments. Alatas defines captive mind as “the mind that is imitative and uncreative and whose thinking is based on western categories and modes of thought” (Alatas, 2000) The ‘captive minds’ are found in the post-colonial societies and its replica cannot be located in the west. The target of colonization shifted from materials to psychological control of the subjects and captive mind became the tool of control.

According to some international relations theorists (Escobar, *Encountering Development The Making and Unmaking of Third World*, 1995), globalization and development efforts have become synonymous with westernization. The promotion of west’s ideas takes a firm root in post-colonial societies because of their colonial past in tandem with the Europeans. as discussed above the epistemic privileges translates into intellectual control and sustenance of academic hegemony over the production of discourses of all kinds. From theoretical to developmental policies to history the types of knowledge and intellectual base is systematically controlled by the west (Woolf, 1982; Doty R. , *Imperial Encounters*, 1999; Escobar, *Encountering Development The Making and Unmaking of Third World*, 1995). When the structure of academic interdependence (running parallel to economic interdependence) is maintained, a hierarchy supporting the hegemon’s view point is promoted. However, Intellectual imperialism did not come into play only because of global interdependence of the 21<sup>st</sup> century but is a result of colonial history of hundreds of years which rendered the people of south psychologically subjugated to certain norms and traditions of the west, which were imposed by their colonial masters. In academia, it lead to a general acceptance of history’s Eurocentric view (Maeso & Araújo, 2015) to be devised for curriculums in schools, colleges and universities amounting to epistemic ignorance (Saulivan & Tuana, 2007). It becomes more relevant and pertinent. In other words, ‘Eurocentric’ history becomes ‘world’ history. Alatas

calls this ‘natural acceptance’ of such Euro-American knowledge (Small, 2012) as ‘intellectual bondage’ which results in epistemic obedience.

The Captive mind becomes the source of intellectual bondage which establishes the nurturing environment of academic dependence. According to Alatas: “A captive mind is one that is imitative and uncreative and whose thinking is based on western categories and modes of thought”. This mental state is constructed by an entire education system approved by the western standards. In the absence of alternative discourses, the study of western discourses of literature, philosophy and historical events that are not directly related to the reader, subordinates the post-colonial student to epistemic obedience (Mignolo, 2009). Because of this intellectual bondage and captive mind duo, the students and scholars of global south starts internalizing the superiority of western academic prowess. The captive mind understands itself through western theoretical perspectives, it quantifies, evaluates and measures all its knowledge and insights by western standards. Such captivity has cultural, political, social and normative implications for post-colonial societies. This points to an obvious realization that the process of decolonization is still left hanging mid-air (Wacquant & Bourdieu, 1999). The former *direct* form of imperialism manifested itself into an *indirect* psycho-sociological form of control (Hwami, 2016). In such post-colonial societies, the aftermath of that intellectual imperialism is reflected in the preferences (for western modes of pedagogy) and academic choices of students, teachers and civil society.

The subject formation in the global south can be understood from different angles. Psychological traits of the captive mind translates into a form of sociological system in which the post-colonial societies are unable to decolonize. (Go, 2013; Alatas S. F., 2011; Medina, 2014; Mignolo, 2002) First, those traits are inculcated due to the inadvertent conditioning of the student’s mind via discourse that creates an imitative, analytically dependent mind. When the masses of educated elite youth of global south are imitative in their intellectual capacities and they rely on foreign Euro-American history books, foreign historians, and theorists, they would prefer western stance for example in matters of governance or security etc. When these students join the work force they would be supportive of that Euro-American enterprise in all domains; governance, economics, pedagogy, culture etc. This concept has also been supported by Foucault’s notion of governmentality (Walters & Larner, 2004; Walters, 2012). Governmentality means governing of the self with rationality. It is when a body is governed from external hierarchical power but it



derives that rationality from discourse and learns how to govern his actions, ways of thinking etc. In educating young minds, a set of student ‘subjects’ are constructed in schools by feeding a set of discourses (designated in curriculums). The students are then able to govern themselves according to the rationality they adopt from *that* discourse. In other words the discourse (for instance of history or International Relations) simply modifies the socio-political conduct of the student. Neo-liberalism, on the other hand, becomes the ideology and the source of this governmentality in modern societies.

As discussed above this rationale of neo-liberalism as a discursive formation to produce a set of conformist ‘golden collars’ on a global scale has been explored by scholars thoroughly (Connell & Dados, 2014). In order for the American neo-liberalism to expand globally, education systems are required to produce capitalist subjects or international/global citizens. This means that the discourse seeps in not only into the cultural and political realms but also controls the beings and way of thinking of subjects (Pupala & Kaščák, 2011). The subjects operate like a currency for the neo-liberal market. Through the marketization of education and the discourses they teach, a desirable self-governing subject is formed. The Euro American discourse (e.g history) helps create an individual thought pattern based on ‘their’ version of truth. Moljie tries to explain the molding of subjects through her work in studying post-colonial feminist subjects. She gives an example of the discourse built around Malala Yousafzai in the west (Moolji S. K., 2018; Moolji S. K., 2014; Khoja-Molji, 2015; Moolji S. K., 2017; Moolji S. K., 2015). She says that the subjects are created and represented at the same time by hegemonic discourses and through women empowerment discourses women in post-colonial countries are dictated by them. Women rights, human rights discourses under the banner of neo-liberalism etc becomes governing discourses. This is what Alatas asserts that by injecting a Eurocentric conception of sociology, the student molded in third world countries is intellectually in grasp of the western ways of thinking<sup>1</sup>.

Second, the captive mind is “fragmented in its outlook” its representational identity is blur, from which the student could have been rescued in order to be given an indigenously rooted identity but since s/he is loaded with foreign discourse and constantly consuming Euro-American discourse, s/he is unable to identify *their* history to his/her ‘reality’. Third, the captive mind is not innovative.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that western modes of thinking is bad or irrelevant. It is to assert that this gives rise to unoriginal thinking and alienation from situated realities.

This trait is the most harmful to post-colonial student because when s/he lacks that analytical prowess to address his/her country's immediate problems, the intellectual use of that education goes to waste. In such conditions a gap is left for European development discourses to seep in and paternalistically dictate those conditions and principles required for governance, trade, economics etc (Doty R. , *Imperial Encounters*, 1999).

Here, the theories of captive mind and governmentality combines to show that the already fragmented mind who has yet to grasp the reality of his surroundings is bombarded by western academic literature. This happens specifically to the student belonging to social elite in post-colonial societies that prefers getting educated in foreign academic systems, such as the Cambridge system of education. Again the captive mind makes a choice based on a rationalization (which is also associated with western system (Raju, 2011) and thoughtlessly and uncritically adheres to the west. Academic discourse becomes the tool through which a unique bio-power is wielded and academic dependency (Beigel, 2015) is ensured. C.K Raju explains this academic choice of people in global south as:

“This extreme anxiety for Western recognition is itself clearly a consequence of the strong feelings of collective inferiority that prevail to this day. That feeling is generated not merely by imperialism but by indoctrinating people with racist history; and that history, propagated by Western historians, was used to derail the entire agenda of education in India, and to consolidate imperialism. Academic imperialism is being used to maintain real imperialism”.

The over-riding Eurocentric discourse of the social sciences (Alvares, 2011) has compelled post-colonial societies to opt for alternative discourses. This idea of choosing an alternative to mainstream knowledge production of west has been presented in scholarly arena for the past few decades. As stated above the decolonization of education has been advocated vigorously by post-colonial theorists which has been further supplemented by the canon of discourse on the need for indigenous intellectual creativity by Farid Alatas. In opposition to Alatas's conception of alternative discourse, Alvares adopts a pluralist discourse of social sciences.( Mulder,2016) the problem with the pluralist discourse arises that the powerful knowledge generator, the west, takes precedence over the other pluralist discourses. This is the reason why, the idea of superstructure and its inclusiveness of non-western discourses is failing to work. A critique of the alternative discourse lies in west labelling these indigenization and sacralization of discourses as a “cherishing

(re)discovering non-western treasures” seen as “flag-waving nationalism” and other charges of nativism. The problem of not having those modes of alternative or indigenization of knowledge is that students are unable to critically evaluate the problems of their own societies and are more relying on their analysis on the west. As inscribed earlier, this is the result of captive mind, a product of Eurocentric discourse and pedagogy. Today the need to weed out the oppressor(colonial form) from the oppressed(colonized) is via innovative pedagogy, as the oppressor is housed in the oppressed (Hilton, 2011) that is to say, the teacher should not be the transmitter of Eurocentric conceptions and ideas. This however does not indicate the western theories and philosophies becomes absolutely irrelevant but this calls for a break in the creation of captive minds so that local/nativist methodologies and theories can be applied to local realities.

Representation lies at the core of every discourse by which meanings are exchanged. Meanings are produced by relation of those representational practices. Representational practices in discourse not only produce meanings but also a broader landscape of discursive practices, culture and by extension, identity creation (Hall S. , 1997). According to Hall, language is that primary “medium through which thoughts, ideas and feelings are represented in culture”. Those representations are central to the meanings and concepts that are produced in the cognition of the reader. The representational practices are not only involved in the production of meaning in the circuit of culture (as illustrated by Hall), also in the production and regulation of a discourse that gets rooted in those representations (Hall S. , Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices, 1997). In linking the bigger picture of culture to representational practices, hall argues that there is a ‘production and exchange of meaning’ going on.

According to Ferdinand Dessausure, Language functions as a composition and correlation of ‘signs’ (Hall S. , Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices, 1997; Saussure, 1983). Signifying practices determines the meanings ‘constructed’ through language and human interpretation of it; certain words, phrases and terminologies which stands for or refers to a particular symbol or sign or phenomenon. For instance ‘September 11’ is a signifier which automatically gives off a meaning of ‘terrorism’ (signified, which is the concept triggered by the signifier). According to hall, the social constructionists are of the view that this link is established by the interplay of meaning making process and representational practices. In the process of deciphering those signs, signifiers and signified a common collective/individual cognitive

interpretation of symbols is created. For example “Osama bin laden”, “Taliban”, “9/11”, “Islamic Jihad”, all are those signs circulating which were given a meaning to. Language through representational practices, symbols and signifying practices helps in constructing and ‘conceptualizing a culture’ for example an ‘American war against terrorism’. These signifying practices gives off meanings which are interpreted in different ambits of culture and it ends up shaping the social subjects (Staunæs, 2003) . The study of those process of shaping and molding subjects is done through semiotics (Parker, 1990) and constructivist approaches (Hall S. , Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices, 1997). By employing this method in chapter 2, this study will clarify how academic representations create such conceptualizing cultures.

On the other hand, after the linguistic-turn (Saussure, 1983), scholarly work (Foucault M. , 1974) focused on meaning making processes embedded in discourse; i.e a power/knowledge relationship was discovered. According to post-structuralists, the representational practices were embedded in discourse and the discursive practices originating from it and depended not only on the structures of signifying practices (Hall S. , 2009) but on the nature of knowledge and its relation with power (Hall S. , Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices, 1997). Because according to these theorists, discourse constructs and governs not only the subjects under study but also gives a shape to the broader landscape of ideas and ways of thinking. Foucault’s notion of subject<sup>2</sup> was different since he did not believe in giving complete autonomy to subject as the independent author of a discourse ‘they are operating within the limits of the episteme’ (ibid pg. 55) . Discourse constructs the subject and gives the subjects knowledge to govern their bodies, their ideas and belief systems. Power is embedded in discourse and discursive practices, through which the subjects can be governed or power can be exercised. That discursive power manifests itself in different ways. It can be found in knowledge production or constructing knowledge of different kinds, authority of knowledge and discourse and in institutional practices. Once the discourse and associated practices constructs that knowledge and is translated into certain social practices, it *becomes* the ‘truth’.

---

<sup>2</sup> Foucault’s notion of subject is two-fold. Subject to outer control and subject to self-knowledge. According to him it is discourse that produces knowledge not the subject.

On one hand, according to neo-Marxists (Kenny & Germain, 1998; Rehmaan, 2013), Hegemony is understood as dominating social groups, anchoring their superior position with respect to other groups, so that their version of truth prevails in thought and practice. On the other hand, poststructuralists, power/knowledge relationship within discourse explains how the knowledge serves power to create hegemony. According to Foucault, Power circulates within the discourses. It becomes a discursive practice which is found in all strata of society. Post structuralists explains the hegemony of discourse via the interplay of empty signifiers and privileged nodal points (Townshed, 2004).

A discourse can be synonymous to ideology (Hall S. , 1997; Hunt & Pervis, 1993); the only difference lies in interpretation and representation of reality as facts and it can also be hegemonic in nature. Nature of development(s) in International politics or certain events can be arbitrary serving as floating signifiers, which have not yet been articulated or represented in discourse that is: the meaning of a set of discourses is not fixed and has yet to create a ‘regime of truth’ . For instance before and during the cold war, communism acquired a special meaning (in relation to capitalism) and its meaning got fixed, mostly in the western world as something bad, totalitarian and unjust (Campbell, *Writing Security: united States Foriegn Policy and Politics of Identity*, 1992). In another example, ‘war on terror’ . Events of 9/11 were discursively linked to terrorism, a floating signifier. The fixing of the meaning is then done ideologically and in return the discourse is not innocent anymore (Hunt & Pervis, 1993). Hegemony of any discourse is created when/if these floating signifiers are given a certain meaning that remains uncontested on a broader scale. Though there are no fixed centers but there are certain established and privileged discursive points ‘nodal points’ which are able to fix meanings, link one signifier to another and articulate a wholesome meaningful picture (Phillips & Jørgensen , 2002).In discourse, nodal points are certain privileged points which determines what meanings and societal values are attached to events or processes (Solomon, 2015) . There is a ‘moment’ in discourse articulation when nodal points comes in action to fix any supreme meaning to any political event or explanation by putting a bunch of empty signifiers like ‘backward’, ‘Muslims’ with ‘threat’ with privileged signifiers like ‘national security’ and ‘intervention’ or ‘justification for invasion’, events starts to make sense and the discourse produced in the process, gains prominence. The representational practices within a hegemonic discourse, therefore, determines the kinds of institutional and individual practices of the subjects. These repetitive representational practices found in hegemonic discourse wields

power over bodies through institutional practices. In the case of this study, pedagogical institutes and the nature of academic knowledge governs the post-colonial student.

The representation and repetition of certain orientations of historical facts and figures found in history books' texts can carry an effect on the discursive practices of its reader. The student of history is conceptualizing a picture in order to understand any past event. He/she relies on those historical data (inscribed within the textbook) of events as specific signifiers for example while studying the reasons for cold war and analyzing them, he/she would come to a conclusion that since Bolshevism stood for slavery, tyranny and oppression, the opposite; the American liberty, equality and justice stood in stark contrast to it (Campbell, 1992). Here, the signifier: 'an image of a Russian leader' would lead to a concept of tyranny and repressed Russians (the signified) in the minds of a juvenile reader. The metaphors for social problems gets associated with race or a nation or an ideology. This is what Campbell asserts that the writing of the cold war history in this particular orientation has rendered the minds of people to function in binary decoding. They construct their version of self through negation of the 'other'. Also a similar political discourse analysis has been conducted by several scholars and have arrived at the conclusion of 'construction of *Russophobia*' (Taras, Peterson, Malinova, & Feklyunina, 2013). Representational practices created through language and discourse plays a major role in identity creation (Campbell, *Writing Security: united States Foriegn Policy and Politics of Identity*, 1992). Historical discourse then begins to naturalize meaning for the reader and the power which that knowledge carries begins to influence the dominant discourse of other disciplines like international relations, education, psychology etc.

As mentioned before, the representational practices within the discourse locates and positions the subject, the representational practices in the field of International Relations is primarily emerging from the 'Euro-American centrality' of world history which in turn ensures the hegemonic discourse and its practices to prevail and maintain an imperial power over other set of discourses and discursive practices in academia and pedagogical structures across the world. International Relations because of Eurocentric history (Hobson J. M., 2012) and sociology (Bilgin, 2009) faces the same issues of Euro-centrism (Tickner A. B., 2003; Smith, *The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: "Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline"*, 2002; Bilgin, 2008; Bilgin & Morton, 2002). Through discourses of history and I.R a common cognitive

interpretation is readily constructed for the student. For instance World War II is the starting point for most of the modern world history textbooks, rendering the representation of events of decolonization in Far East, South Asia, Africa and South America irrelevant and unimportant or of a tertiary value (Bilgin, 2016; Buzan, 2015). The students while deciphering the mainstream discourse on world history cannot locate the veiled subjects for example the colonizers and colonized, since they are not highlighted in such imperial texts. S/He sees his/her position and contribution to world history of no significance. For the post-colonial student the geo-historical image cognitively established is that of 'the west' at the spotlight of historical evolution and 'the rest'(periphery/third world/global south) as the passive bystander of all historical development (Hall S. , 1992).

Another way of looking at this argument can be by way of characterizing the practices that comes before representation itself, that is, the creation of reality based on assumptions and presuppositions. In human interaction, certain propositions are assumed, detained and forwarded on 'as natural facts'. These presupposition are magnified within the discourse when a crisis emerges, for instance an event needs to be clarified. Those assumptions previously articulated become active in order to make sense of let's say a political crisis etc. The presuppositions are re-represented and repeated throughout the discourse so that the supposed meaning is fixed and constituted i.e naturalization of meaning. (Doty R. , *Imperial Encounters*, 1999). This urge for naturalization of meaning happens when certain experiences are unclear and not easily definable. Those experiences are explained by theoretical supposition which gains momentum in discourse through repetitive representation. There can be a repetition of 'classifying meanings' associated with those geographies and human bodies and categorizing it into neat boxes of hierarchies or ranking so that they are easily 'identifiable' within the discourse. For instance, the acceptance of the discourse on 'Global North/South' , 'developing countries' or ' failed states' is one of those signifying practices that gets fixed in discourse by 'process of naturalization'. The Eurocentric history is conventionally ripe with the processes of exclusion or misrepresentation .By practices of Negation, appropriate agency is denied to third world. It does not only give a distorted view of history it also decides how to represent elements under study and their position and relevancy (subject to subject positioning). Those elements are predefined by historians and translated and transcribed into several other social disciplines. Since the discourses are open and have no fixed boundaries, they crisscross through one another and end up supporting a larger superstructure

which translates as a hegemonic. That discourse then seeps into the curricular discourse (Stein, 2017) (explained in detail in chapter3).

IR-History text of the O-level curriculum mends the embryonic thinking frames of international students. Because of the mainstream ‘texts’ of history books and International Relations discourses produced in global north and read and circulated in global south, a set of representational practices comes into play. Both discursive and non-discursive practices stemming from those texts, can be reflected in academic discourse, populist discourses (media/social media) and observed in practices of foreign policy. When a student thinks in those terms of representational practices, s/he accepts that particular historical stratification (for example North/South, East/West) which defines the nature of discourse. A certain flux of meanings is produced when discourses of different kinds competes with one another. This clash of competing discourses creates a version of self and other for the reader; a process of creation of identities is set in motion. According to Foucault’s observation of disease and body, he presents this notion that a certain stigma can be set on a body because of the representational practices associated with it. Political analysis, foreign policies and the decisions to wage wars are decided on the basis of history and its underlying representational practices. A student of history starts developing a framework of mind (Burman, 2016) supportive of conducting hegemonic foreign policies. This is because the frame of history has been rendered ideological and hegemonic to the extent that it develops the rationality of its reader and the analytical prowess, inculcating them towards the situated ‘regime of truth’<sup>3</sup>. Historical representations of reality decides what to view as a threat in national security. History is a remembrance of past but the way it is represented, stigmatizes the other solidifying identities. This is why there is a scholarly debate for a need of a more global perspective on International Relations. The secondary premise of thesis lies here in the premise that with a decontextualized imperial history, a more global and an impartial reflexive IR is not possible (Acharya, *Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies*, 2014; Bilgin, 2016; Bilgin & Tanrisever, 2009; Adler-Nissen, 2013)

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the student is not a passive subject of history. The subject can think and act for himself but here I am talking about subjects molded by the discourse.



## CHAPTER 2

Positivism has been the epistemological backbone of international relations theory since the discipline's inception in mainstream academic discourse (Soreanu, 2010; Wendt, 1992; Peterson, Tierney, Oaks, & Maliniak, 2011). Positivism relies on scientific study of social phenomenon and infers strictly according to 'facts' and 'data'. They take social realities or facts as scientifically observable and independent in value. In such a lens of understanding they forego the underlying contextual relations. They also assert that social facts are not value laden and they are neutral just like scientific facts for example water has a formula of H<sub>2</sub>O irrespective of the state of water (gaseous, liquid or solid). This is a universally recognized scientific fact accepted and recognized by all. On the other hand when it comes to social sciences, the assertion and representation of 'USA is a super power' as a sociological 'fact' is not as neutral as water carrying the formula of H<sub>2</sub>O. Here, the USA, being the caricature of 'super power' holds multiple meanings and interpretations in global politics, economics, history etc which is not 'normal science' (Dessler, 1999). The phrase 'USA as a superpower' is itself not a neutral proposition and various reactions to this sociological fact are value laden. This is where a critique on positivism arises. Positivism does not account for problems of representation, identity or norms and values that are central to the sociological world. Positivist assertion that sociological truths can be discovered by applying scientific methodologies is critiqued by feminist scholars who prove how even the common reality of 'sex' (in everyday use of the term) is socially constructed rather than a hard core scientific fact (Butler, 2006). This proves that social facts cannot be treated as scientific facts when conducting an analysis. Another set of critique on positivism asserts this: since social knowledge is expressed through language and language in return is malleable and text is articulated subjectively, which is the basis of post-positivism. In the past fifty years, the critique of positivism in social sciences has been expanded by philosophers (Foucault M. , 1980; Derrida & Spivak, 1997), theorists (Wendt, 1992; Smith, United States and International Relations "Hegemonic country,Hegemonic discipline" , 2002; Ashley, 1988) and linguists (Saussure, Chomsky) who are of the view that natural world is different from the social world and the approach to study social processes should be different from what the positivist methodologies dictates (Brown V. , 2011; Brown C. , 2001). Today, there is an increasing trend of including post-positivist ways of studying International politics, albeit positivism still dominating the academic discourses (Eun, 2016; Smith, Booth, & Zalewski, 1996).

This is precisely where discourse analysis comes in. It signifies a methodological shift from positivist criteria of research and study of social world towards a more reflectivist and constructivist approach. It is in the discourse where social ideas float and renders certain concepts significant or insignificant. For instance take the orientalist assumption that people of the global south were backward in civilization and there was a need for European countries to civilize them (Slater M. B., *Barbarians and civilisation in international relations*, 2002; Mgbeoji, 2006). This discourse was repeated and re-represented which gave justification to colonization. Since discourses have a memory of their own it is imprinted in socio-cultural cognition of any society that operates within a framework of that discourse. The version of the reality taught at schools is of utmost value since it composes the embryonic socio-cognitive process of students at large. Most importantly, it forms the 'preconditions for action' (Neumann I. , 2008). Discourse analysis is a way forward for understanding how a certain reality gets constituted and became normalized through social processes involving circulation of particular texts. According to Neumann, "Realities are maintained by the frequent repetition and confirmation of representations"(p.66). In a post-positivist approach like this a researcher can explore the reasons for certain discourses that dominates one representation over others (hegemonic discourses). This becomes a best way to understand power practice at play underneath the texts produced.

There are two major traits of discourse; first, discourse has the element of productivity and re-productivity and second, it carries systems of signification that acts out to represent different social realities. Language is the carrier of signs, symbols and associated meanings (Hall) which forms a large part of discourse and discourse as a whole acts not just as the 'background capacities'(Milliken,1999) for people to view the world but also as structures employed in day-to-day practices. It not only is serving as the background source for 'precondition of actions' but in the process discourse is participating in the construction of meaning and signification. Discourses are constructed and created. Discourses are not just some specific texts, they are a set of regular verbal and textual practices employed by institutions and by people in general. This is vital for understanding the second major trait of discourse: they are productive in nature. Because of this characteristic it stands as foundational base for constituting particular regimes of truth. For example, for 'cold-war' to become a reality historical discourse was constructed and identities were created within the discourse. The discourses were socially regulated through press and academia which in return lead state policy practices (Neumann, 1999). In order to create an entire

regime of truth, discourse spreads out from text into the realm of discursive practices: play of practice, legitimizing acts and authorizing subjects, and generating a common sense. These serve as some of the functions of discourse productivity.

First, the play of practice in discourse theory refers to the conditions and pretexts which causes certain discourses to dominate and others are repressed (Milliken, 1999). These practices leads to suppression or exclusion of other knowledge(s), subjugated knowledge(s) or alternative discourses. This happens because power is also associated with a speaker's authority. The powerful speaker produces and reproduces knowledge. And it is by the supremacy of those speakers, text and the practice of discourse production that other competing discourses are silenced. The space for other 'truths' is extinguished. As a result not only an ideological discourse emerges with a body of text so strong and supported by discursive practices, it also becomes hegemonic and repressive, leaving no room for alternative discourse (Alatas). Second, after a particular discourse is so wide spread and popular (black race is inferior to white race), it legitimizes certain policy practices (colonization, interventions in foreign lands). This kind of interplay of discourse articulation and application gives rise to points (or centers) of authority which wields high influence on discourse productivity. Third, after such a discourse is accepted as an ultimate truth, it generates common sense. Discourses produce a perception of social realities, and those perceptions in return are guided by common sense. The biggest drawback of such common sense creation is that resistance to these over-arching discourses becomes difficult. The view of the world as presented in subjects of history, International relations theory or in the news or media promotes a world view based on a single dominating source of discourse (Milliken 1999).

While examining a discourse, in order to explore the micro-physics of power, questions pertaining as to 'how' something happen is more useful (Dunn, 2008). Since power is embedded in discursive practices, it circulates within the discourse. The 'partial fixity' and fluidity of discourses serves as a means for examining how power was instated and regulated within the discourse in the first place. The knowledge-power link; knowledge is an exercise of power and power exercises knowledge (Foucault M. , 1980) is a way forward for understanding the foundational source of hegemonic discourses attempting to 'define' or 'present' the other. For example at a UN general assembly different heads of states defined the political problems of Congo and gave their own narrative of Congolese identity. These representations of Congolese people and their problems in

media, press or academia were constantly articulated and rearticulated with multiple discourses in competition with one another to achieve dominance (Dunn, *Historical Representations*, 2008). One discourse clashes with another. So the stronger discourse over rides the alternate ones due to discursive power. Due to the 'unfixed' nature and productive capability of stronger discourses, it attempts to fill in blank spaces of history and through text creates the image of other. In the process, one representation is hailed over the other, marginalizing and excluding identities, realities and truths: "Because the question of representation has been excluded, the historical construction and consequences of these differences have not been considered legitimate realms of inquiry." (Doty R. , *Imperial Encounters*, 1999, p. 4) She is of the view that by examining binaries like north/south, superior/inferior, the duality of discourse is revealed-another trait of discourse explored by Derrida (Arfi, 2012). By a clear analysis of socio-political practices and representational practices within the discourse, we can get a clearer view of how knowledge and truth circulates to give us a reality.

In an attempt at fixing meanings, the blank spaces (discursive spaces) in historical discourses are given a 'convenient form' of representation or loosely articulated labels (Fierke, 2002; Wolf, 1984). For example within a Eurocentric discourse, a Non-European 'other' is presented as a threat (Hall S. , *The west and the rest; Discourse and Power*, 1996). In policy papers or in academic research, words like "under-developed", "failed states", "third world", "rogue states" etc are attached to unexplored and foreign identities (Waheed, 2019). A collective of people and countries then fall under single representational practice. These can be of high value to national securitization practices. Some representational practices and meaning making processes can be more implicit and intrinsic in nature, that is to say not identifiable easily. Rooting out those can prove to be a canonical task of discourse analysis, such was the study of 'orientalism' (Said 1970, 1980). Meanings are attached to phenomenon/persons/historical events only when their representations are discursively repeated. Therefore both discourse and the underlying 'power' structures which determines what form of historical representations becomes dominant and which becomes marginal(Hall,1972).

Historians tend to create ideological regimes of truth rather than present an objective truth or reality because according to reflectivists truth is produced not looked for. In order to explain a reality representational practices are involved. These representations which are primarily meant to show ontological realities, are not necessarily composed of neutral signifiers. Which is to say that

anything (signifiers) that functions to explain the truth might carry more than one connotation. Therefore those representations are affected. In discursive practices, these representations are shaping human perceptions. As a result of which a superior regime of truth is constructed and a common sense is established. History produces its own discourse and regime of truth (Dunn, *Historical Representations*, 2008). Based on those representational practices of these historical discourses, International Relations and understanding of world politics is then framed and understood (Lawson, 2006).

Discursive memories play a larger role in the creation of an academic ‘common sense’, struggling out of which might be labeled ‘controversial’. Those challenging the prevalence and universalization of such an imperialist common sense, are seen as nativists and their act of indigenization of discourses is seen as a nationalist rebellion rather than an academic revision. Because of the inherent productivity, ‘discourses carry a memory of their own’ (Neumann I. , 2008). That discursive memory becomes the collective memory of all the disciplines involved in social sciences. For instance post 9/11, a generalizing discourse developed that of: “all Muslims are terrorists”; it started circulating in the west in the past decade. The discourse gained momentum and gradually became the larger source of representation of Muslims worldwide. It did not develop overnight, an orientalist discourse of the people belonging to Middle East (Muslims in general) was already embedded in the collective psyche of American discourse, in its discursive memory. A moving event like an attack on its economic and military hubs only confirmed the socially constructed image the populace had carried via its discursive memory. The otherization of Muslims as the new American foe was ripe and this reflected in their foreign policy actions (Jackson, 2008). The common sense of a generation of people requires a collectivity of textual representations, media imaging and academic discourses. This case study, however, focuses on academic texts circulating internationally-representing a ‘modern’ world view of history.

The core content of the ‘modern world history’ opens with the heading of 20<sup>th</sup> century International Relations since 1919, as this year serves as the historical junction of end of empires (which is contested by historians) (Cooper & Burnak, 2019). Usually the configuration of International relations takes post World War II scenario as the starting point for explaining International politics (Bell, 2009). According to Arif Dirlik (Dirlik, 1999): “Since World War II, Euro-centrism has been the informing principle in our constructions of history-not just in Euro-American

historiography, but in the spatial and temporal assumptions of dominant historiographies worldwide.”(p.4)

It (??) is usually based on two blocks of realism versus liberalism (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006), as is observed critically that in the mainstream view of IR ‘...they locate agency and history with the great powers’ (p.340). Some have studied the historical constructions of certain events and addressed the problem of mixing myth with history: *Mythhistories* (Bently, 2005). The curriculum book begins with the end of world war one and directs the student towards the interwar years of 1919-39 and the diplomatic treaties and events of aggression. Each chapter title is a one liner questions. They are of historical significance for understanding the international practices of the time frame. The textual formation of those questions however sparks the individual intrigue of the student/reader. For instance some chapter titles reads “who was to blame for the cold war?”(Chapter 4), “Why did the events in Gulf matter, c.1970-2000?”(Chapter 7) or “How secure was USSR’s control over eastern Europe?”(Chapter 6). Although these titles are written in this inquisitorial form so that it caters to the analytical charge of the young reader but the receptivity of these questions can be also ideological and may fix a unilateral paradigm of thinking. This textual practice of posing of such questions at the beginning of the text, before the actual historical events are pedagogically conveyed to the student, directs towards the practice of presupposition by the author. By such discursive practices of inscribing an analytical statement *before* the historical value free facts, the text creates ‘background knowledge’ (Doty, 1999). So if a genealogy of events is presented *after* the normative question, the knowledge itself does not remain innocent for the student. This can be deduced that this curriculum like other historical texts carries an element of ideology, as it is also widely accepted that no text is free of ideological tilt (Hunt & Perves, 1993; Rathburn, 2012). The act of presupposition and multiplication and dissemination of the discourse, begins to *naturalize* the knowledge. By naturalization of discourses, it is meant that with the help of a background knowledge, a framework of understanding is fixed and constituted within a discipline (Qin, 2018; Snider & Beattie, 2019). This collides with the ethical aim of teaching history: a record of past events to understand why and how everything happened. In the case of this curriculum, the book’s aim should roughly be this: to give a background to the o-levels student how states interacted with one another, what policies and actions lead to the current international political conditions and specifically how international relations was practiced.

Negation has been at the center of this historical discourse. The core subject content reads: ‘modern *world* history’ but there are instances of clear negation of an agency to half of the world and obscurantism of politics of global south which is not uncommon in knowledge production (Agnew, 2007). According to scholars (Wodak, Butler, Foucault), texts must indulge in exclusionary practices in order to close the content at someplace but at times gives rise to discourses of racism and discourses of power (Wodak & Reisigl, 2008; Reisigl & Wodak, 1999). The exclusionary practices in development discourses (Doty R., *Imperial Encounters*, 1999; Escobar, *Encountering Development; The making unmaking of the third world*, 1995) on the other hand are now challenged by participatory research agendas (Saunders, 2002). The historical representations of what is usually classified as the ‘third world’, is not completely absent from the discourse of the curriculum ascribed for O-levels students of history despite its dense Euro-centricity. The global south is represented is majorly represented by a larger discourse about Gulf war in chapter 7 (p.146), Vietnam (p.110) in chapter in chapters, covering the cold war section. Two of the Middle Eastern countries are represented in detail here: Iran and Iraq. Mentioning the Gulf war and the concomitant politics of oil is of high relevance to the due course in IR history and foreign policy but in terms of a holistic historical representations of the global south, there are many blank spaces (geographical and temporal in nature) left out. A politics of the so called global north with global south is missing (Frank, 1992; Westad, 2005). Despite its analytical and critical representation of every political event in history be it any geographical area and historical period, the sketching of events and their drawn chronology is in effect Eurocentric (Dirlik, 1999; Conrad, 2018; Aroujo & Maeso, 2012) and ideological entrenched in western neo-liberalism which is challenged largely by the post-colonial readings of the text (Matin, 2012; Pels, 1997). The curriculum entails a constant creation of the euro-American self-versus the non-west other (Hall S., *The west and the rest; Discourse and Power*, 1996; Neumann I. B., 1999).

By the use of juxtapositional method, it is shown how certain truths are made dominant by suppressing other articulations and explanations. By pairing the dominant Eurocentric imagination of world history in this curriculum with some accounts of events from the global south, representation of which are missing in this book, the hegemonic nature of text is revealed. The major drawback of this text is the missing representation of the context of British colonial rule and the processes of imperial encounters transformed the west and the rest of the world (Capan, 2016; Saurin, 2006). This exclusion of a huge chunk of historical reality is a colossal elimination of the

colonial past (Hall S. , *The west and the rest; Discourse and Power*, 1996; Wolf, 1984; Chakrabartay, *Provincializing Europe, Post Colonial thought and historical difference*, 2000). The resultant discourse cannot help frame a young mind to a more impartial understanding towards theorizing International Relations (Tickner A. , 2003; Smith, *United States and International Relations "Hegemonic country,Hegemonic discipline"* , 2002). The missing representations therefore creates problems of theorizing (Bilgin & Morton, *Historicising representations of 'failed states': beyond the cold war annexation of the social sciences ?*, 2002). This view is supported by revisionist historians (Frankopan, 2016; Hobson J. M., 2004). One such white washing of crucial international relations events in the book, is of that of Bandung conference in the cold war time period (Westad, 2005). It is rather hard to believe as to how a major third world conference whose participants just like the members of League of Nations or United Nations aimed at a restructuring of the 20<sup>th</sup> century world order, gets omitted from the premise of International relations history curriculum. Other international events of modern world like the Asian Relations conferences (1947 & 1949) Arab league and Organization of African Union (OAU) (Acharya, *Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds*, 2014) are excluded. Here the practice of negation-denial of agency to south- is maintained. The modern world historicizing (Bilgin & Morton, 2002) for international relations not only misses the most important course of event of history pertaining to global south but also that of inclusion of other historical narratives which explains the current state of geopolitics (Narain, 2017).

The texts circulated in international media like newspaper, magazines and infotainment websites are dedicated to explain contemporary international social relations. The pedagogy of history also involves other texts besides the central text, the curriculum's book. Teaching history is then complimented with extra reading materials (other text sources mentioned above) to be able to facilitate the student's frame of mind and his/her understanding of the world. Hence any discourse is industriously re-produced in all domains of educating the receptive young learner. This gives us an idea of how important are the representational practices imbedded in these textual materials. In order to understand how representations operate within highly popular texts of information, IGCSE curriculum for history of modern world pertaining to international relations is evaluated here with the help of discourse analysis. The IGCSE curriculum informs a large student body both internationally and within Pakistan, therefore this has been one of the reasonable sources in order to carefully examine the type of text circulating in global knowledge corridors and its effect. The



chapter analyzed for the sake of studying the historical representational practices of global south, is chapter 7 (Baumann, 2013), where the events of Gulf war are the prime subject matter under examination. The inclusion of this chapter aims to give the o-levels student a background of American and British foreign policy interventions in the region.

In order to find out the nature of the underlying signifying practices, Predicate analysis is employed to reveal the nature of the text. Some predicates can be differentiated from one another on the basis of the value they entail (Ahall & Borg, 2012). Emotion predicates, identity predicates, repression predicates, violent predicates etc. Other identities that are not more explicit in expression can be interpreted from the structure of the sentence and meaning-making processes. Also, this study highlights those chunks of paragraphs and texts that might lead the reader to form in his/her mind an ‘Us versus them’ identity conflict, the reader would see her/himself through the eye of the other. Milliken calls this ‘the relational positioning of object spaces creating a frame for understanding or defining subject identities’ (Milliken, *The study of discourse in International Relations: A critique of Research & Methods*, 1999). So, the predicates assign a value to representation of certain discursive spaces: ‘social construction of space and of geopolitical reasoning’ (Milliken, *The study of discourse in International Relations: A critique of Research & Methods*, 1999; Neumann I. B., 1999). Some selected phrases and sentences entailing representation of people from global south are enlisted below. Note the following: predicates (verbs, adverbs, adjectives defining the subject) are underlined, oft repeated words of the text are shown as (abcdefg) and ‘representational phrases’ in underlined italics (*abcdefg*), and repetitive discursive practices are presented in bold letters (**abcdefg**).

1. Pg. 149 “...the land of the Iraq was invaded by the Arabs and its people adopted the language, Arabic and the religion, Islam, *of the invaders*”.
2. Pg. 149 : “ Today Iraqi school children all learn about the ‘revolution of 1920’s’ and how their nationalist heroes **stood up to** foreign, imperialist armies. (Us versus them)
3. Pg. 149: “...the three provinces were combined as a league of nations mandate run by the British. The main reason the British were keen to do this was **oil**”.
4. Pg. 150: “As a young man Saddam had been immersed in the anti-British, anti-western atmosphere of the Arab world in the late 1950s and the 1960s.”

5. Pg. 150: “Saddam was an admirer of Stalin”. Page 151: “Saddam was an admirer of Stalin’s use of terror to enforce submission.”

6. Pg. 150: “The main aim of education was to immunize the young against foreign culture and promote Arab unity and love for order.” (Us versus them)

7-a. Passage from chapter 7, pg. 155: “In the 1970s the shah faced increasing opposition, with the parliament suppressed, the opposition was led by the mullahs (Muslim religious scholars). In the mosques, especially weekly Friday prayers, the mullahs criticized the wealth, luxury and corruption of...They also criticized the Shah’s close relations with the non-Muslim west... The Mullahs encouraged street demonstrations which targeted banks, because of the close ties to the western companies, or cinemas which showed mostly foreign, often sexual films. They were felt to be un-Islamic... The shahs secret police arrested ...including the mullahs. The outstanding leader of the opposition was Ayatollah Khomeini, a leading Muslim Scholar. Like many other Muslim religious leaders, he had been forced into exile by Shah’s government.”

7-b. “Iran’s income from oil’s sales dwindled but Mossadeq remained hugely popular **for standing up to the west** and asserting Iran’s independence.”

8-a. Pg. 157: “The USA, the former ally of the Shah, was seen as the main enemy in Iran and came to be known as the Great Satan.

8-b. Page 157: “Yet, millions in the Muslim world, both Arab and non-Arab, admired Khomeini **for standing up to the west.**”

9. Pg. 158: “They now resorted to firing missiles at Iran’s cities in order to terrorize the civilian population.”

10. Pg.158: “...many of them fired up with the revolutionary enthusiasm, willing to become martyrs-to sacrifice their lives for the Islamic revolution....when you realize I am a martyr’. Iranians believed they were fighting for good against evil.

11. Pg.159: “The Iranian front lines tend to be scenes of chaos and dedication, with turbaned mullahs, rifles slung in their backs, rushing about on colored motor cycles encouraging the troops. Religious slogans are posted everywhere and sometimes reinforcements arrive cheerfully carrying their own coffins a sign of willingness to be martyred.”

12. Pg. 159: “We were led by a prophet-like statesman, Khomeini. So this is how we perceived the war. This was the reason for our overwhelming commitment. *The war could not be separated from our religion.*” (Us vs them)

13. Pg. 160: “The thought of revolutionary Iranians controlling so much of the **oil** in the gulf terrified the Americans as well as most of the Arab states.”

14. Pg. 161: “No doubt terror played a part too, they feared what might happen to their families if they went over to the other side.”

15. Pg.161: “However, it had not succeeded in exporting its revolutionary Shiite brand of Islam.”

16. Pg.161: “Despite the terror exercised by Saddam’s police and army, there were riots and strikes. Some opposition was coordinated in the mosques, which were beyond the control of Saddam’s police...would not dare to attack the mosques because it would intensify the opposition of all Muslims.”

17. Pg.162: “Although women and children were released, there was still widespread condemnation of ***Iraqi behavior***.”

18. Pg. 163: “Saddam would not be able to claim that this was a western crusade against the Arabs and Islam.” Many feared that Iraq might also seize the Saudi **oil** fields, biggest in the world...”

19. Pg. 163: “Our job, our way of life our own ***freedom*** and ***the freedom of friendly countries*** around the world would all suffer if control of the world’s great **oil** reserves fell into the hands of Saddam Hussein.”

20. Pg. 165: “Saddam used violence and terror as ever to control resources and reward his most loyal supporters.”

21. Pg.165: “Saddam allowed the filming of mass suffering, especially for Arab television networks, so that the ***image of Iraq*** as the victim of the greedy uncaring west would be propagated.”

Often repeated words throughout the text of twenty pages of explaining why gulf war event mattered was represented by the most highly repetitious words of ‘oil’ , ‘Islam’, ‘control’, ‘terror’,

‘repression’, ‘Nationalization’, ‘Muslim’ and ‘violence’. Some emotion predicates used are hope, fear and ‘greedy and uncaring’. These can act as pre-suppositional standpoints of the author, because it conveniently portrays underlying motivations for political actions. The practices of presupposition (using words like feared, hoped) by the author constructs a kind of background knowledge readily framed for the student in the text. It also tends to create imitative emotions within the reader. Since naturally, the student derives his initial analytical charge from the text (especially the one he is introduced to in the curriculum). The predicates used in this academic text is constructing a Middle East (its leaders, its rivalries and its history of involvement with the west) for the students. It is construed as a subject with specific traits (religiously strict, nationalists), emotions (hate for west) and actions/reactions (terror/repression, freedom). One can say that countries are represented as ‘persons’ in the text (Drulak, 2006). Oil, geographically located in the Middle East, is presented as a ready-made internationally ‘shared reserve’. The text tacitly indicates to the reader that a legitimate claim to those resources lies with the west, which has to be acquired by the more progressive western bloc: Europe and United States. Securitization of oil becomes a national priority. In a way, it can be observed that the author is apologetic for the imperial adventures of US and UK in the region. The author gives a sketch of the leaders of Iraq and Iran and its people who are ‘anti-west in their sentiments’ and in that prejudice, they have made ‘irrational’ foreign policy decisions, .In the light of that irrationality, the US only had an option of war. By decontextualizing the history, a lens of scientific realism (Hobson J. M., 2012) is inculcated within the student through this kind of text in the student learning IR history on a secondary level of education.

The chapter representing the gulf war is the continuation of some background discourses circulating in academia, newspapers and policy texts about the same topic. This text acts as a preliminary guide to educate the O-levels students and begins to fix meanings. In the absence of truth, background knowledge is built on the basis of presuppositions (Doty R. L., *Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines*, 1993). Another means that constructs reader’s frame of mind are those predicates (underlined above) that assigns some value or attributes to the subjects (persons or things). Within the text attachment of adverbs like ‘revolutionary’, ‘nationalist’, ‘religious’, ‘Islamic’, ‘terrorizing’, ‘controlling’ etc. becomes signs that are attached to certain nouns like Muslims, Iraqis, Iranians, and Arabs etc. The predicates in the text then provides a mosaic of qualities by the

help of which a reader creates a mental visualization of the subjects within the discourse. When reading other texts, the foundational academic representational practices becomes the key to formulate primary conceptualization about the persons or things, which are the subject of texts. For instance Saddam Hussein is represented as a Stalinist; it's mentioned (on page 150,151) that he admired the leader Stalin. In presenting Saddam as an admirer of Stalin, the discourse tends to associate the qualities of Stalin as a fascist/communist leader: ruthlessness, murder, torture to Saddam, equating him with not just Stalin but also his ideology. The sentence 'Saddam used repression to control his people'(p.) becomes a historical fact but presenting it as "Saddam was an admirer of Stalin... he used repression and control..."(p.), the implication of this sentence becomes not just socio-politically significant but a special meaning is retained and fixed in the psyche of the young reader.

Within the text, the reader can find certain oppositional set of dichotomies operating subtly to create and fix the general political interpretation. It is primarily based on a realist tradition in IR (Halliday, 2005). In order to explain the Gulf war largely entails the ambit of the Huntington formula, the clash of civilizations thesis (Orsi, 2018; Mustafa & AlHamdi, 2007). The chapter simplistically exhibits a 'Pro-West versus Anti-west' explanation for the historical events. This Pro and anti-ness towards 'the West' predetermines two things for the reader. First, it outlines the basic and foremost trajectory of analyzing the Gulf war as a 'West versus non-west' problem rather than presenting it within a broader cold war context, or anti-colonial struggle and global socio-economic issues accompanying it. In other words it simplifies and generalizes the explanation of a complex historical event. Second, it represents the other and its geo-political history as something inherently volatile, aggressive and dangerous. It attributes the subjects of discourse with opposite adverbs and adjectives (use of emotional predicates). For example the author is representing the Americans as 'terrified', 'fear' (-full) in comparison to Iraq and Iran. On the other hand, the Iraqi leader Saddam is represented as 'terrorizing' and 'hope' (-full). Following list of words are taken from the text:

- |                |             |
|----------------|-------------|
| • Islamic      | Un-Islamic, |
| • Pro-west     | Anti-west,  |
| • Anti-British | Pro-British |
| • Repression   | freedom     |



of discourse in *International Relations: A critique of Research & Methods*, 1999) which are constantly in interaction and are defined in relation to one another. For instance the passage(p.) says that the Shah was facing an increasing opposition from Iranians, for suppressing the parliament and widespread corruption. In parallel to this mass opposition from common people, mullahs were getting strong in their socio-political position to oppose him. Mullahs in addition to opposing him for corruption were also against his close ties to the west. Shah was a useful ally to the USA in Middle East. The text purports that not only was Shah in trouble because of his diplomatic ties with USA, there was an underlying conflict in the fact that non-West was Muslim , therefore that was not good and that puts USA(in the West) as a threat to Iranian people and Iranian people as a threat to USA and the west. Subtly stating that USA and the rest of the Western countries had a common enemy in people opposing the Shah. So the predicates while constructing the opposition to shah defined the object spaces by identifying mullahs, differentiated the relationship between the west and the Iranians specifically and Muslims generally. Therefore the predicates and the representative practices defined subjects while revealing the contingency between them. In other passages (p.159-p.161) a logic chain is created that defines the Iranian and Iraqi subjects as having something common between them ; being against the west, the British and specifically the USA, tagging them with threat-predicates : aggressors and terrorizers and defining the west with emotional predicates like feared and terrified. From the passages of the text, it seems as if a logic chain of mullah-terror-anti-USA is established for a threat to be identified. Mullah will be automatically then presumed to be linked to terror and US hating. While thinking of terror, anti-western sentiments of the people in Iran and Iraq would constitute the analysis of international politics.

Robert Frisk is a prominent British journalist who has thoroughly covered the Middle East issue in his column articles and books (Frisk, 2006; Frisk, 2008). The author gives out extracts from Frisk's articles as sources for supplementing his explanation of Iranian revolution and Gulf war. Although the author's selection of Frisk's passages commenting on the events of the 1980's shows how the curriculum wants student's understanding of the Middle East issue not just directly informed by straight forward academic text but also molds the student towards critical thinking. The assertion here is that, the selection of Frisk's texts is one sided. The passages, though included to broaden the critical thinking of student, is also facilitating hegemonic view point of larger discourses regarding Middle East. So there is a need to root out the subjugated knowledges; the

kind of truths that stand in opposition or alternative to dominating discourses. In order for the text to be free from political bend all perspectives (truths) on an issue must be given representation. This method will generally clarify how the play of practice in discourse production and its articulation supports a hegemonic political agenda. Given below are some of the chapter passages quoting Frisk on Iran and Iraq, followed by alternative passages by the same author (subjugated knowledge), quoted from the same book sources but presenting a view point about the world politics distinct from the one in the curriculum.

Hegemonic discourse on Middle East I:

Pg. 159: *“My involvement in the war was a reflection of the nature of our Islamic revolution. It was based on a new interpretation of religion—getting involved in the war was a sacred duty. We were led by a prophet like statesman Khomeini so this is how we perceived the war. This was the reason of our overwhelming commitment. The war could not be separated from our religion.”*

Subjugated knowledge regarding Middle East I:

Also Frisk on Middle East and the neo-imperial ways of dealing United States and Britain (pg. 354)

*“We go on dividing and scissoring up the lands and printing more and more of our racial maps and I do wonder if we seriously wish to promote civil war across this part of the world? And you know what? I rather think we do.”*

Hegemonic discourse II:

Pg. 150 of the chapter: Frisk on Iraq

*“...Iraqi Hangmen were dispatching victims to the gallows at the rate of a hundred every six weeks”*

Subjugated knowledge II :

Also Frisk on Iraq, post American occupation: *‘In the darkness of Iraq...Arab society was uprooted, torn apart in an epic of ethnic cleansing. Tens of thousands of Iraqis were now dying in suicide bombings, street-side executes and grand-land terror. While Bush and Blair continued to boast that country’s prospects were improving, it was plunging to state*



*of civil war that Americans were powerless to control. Indeed Syrians – blamed by the United States for encouraging the insurgency- were now suggesting openly that the mass murders and car bombings might be the work of the new Iraqi government, or mercenaries working for the western occupiers- anything to turn Iraqis against each other rather than increase American casualties. In reality, the Iraqi authorities controlled only a few acres of few acres of Green Zone ...” p.1282 (Frisk, 2006)*

*“But it was a dark comparison that Bush and Blair were making, if Saddam’s immorality and wickedness had to be the yard stick against which all our iniquities were judged, what did that say about us?” (ibid)*

*“Pollack accepted that Saddam was no Hitler, but once more Saddam was dressed in Hitler’s clothes-just as Nasser was the Mussolini of Nile during the Suez crisis of 1956 and anyone who opposed was by quiet extension, a Nazi sympathizer.” (p. 1139 ibid)*

Here the subjugated passages of Robert Frisk indicates towards the possibility of silencing and exclusion of political perspectives on the part of the curricular text.

### Chapter 3

With the international neoliberal standards of education, the elite of peripheral countries usually opt for education systems and curriculums prescribed by the west. For the Pakistani elite\*, the popular means for higher education is examination system and curriculum approved by the Cambridge system of education (Ashfaq, 2009). Apart from global borrowing of educational policies (Ali, 2012), it serves the most readily available private sector educational alternative (Menashy, Mandey, & Afridi, 2014; Benz, 2012) in comparison to national boards of examinations i.e FBISE-federal board and other regional provincial boards (Christie, 2012). The Cambridge international is a system of education that is widespread worldwide; its curriculum and academic texts are produced and approved by University of Cambridge international group (Michael O Sullivan , 2018). This segregated system of education has become a pinnacle of excellence for the Pakistani students to get recognition both nationally and internationally. This is true not just for Pakistan but generally for all the former colonial countries adopting this system of instruction for the lack of a more robust, indigenously based pedagogic systems. In such conditions, the international standard practices of education and academic procedures becomes a blue print to be followed by other ‘developing countries’ or in some cases giving them space in private education sector. Particularly the curriculum itself becomes the key aspect of promoting the international agenda (Leask, 2015). Therefore, the texts introduced and supported by such international examination systems maintains in a way a superior position or ‘authority’ over other texts which could have been included in academic discourse.

There are several reasons for educationists to believe that. As discussed in chapter 1, the global system of education is not free from intellectual imperialism, the knowledge corridors are heavily controlled by the west. The realization that education curriculums needs to be revised in order to be more inclusive about the third world countries and address their representational practices regarding the global south is not new, since the 1970s the academia produced scholarship which was all for internalizing the curriculums. However, the problems started with the ‘representation’ and selective bias of historicizing. At the turn of the century, it became clear that platforms of international education were promoting highly Eurocentric texts to be included in curriculums and terming them ‘global’ or ‘international’ without scrutinizing the text. Today the research has shifted towards improvement of representational practices in curriculums and some stress upon a

post-colonial approach towards education (Coloma, 2009; Tickley, 1999; Lavia, Lingard, & Rizvi, 2006) rather than a neoliberal internationalist approach to higher education (Ferguson, 2009; Moolji S. K., 2014; Harris, Barker, & Lilley, 2016). The political lineage of such curricular practices have been shown by the works of transnational educational practices of neo-liberal feminist scholarship (Moolji S. K., *Forging the ideal educated girl Production of desirable subjects in South Asia*, 2018). Along with these reforms, a major theoretical shift came when critical theorists (Apple et al) started inspecting the educational discourses and its effects on understanding social reality.

The issue of Euro-American centrality however does not only depend on curriculums approved by international examination systems but also depends on international schools, colleges, universities and the entire pedagogical staff. (Stein, 2017) A record of a testimony of a student iterates "...because everything I was taught was delivered in a western point of view since all the teachers were from the west" (Hayden & Thompson, 1997). The purpose for the international education is not just education itself, it is the adoption of a particular 'international attitude'. It can be said that a globalization of a set of norms and values is required for the students to adopt and cultivate a form of 'international perspective'. This special perspective adopted by all students either enrolled in international schools or those who follow curriculums approved by international examination boards instills a kind of homogeneity (or modernity) international schooling is aiming for. From this we can understand one thing: that a student is being injected with a particular kind of discourse with which s/he can govern her/himself, which is not a problem itself since education serves to guide a student and formulates student's intellect. The problem lies in the hegemonic enterprises in academia that reproduces their scholarly views into discourses (books, scholar papers etc.) and are then included in curriculums because of their popularity and global recognition. It's established that the more advanced, and recognized knowledge systems are located in west. By virtue of this the same knowledge is available in textbooks as well. Though the academic texts are not as direct as policy texts therefore assessing them critically is not an easy task. But by assessing the ideological effects of discourses one can arrive at identifying certain flaws in the nature of single texts (important books) and collective set of texts (entire curriculum of higher education, additional readings assigned with the books etc). For the purposes of this study, I stress on the representation practices in former.

Labelling practices and representational practices in the curricular course serves as background knowledge with which the student assesses a political phenomenon. The presentation of various discourses squeezed into a single text book is a paramount task itself, but the representation of reality of any historical event can be kept minimally biased and free from ideological tilt. The nature of a policy text is more direct and straightforward but in order to read between the lines of an academic text one has to observe the underlying representations and observe what signifying practices form the base of the text. The definitive nature of words or ‘labels’ that can be defined as ‘discursively repetitive vocabulary used to limit our understanding’. For instance in the chapter the repetitive use of words like ‘terror’ or ‘west-hating’ becomes characteristics through which Iran and Iraq are judged. The inclusion of the chapter on gulf war is done in such a way that it explains to the student roughly this: ‘Next immediate threat to the world after Communists are (Muslim) terrorists with Oil’. As an IR history text, this notion itself is not problematic rather the subject framing and creation of a stereotype is. The language of history, foreign policy texts or international relations, all employs certain use of words, metaphors and personifications that distorts the understanding of politics (Twardzisz, 2013). It is through labels that the enemy / other is *being* constructed (Brassett, 2008; Herschinger, 2012). What is worst is that they are clustered together under one label that generally describes all.

In the entire curriculum the general focus on global south: Africa, Asia, South East Asia gets no mention, but Iran and Iraq have been cherry picked to define the global south and Middle East. It has also managed to set a fixed over-view of Muslim states and labeled them as natural enemies of the US and the west in general<sup>4</sup>. The individual cognition combined with curriculum of dislocation explains how the student remains permanently rooted away from ground realities (Wang & Zheng, 2017). International curriculums render post-colonial students apolitical, dislocated from historical and political processes; this is called the curriculum of dislocation (Beltran, 2018). As discussed before, the curriculum and its content *defines* or *positions* the subject loci. The o-levels’ student through such curricular discourses recognizes the ‘self’. As inscribed in chapter 1, the student forms the ‘other’ of the discourse as his/ her personal ‘other’. The post-colonial self is remodeled by all the decontextualized, ahistorical frame of history curriculum. In

---

<sup>4</sup> Interestingly this is done casually. No background is presented for the student as to explain what constitutes the west or east. It is assumed that a student should think in dichotomous binaries: east/west north/south Muslim/atheist etc or through text, the student is lead to think this way.

addition to this, according to Beltran, the experience it tends to create is detached from the reality of the post-colonial student; he is more aware of the European experience rather than his own native struggles and indigenous identity. From an international perspective the subject positioning of O-levels student is done slightly differently. He is positioned as an important node in a network of global elite. Not just that but the subject (the o-levels student)

This psycho-sociological conundrum tends to place modernity in opposition to the colonial experience. The international system of education then functions to define and position the o-level students as modern as opposed to non-o-level students which when not given:

“...process of making those who are modern (the west, industrialized, the developed world) and those who are not...of those who can be citizens of the world (global citizens, international school students, cosmopolitan citizens) and those who are not...”

When students cannot make connections to national histories ...positioning of student.

According to Ty Solomon, there is a constant need or what he terms as desire of a subject to identify with something concrete. This urge to identify with something, student searches for it within the discourse provided to him/her. . . If the desire of identifying isn't fulfilled there is another problem. The student cannot draw identification from indigenous raw materials<sup>5</sup> since he/she cannot match it with the discourse of curriculum he learns at school (Beltran, 2018). The elite strata of education in peripheral states is so detached and segregated from the socio-cultural reality of the society that he cannot identify himself neither in his society nor within the discourse of history books.

On the other hand, this identification issue has also been explained by Ty Solomon. While explaining the Lacan's understanding of identity; it asserts that the human subjectivity which is based on symbols (the symbolic realm), images (imaginary) and reality (the Real) (p30). He explains the identification process by giving an example of early child development when he sees an image in mirror and tries to understand the 'whole' of his existence and tries to make sense of reality. He assumes an image for himself. If the bodily functions are disjointed then it is reflected in the alienated experiences of the self, therefore the assumed image is not 'full'. The end result of

---

<sup>5</sup> By raw materials it is meant native politics, indigenous heroes, local events, religion etc which forms the basis of cultural settings within a society.

which is that the subject is decentered. Keeping this Lacanian view of human subjectivity, the situation of O-levels student is assessed. The curriculum of history acts as a mirror. It functions to give a picture of reality. He would draw out identification through the discourse of curriculum by mirroring himself in the representations and images of the book. The failure to establish a link between the history curriculum taught at school and grounded settings of society the student navigates in, creates a misrecognition, 'where the self finds itself at the place of the other'. He/ she cannot find himself/herself in the symbolic order (the language that gives recognition to his/her identity). This was exactly the experience of Beltran when she associated her image with the British elite rather than her own natives.

The reason Beltran's work is crucial for understanding this curriculum molding the post-colonial student is because she has experienced the dislocation herself. Through her narrative story, she enumerates the effects of those problems of curriculum which has been the central point of this research. The feeling of indifference towards fellow citizens, a disjointed emotion from the political and social happenings in local community, becoming apolitical. While there has been a plethora of literature reflecting on the new educational trends of internationalization in the era of globalization she iterates that within a global community, the positioning of a subject is highly critical. Because of that positioning the subject draws his/her identity. As a Colombian, she did not align herself with other Colombians rather she posited herself as British: "Geographically, I was member of underdeveloped nations, but I did not feel poor or unfortunate...". This inability to feel is desensitization that can easily develop in the elites of the society getting educated.

---

## **Conclusion**

The power over the people has many domains and means of control. The governance of the subjects is brought about not just by institutions but by means of controlling their way of thinking and restricting their intellectual options. This circulation of power, which accompanies the truth, can give rise to governmentality of bodies through intellectual imperialism. The study above demonstrates this form of subjective control of groups of individuals that can materialize into polarization of societies. With education of elites differing in variations from ones schooled indigenously, the society plunges into a divide of narrative over politics. This is not uncommon but here the underlying mechanism has been explained via academic dependence. The stratification of societies based on economic and socio-cultural resources has long been studied and scrutinized but the control of intellectual domain by few power centers in west calls into question the individual freedom and thinking capacities by which he/she can decipher the reality of societies they inhabit. The primary means of control comes from education and reformers need to address these issues of historical biases and misrepresentations. The impact of these academic practices in history texts not just distorts the image of history itself but also the accompanying fields of scholarship, the primarily one being International Relations. If the underlying practices of signification and Euro-centricity of text is not addressed the analytical imagination of academic scholarship will be subjected to racial stereotypes, religious prejudices and inclined to disregard post-colonial scholarship as a viable means of bringing about an innovative change in academic texts.

## References

- Ismael , T. Y., & Ismael, J. (2005). Whither Iraq ? Beyond Saddam Sanctions and occupation. *Third World Quaterly*, 609-629.
- Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds. *International Studies Quaterly*, 1-13.
- Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies. *International Studies Quaterly*, 647-659.
- Adler-Nissen, R. (2013). *Bourdieu in International Relations*. London & NewYork: Routledge .
- Agnew, J. (2007). Know-Where: Geographies of Knowledge of Geographies. *International Political Sociology*, 138-148.
- Ahall, L., & Borg, S. (2012). Predication, Presupposition and Subject-positioning. In L. Shepherd, *Critical Approaches to security: An introduction to Theories and Methods* (pp. 196-207). London & New York: Routledge .
- Akena, F. A. (2009). Critical Analysis of the Production of Western Knowledge and Its Implications forIndigenous Knowledge and Decolonization. *Journal of Black studies*, 599-619.
- Alataas, S. F. (2011). academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences . *current sociology*, 599-613.
- Alatas, S. F. (1972). The captive mind in development studies. *international social science journal*, 691-700.
- Alatas, S. F. (1993). On the Indigenization of Academic Discourse. *alternatives; global, local, political*, 307-338.
- Alatas, S. F. (2000). An Introduction to the Idea of Alternative Discourses. *South East Asian Journal of social sciences*, 1-12.
- Alatas, S. F. (2006). *alternative discourses in asian social sciences: responses to eurocentricism*. New Delhi: Thousand Oaks : Sage Publications.



- Alatas, S. F. (2011). academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *current sociology*, 599-613.
- Alatas, S. H. (1974). Captive Mind and the creative development . *International Social Science journal*, 691-700.
- Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems. *South East Asian Journal of Social Science*, 23-45.
- Alatas, S. H. (2016, august 1). Captive Mind. *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Jhon Wiley & Sons.
- Ali, S. (2012). Education policy borrowing in Pakistan: Public-Private Partnership. In Y. A. Manthri , & G. Donn, *Education in the broader Middle East: Borrowing a baroque arsenal* (pp. 23-40). Oxford.
- Allender, T. (2010). Anglican evangelism in North India and the Punjabi missionary classroom: the failure to educate 'the masses', 1860-77. *History of Education*, 273-288.
- Allender, T. (2010). Understanding education and India: new turns in post colonial scholarships. *History of Education: Journal of History of Education Society*, 281-88.
- Alvares, C. (2011). A Critique of Eurocentric Social Science and the Question of Alternatives. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 72-81.
- Arfi, B. (2012). *Re-Thinking International Relations Theory Via Deconstruction*. London : Routledge .
- Aroujo, M., & Maeso, S. R. (2012). History textbooks, racism and the critique of Eurocentrism: beyond rectification or compensation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1266-1286.
- Ashfaq, U. (2009). A Study Of The Rapid Growth Of “O” And “A” Levels Of Education In Pakistan. *Contemporary Issues in Educational Research*, 75-79.
- Ashley, R. (1988). Untying the sovereign state: a double reading of the anarchy problematique. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 227-.
- Bannet, K. (2013). English as a Lingua Franca in Academia; Combating Epistemicide through Translator Training. *Combating Epistemicide through Translator Training*, 169-193.

- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The post-colonial ,moment in security studies. *International Studies*, 329-352.
- Bartle, G. (2006). The role of the British and Foreign School Society in elementary education in India and the East Indies 1813- 75. *History of Education*, 17-33.
- Baumann, M. S. (2013). Why did events in the Gulf Matter, c1970-2000. In B. Walsh, *Modern World History* (pp. 147-167). London: Hodder Education .
- Beigel, F. (2015). Academic Dependency. *Alternautas*, 60-62.
- Bell, D. (2009). Writing the world: Disciplinary History and Beyond. *International Affairs*, 3-22.
- Bellenoit, H. J. (2016). *Missionary education and empire in late colonial India, 1860-1920*. London: Routledge.
- Beltran, A. C. (2018). The nowhere of global curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry* , 273-292.
- Bently, J. H. (2005). Myths, Wagers, and Some Moral Implications of World History. *Journal of World History*, 51-82.
- Benz, A. (2012). The Crisis of School Education in Pakistan: of Government's Failure and New Hopes in Governing Private Education Sector. *Internationales Asienforum*, 223-244.
- Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking past 'Western' IR. *Third World Quaterly*, 5-23.
- Bilgin, P. (2009). The International Political "Sociology of a Not So International Discipline". *International Political Sociology*, 338-342.
- Bilgin, P. (2016, june 21). *Do IR scholars engage with the same world?* Retrieved from Political Studies Association Blog: <https://www.psa.ac.uk/psa/news/do-ir-scholars-engage-same-world>
- Bilgin, P. (2016). How to remedy Eurocentrism in IR? A complement and a challenge for The Global Transformation. *International Theory*, 492-501.
- Bilgin, P., & Morton, A. D. (2002). Historicising representations of 'failed states': Beyond the cold-war annexation of the social sciences? *Third World Quaterly*, 55-80.

- Bilgin, P., & Tanrisever, O. F. (2009). A telling story of IR in the periphery: telling Turkey about the world, telling the world about Turkey. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 147-179.
- Blaut, J. M. (1993). *Colonizer's Model of the World; Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Borg, S., & Åhäll, L. (2012). Predication, presupposition and subject positioning. In L. Shepherd, *Approaches to Critical Security: An Introduction to theory and methods*. Routledge.
- Bowden, B. (2009). *The Empire of Civilization, the Evolution of Imperial Idea*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Brassett, J. (2008). Cosmopolitanism vs. Terrorism? Discourses of Ethical Possibility Before and After 7/7. *Millinium Journal of International Studies*, 311-338.
- Brown, C. (2001). *Understanding International Relations*. Macmillan International Higher Education .
- Brown, V. (2011, February 27). *The Reflectivist Critique of Positivist IR Theory*. Retrieved from E-International Relations Students: <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/02/27/the-reflectivist-critique-of-positivist-ir-theory/>
- Burchell, G., Gordin, C., & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault Effect; Studies in governmentality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Burman, E. (2016). Fanon and the child: Pedagogies of subjectification and transformation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 265=285.
- Butler, J. (2006). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge .
- Buzan, B. a. (2015). *The Global Transformation: History, Modernity and Making of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing Security: united States Foriegn Policy and Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Campbell, D. (1998). *writing security*. Minnesota university press.
- Canagarajah, S. (1996). Nondiscursive" requirements in academic publishing, material resources of periphery scholars, and the politics of knowledge production. *Written Communication*, 435-472.
- Capan, Z. G. (2016). Decolonizing International Relations. *Third World Quaterly*, 1-16.
- Chakrabartay, D. (1992). Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts? *Representations*, 1-22.
- Chakrabartay, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe, Post Colonial thought and historical difference*. New Jersey : Princeton University Press.
- Christie, T. (2012). Variation in standards in Pakistani school examination boards. *In Search of Relevance and Sustainability of Educational Change : An International Conference at Aga Khan University Institute for Educational Development*, (pp. 24-31). Karachi: Agha Khan University .
- Chun, A. (2008). The post colonial alien in us all; Identity in the global division of Intellectual labour . *positions*, 689-710.
- Coloma, R. S. (2009). *Postcolonial Challenges in Education*. London: Peter Lang.
- Connell, R., & Dados, N. (2014). Where in the world does neoliberalism come from? The market agenda in southern perspective. *Theory and Society*, 117-138.
- Conrad, J. (2018). The Big History Project and colonizing knowledges in world history curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1-20.
- Cooper, F., & Burnak, J. (2019). Empires after 1919: old, new, transformed. *International Affairs*, 81-100.
- Dabashi, H. (2009). *Post-Orientalism, Knowledge and Power in times of terror* . New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Dabashi, H. (2015). *Can Non-Europeans Think?* London: Zed Books .
- Derrida, J., & Spivak, G. (1997). *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: John Hopkin's University Press.

- Dessler, D. (1999). Constructivism within a Positivist Social Science. *Review of International Studies* , 123-137.
- Dirlik, A. (1999). Is There History after Eurocentrism?: Globalism, Postcolonialism, and the. *Cultural Critique* , 1-39.
- Dodson, M. S. (2007). *Orientalism, Empire and National Culture (India: 1770-1880)* (Vols. Cambridge Imperial and Post-Colonial Studies Series). Hampshire & New York: Palgrave McMillan.
- Doty, R. L. (1993). Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines. *International Studies Quarterly*, 297-320.
- Doty, R. L. (1996). *Imperial encounters: The politics of representation in North-South Relations*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Drulak, P. (2006). Motion, Container and Equilibrium: Metaphors in the Discourse about European Integration . *European Journal of International Relations*, 499-531.
- Duffler, J., & Frey, M. (2011). *Elites and Decolonization in the 20th century*. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Dunn, K. C. (2008). Historical Representations. In D. Prakash, & A. Klotz , *Qualitative Methods in International relations A pluralist Guide* (pp. 78-92). London: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Eduardo, I. C. (2006). 'Organization Studies and Epistemic Coloniality in Latin America, thinking otherness from the margins. *organizations*, 463-88.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development; The making unmaking of the third world*. New Jersey : Princeton University.
- Eun, Y.-S. (2016). To what extent is post-positivism 'practised' in International Relations? Evidence from China and USA. *International Political Science Review*, 593-601.
- Evera, S. V. (1990). Why Europe Matters, Why the third world doesn't; American Grand strategy after the Cold war . *Journal of Strategic studies*, 1-51.
- Fanon, F. (2004). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Groove Press.

- Ferguson, J. (2009). The Uses of Neoliberalism. *The Author's Journal Compilation*, 166-184.
- Fierke, K. M. (2002). Links across the Abyss: Language and Logic in International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 331-354.
- Foucault, M. (1974). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge selected interviews and other writings 1972-77*. (C. Gordon, Ed.) New York: Pantheon Publishers.
- Frank, A. G. (1992). Third World War: A political economy of Gulf war and the new world order. *Third World Quarterly*, 267-282.
- Frankopan, P. (2016). *Silk Roads: A New History of the World*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Frisk, R. (2006). *The great war for civilisation: The conquest of the Middle East*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Frisk, R. (2008). *The Age Of The Warrior: Selected Essays*. London: Harper Collins.
- Galtung, J. (1971). Structural theory of imperialism . *Journal of peace research*, 81-117.
- Galtung, J. (1980). "A Structural Theory of Imperialism"- Ten Years Later. *Millinium - Journal of International Studies*, 181-196.
- Ghosh, S. C. (1995). Bentinck, Macaulay and the introduction of English education in India. *History of Education*, 17-24.
- Go, J. (2013). Decolonizing Bourdieu: Colonial and Postcolonial Theory in Pierre Bourdieu's Early Work. *Sociological theory*, 49-74.
- Grosfeugal, R. (2012). Between Liberal Multiculturalism, Identity Politics, Disciplinary Colonization and Decolonial Epistemologies. *Human architecture : Journal of the sociology of self knowledge* , 81-90.
- Grosfoguel, R., Cohen, J., & Boidin, C. (2012). Introduction: From university to Pluriversity A Decolonial Approach to the Present Crisis of Western Universities. *Human architecture : Journal of the sociology of self-knowledge*, 1-6.

- Gunaratne, S. A. (2009). Globalization: A Non-Western Perspective: The Bias of Social Science/Communication Oligopoly. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 60-82.
- Hall, C. (2008). Making colonial subjects: education in the age of empire. *History of Education*, 773-787.
- Hall, S. (1996). The west and the rest; Discourse and Power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, & K. Thompson, *Modernity: an Introduction to Modern Societies* (pp. 184-227). Maldin, MA Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hall, S. (2009). Signification, representation, ideology: Althusser and the post- structuralist debates. *Critical Studies in Mass communication*, 91-114.
- Halliday, F. (2005). *Middle East in International Relations; power, politics and Ideology* . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Harris , N., Barker, M., & Lilley, K. (2016). The Global Citizen Conceptualized: Acoomodating Ambiguity. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1-16.
- Hayden , M. C., & Thompson, J. J. (1997). Student Perspectives on International Education: A European Dimension. *Oxford Review of Education*, 459-478.
- Herschinger, E. (2012). ‘Hell Is the Other’: Conceptualising Hegemony and Identity through Discourse Theory. *Millinium Journal of International Relations*, 65-90.
- Hilton, B. T. (2011). Frantz Fanon and Colonialism: A Psychology of Oppression. *Journal of Scientific Psychology*, 45-59.
- Hira, S. (2012). Decolonizing the Mind: The Case of the Netherlands,. *Human Architecture: Journal of sociology of self knowledge* , 53-68.
- Hobson, J. M. (2004). *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization*. Newyork: Cambridge University press.
- Hobson, J. M. (2012). *Eurocentric conception of world politic; western international theory 1760-2010*. Cambridge.

- Hopkins, A. G. (2017). Globalization and Decolonization. *The journal of Imperial and common wealth history*, 729-745.
- Hunt, A., & Pervis, T. (1993). Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology... *The British Journal of Sociology*, 473-499.
- Hunt, T., & Perves , A. (1993). Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology... *The British Journal of Sociology*, 473-499.
- Hwami, M. (2016). Frantz Fanon and the problematic of decolonization: perspectives on Zimbabwe. *African Identity*, 19-37.
- Idemudia, P. E. (2011). Identity, Representation, and Knowledge Production. In G. J. Dei, *Indigenous Philosophies and Critical Education: A READER* (pp. 142-156). Peter Lang.
- Jackson, P. A. (2017). The Neo-Liberal University and Global Immobility of Theories . In A. K. Hornidge, & K. Mielke, *Area Studies at Cross Roads ; knowledge production after the mobility turn* (pp. 27-42). Palgrave Mcmillan .
- Johnson, A. T., & Hirt, J. B. (2012). Universities, dependency and the market: innovative lessons from Kenya. *Comapre: A Journal of Comparitive and International Education*, 230-251.
- Keim, W. (2011). Counterhegemonic currents and internationalization of sociology: Theoretical reflections and an empirical example. *International Sociology*, 123-145.
- Kempner, K. (1998). Post-modernizing education in the periphery and in the core . *International Education Review* , 441-446.
- Kenny, M., & Germain, R. D. (1998). Engaging Gramsci: international relations, theory and the new Gramscians. *Review of International Studies*, 3-21.
- Khoja-Molji, S. (2015). Suturing Together Girls and Education: An Investigation Into the Social (Re)Production of Girls' Education as a Hegemonic Ideology. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education. Studies of Migration, Integration, Equity, and Cultural Survival*, 87-107.
- Koukkanen, R. (2008). *Reshaping the University : Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*. UBC Press.



- Lavia, J., Lingard, B., & Rizvi, F. (2006). Postcolonialism and education: negotiating a contested terrain. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 249-262.
- Lawson, G. (2006). The promise of historical sociology in International Relations. *International Studies Review*, 397-432.
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing Curriculum*. Oxon: Routledge .
- Leffler, M. P. (2003). 9/11 past and future of american foreign policy. *International Affairs*, 1046-1063.
- Leite, D. (2010). Brazilian higher education from a post colonial Perspective. *Globalization, societies and Education*, 219-223.
- Louie, D. W., Hanson, A. J., Ottman, J., & Pratt, Y. P. (2017). Applying Indigenizing Principles of Decolonizing Methodologies in University Classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 16-33.
- Maeso, S. R., & Araújo, M. (2015). *Eurocentrism, Racism and Knowledge, Debates on History and Power in Europe and the Americas*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Matin, K. (2012). Redeeming the universal: Postcolonialism and the inner life of Eurocentrism. *European Journal of International Relations*, 353-377.
- Medina, L. R. (2014). *Centers and Peripheries in Knowledge Production*. New York: Routledge.
- Memmi, A. (1974). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. London: Souvenir Press.
- Menashy, F., Mandey, K., & Afridi, M. (2014). The Role of World Bank in the Private Provision of Schooling in Pakistan. In G. Walford, S. L. Robertson, & I. Macpherson, *Education, Privatisation and Social Justice: Case Studies from Africa, South Asia and South East Asia* (pp. 239-278). London: Oxford: Symposium books.
- Merlainen, S., Tienari, J., Davies, A., & Thomas, R. (2008). Hegemonic Academic Practices: Experiences of Publishing from Periphery. *Organizations (Connexions)*, 629-642.
- Mgbeoji, I. (2006). The Civilised Self and the Barbaric Other: Imperial Delusions of Order and the Challenges of Human Security. *Third World Quarterly*, 855-869.

- Michael O Sullivan . (2018). *The 2018 Cambridge International Global Education Census*. Retrieved from Cambridge International: <https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/Images/417448-overview-brochure.pdf>
- Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local Histories/Global Designs ; Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border thinking* . New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. (2002). The Enduring Enchantment: ( or the epistemic privileg of modernity and where to go from here) . *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 927-954.
- Mignolo, W. (2002). The geopolitics of Knowledge and Colonial Difference . *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 57-96.
- Mignolo, W. (2009). Epistemic Disobedience; Independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 1-23.
- Milliken, J. (1999). The Study of Discourse in International Relations:: A Critique of Research and Methods. *Millinicum* , 225-254.
- Moolji, S. K. (2014). Producing neoliberal citizens: Critical reflections on Human rights education in Pakistan. *Gender & Education*, 103-118.
- Moolji, S. K. (2015). (De)(Re)Territorialization of Muslims Collectivities. *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, 539-556.
- Moolji, S. K. (2017). The Making of Humans and Their Others in and through Transnational Human Rights Advocacy: Exploring the cases of Mukhtara Mai and Malala Yousafzai. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 377-402.
- Moolji, S. K. (2018). *Forging the ideal educated girl : the production of desirable subjects in muslim south asia*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Mustafa, M. M., & AlHamdi, M. T. (2007). Political Islam, Clash of Civilizations, U.S. Dominance and Arab Support of Attacks on America: A Test of a Hierarchical Model. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 723-736.
- Narain, S. (2017). Knowledge Production, Pedagogy and Research in IR: Perspectives from India. *Journal of International and Global Studies*, 19-33.

- Neumann, I. (2008). Discourse Analysis. In A. Klotz, & D. Prakash, *Qualitative methods in International Relations* (p. 267). Hampshire & Newyork: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Neumann, I. B. (1999). *Uses of the Other- The East in European identity formation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Orsi, D. (2018, April 15). *The 'Clash of Civilizations' and Realism in International Political Thought*. Retrieved from E-International Relations Students: <https://www.e-ir.info/2018/04/15/the-clash-of-civilizations-and-realism-in-international-political-thought/>
- Pals, P. (1997). The Anthropology of Colonialism: Culture, History, and the Emergence of Western Governmentality. *Annual Review of Anthropology* , 163-183.
- Parker, I. (1990). Discourse: Definitions and contradictions. . *Philosophical Psychology*, 187-204.
- Pels, P. (1997). The anthropology of culture, history and emergence of western governmentality. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 163-83.
- Peters, M. A. (2017). Manifesto for the postcolonial university. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 142-148.
- Peterson, S., Tierney, M. J., Oaks, A., & Maliniak, D. (2011). International Relations in the US Academy. *International Studies Quaterly*, 437-464.
- Phillips, L. J., & Jørgensen , M. (2002). Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory. In L. J. Phillips, & M. Jørgensen, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (pp. 24-59). London: Sage.
- Phillipson, R. (1997). Realities and Myths of Linguistic Imperialism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 238-248.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of Neoliberal Empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1-43.
- Phillipson, R. (2010). *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. New York: Routledge.
- Phillipson, R. (2018). Linguistic Imperialism. *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1-7.

- Pupala, B., & Kaščák, O. (2011). Governmentality – Neoliberalism Education- the risk perspective. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 145-60.
- Qin, Y. (2018). A Multiverse of Knowledge: Cultures and IR Theories. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 415-434.
- Raju, C. K. (2011). Ending Academic Imperialism: a Beginning. *Centre for Studies in Civilization*, 1-27.
- Rao, P. V. (2014). *New perspectives in the history of Indian education*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.
- Rathburn, B. (2012). Politics and Paradigm Preferences: The Implicit Ideology of International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 607-622.
- Rehman, J. (2013). Louis Althusser: Ideological State-Apparatuses and Subjection. In J. Rehman, *Theories of Ideology: The Powers of Alienation and Subjection* (pp. 148-179). London: Brill.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). Discourse and Racism: European Perspectives. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 175-199.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon books.
- Sullivan, S., & Tuana, N. (2007). *Race and Epistemology of Ignorance*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Saunders, K. (2002). *Feminist Post-Development Thought; rethinking modernity, post-colonialism and representation*. Chicago: university of chicago press.
- Saurin, J. (2006). International Relations as the imperial illusion; or the need to decolonize IR. In G. B. Jones, *Decolonizing International Relations* (pp. 23-42). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield publications.
- Saussure, F. (1983). *Course in General Linguistics*. London: Duckworth.
- Savage, G. (2017). Neoliberalism. Education and Curriculum.
- Scott, D. (1995). Colonial Governmentality. *Duke University Press*, 191-220.

- Selvaratnam, V. (1988). Higher education co-operation and Western dominance and knowledge creation flow in third world countries. *Higher Education*, 41-68.
- Shukla, S. (1996). From Pre-Colonial to Post-Colonial: Educational Transitions in Southern Asia. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 1344-1349.
- Singler, S. (2016, May 3). *Examining the Dynamics of Decolonisation in Fanon's The Wretched of the Earth*. Retrieved from E-International Relations: <https://www.e-ir.info/2016/05/03/examining-the-dynamics-of-decolonisation-in-fanons-the-wretched-of-the-earth/>
- Slater, D. (2004). *Geopolitics and the Post colonial; Rethinking North-South Relations*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Slater, M. B. (2002). *Barbarians and Civilizations in International Relations*. London: Pluto Books.
- Small, S. (2012, January 1). Slavery, Colonialism and their Legacy in the Eurocentricity University: the case of Britain and Netherlands. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, pp. 69-80.
- Smith, S. (2002). The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: "Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline". *International Studies Review*, 67-85.
- Smith, S., Booth, K., & Zalewski, M. (1996). *International theory: positivism and beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Snider, D., & Beattie, P. (2019). Knowledge in International Relations: Susceptibilities to Motivated Reasoning Among Experts and Non-Experts. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 173-191.
- Solomon, T. (2015). *The politics of subjectivity in American foreign policy discourses*. University of Michigan Press.
- Soreanu, R. (2010). Feminist Creativities and the Disciplinary Imaginary of International Relations. *International Political Sociology*, 380-400.

- Staunæs, D. (2003). Where have all the subjects gone? Bringing together the concepts of intersectionality and subjectification. *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender*, 101-110.
- Stein, S. (2017). The Persistent Contesting Coloniality. Challenges of Addressing Epistemic Dominance in Higher Education: Considering the Case of Curriculum Internationalization. *Comparative Education Review*, s25-s50.
- Taras, R., Peterson, B., Malinova, O., & Feklyunina, V. (2013). *Russia's Identity in international relations*. Oxan: Routledge .
- Thiong'o, N. w. (1998). Decolonising the Mind. *Diogenese*, 101-104.
- Tickley, L. (1999). Postcolonialism and Comparative Education. *International Review of Education*, 603-631.
- Tickner, A. (2003). Seeing IR differently: Notes from the third world. *Millinnium: Journal of International Studies*, 295-324.
- Tickner, A. B. (2003). Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World. *Millineum: Journal of International Studies*, 295-324.
- Tickner, A. B. (2013). Core, periphery and (neo)imperialist International Relations. *European Journal of International Reelations*, 627-646.
- Tikly, L. (1999). Postcolonialism and Comparative Education. *International Review of Education*, 603-621.
- Tikly, L. (2001). Globalisation and Education in the Postcolonial World: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Comparitive Education*, 151-171.
- Townshed, J. (2004). Laclau and Mouffe's Hegemonic Project: The Story So Far. *Political Studies Association*, 269-288.
- Twardzisz, P. (2013). *The language of Interstate Relations, In search of Personification*. London: Palgarve Mcmillan .

- Vanessa , V. d., Stein, S., Hunt, D., & Ahenakew, C. (2015). Mapping interpretations of decolonization in higher Education. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 21-40.
- Wacquant, L., & Bourdieu, P. (1999). On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason. *Theory Culture and Society*, 41-58.
- Waheed, A. W. (2019, March 16). *Pakistan and the International Politics of Labeling the States*. Lahore, Pakistan: Pakistan Politico (Magazine).
- Walters, W. (2012). *Governmentality Critical Encounters*. London: Routledge.
- Walters, W., & Larner, W. (2004). *Global governmentality; Governing Global Spaces*. New York: Routledge.
- Wang, M., & Zheng, X. (2017). Embodied cognition and curriculum construction. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 217-228.
- Watson, K. (1985). Dependence or independence in Education? Two cases from pots colonial South East Asia. *International Journal of Educational Development* , 83-94.
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*, 391-425.
- Westad, O. A. (2005). *Global Cold War Third world interventions and the making of our times*. Newyork: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitehead, C. (2006). The medium of instruction in British Colonial education: a case of cultural imperialism or enlightened paternalism? *Journal of History of Education Society*, 1-15.
- Wodak, R., & Reisegl, M. (2008). Discourse and racism. In H. E. Hamilton, D. Tannen, & D. Schiffrin, *Hand book of discourse analysis* (p. 872). Maldin: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wöhre, V., Çelik, E., & Keim, W. (2016). *Global Knowledge Production in the Social Sciences: Made in Circulation*. NewYork: Routledge.
- Wolf, E. (1984). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Woolf, E. (1982). *People without history*. Berkley : Universiry of California Press.

Zaidi, S. M. (2011). Polarisation of social studies textbooks in Pakistan. *The Curriculum Journal*, 43-59.