

Intellectual Imperialism; a Case Study of Muslim representation in IGCSE History Books

Azka Durrani, Lecturer, Department of Peace and Conflict studies, NUML, Islamabad

Email: azkadurrani@numl.edu.pk

Abstract:

This article explores the discursive base of the IGCSE O-level's world history curriculum taught across the world, by combining the textual examination of the curriculum texts with patterns of historic and contemporary systematic exclusions of alternative truths. The article employs Jennifer Milliken's methodological insights on discourse analysis to explain how discourse operates as a background knowledge for the creation of common sense in students regarding world history in general and of international relations in particular. The article's central aim is to expand on the nature and operationalization of knowledge production processes embedded within the global North-South divide. The article's focus lies particularly on the curricular representation of Muslims, how they are characterized and signified in link to 'terrorism' and 'west hating' and how that depiction is linked further to terrorism which leads to a contorted/veiled interpretation of 'Muslim' identity in academic corridors. To this end, a discourse analysis of the curriculum devised for the subject of World History for international students of the Cambridge education system permits an effective evaluation of how representations operate within highly popular texts of information and the dominant discourse is uncritically assimilated and circulated worldwide.

Key words: Discourse Analysis, IGCSE/Cambridge Curriculum, world history education, Muslim representation

Introduction

“Imperialism frames the indigenous experience”- (Smith L. T., 1999)

Texts or discourses generated through knowledge produced in the global North result in the construction of representational identities of the global South, a circumstance which poses a peculiar coterie of problems for the latter. The resultant discourse in turn favors a particular interpretation of ‘Southern’ realities and suppresses alternative ‘truths’, which at times can be misleading for those seeking a historically dense sociopolitical understanding of global north-south relations. Students and sages alike take the history and understanding of global politics originating in the North’s centers as ‘truths’ which do not require additional explanation. Such a predisposition prompts many recipients of the dominant discourse to accept the North’s hegemony as unparalleled and absolute. Indigenous production of knowledge is often considered too embryonic, in marked contrast to the professedly more advanced and superior processes at play in the North.

The education of the elite cadre of post-colonial societies structurally falls within the ambit of the Western neoliberal education system, sometimes resulting in problems of extreme polarization within the state. Whilst 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. Consequently, these established knowledge production processes wind up filling the void left by ‘less advanced’ southern knowledge production. This in turn accentuates the global North-South divide in the mind of the student, urging acceptance of the marginalization of the South as the inevitable consequence of its redundant knowledge. The reiteration and repositioning of selective historical events is done in a manner calculated to present this selection as the more signifying and world changing face of global history. As a result of such exclusionary practices, the post-colonial student of history finds

him/herself cast not simply as the irrelevant other (to the North) but also as an irrelevant self (to his nascent settings), a process dubbed by Ana Beltran as the curriculum of dislocation (Beltran, 2018). Given the pedagogic proclivities of the Pakistani elite, many of whom consider the British Council's IGCSE qualification as the premium standard in quality higher education (Ashfaq, 2009; Ali, 2012), this recourse to a curriculum developed exclusively by the North serves to further perpetuate this cycle. This article will explore the discursive base of O-level's history curriculum, by combining the textual examination of the curriculum texts with patterns of historic and contemporary systematic exclusions of alternative truths. The article employs Jennifer Milliken's methodological insights on discourse analysis to explain how discourse operates as a background knowledge for the creation of common sense in students regarding world history in general and of international relations in particular. In order to understand the causal environment within which pedagogical processes occur, this article uses Farid Alatas' theory on captive mind and Ana Beltran's concept of curriculum of dislocation.

The Cambridge International Examination (CIE) is spread worldwide across 90 countries; its curriculum and academic texts are produced and approved by the University of Cambridge international group (Michael O Sullivan , 2018). In the private education sector, it serves as the most readily available alternative (Menashy, Mandey, & Afridi, 2014; Benz, 2012) to national/indigenous based boards of examinations i.e. FBISE-federal board and other regional provincial boards (Christie, 2012). This segregated system of education has become a pinnacle of excellence for Pakistani students to get recognition both nationally and internationally; thus acting as an alternative that has been adopted by most former colonial countries that lack more robust, indigenously based systems of instruction. The IGCSE curriculum informs a large student body both internationally and within Pakistan, thus making it a pertinent resource for a careful

examination in order to study its attendant effects under linguistic scrutiny. On an international scale, postcolonial scholarship has produced works scrutinizing history curriculums devised for educating students globally (Chakrabartay, 2000; Beltran, 2018; Hall C. , 2008; Conrad, 2018). On a national scale, in Pakistan, however, the scholarship examining curriculums devised locally for universities and higher secondary schools is limited in comparison (Aziz, 1993;2004; Vazir, 2003; Jamil, 2009; Durrani, 2008; Durrani, 2007). Keeping these studies in mind, there is, however, a lack of scholarly work attempting to scrutinize the representational practices contained within those history books, which are part of curriculum. Most importantly those, which are being produced by international education systems and are received by Pakistani private educational sector. This study does not stand alone in its postcolonial propositions regarding the curricular practices common in ‘international knowledge corridors’ (Leask, 2015; Selvaratnam, 1988; Savage, 2017; Mignolo, 2002; Smith M. W., 1999; Acharya, 2014; Taiwo, 1993). It departs from established practice by launching an exclusive inquiry into the curricular practices of the Cambridge history book. The paper’s central aim is to expand on the nature and operationalization of knowledge production processes identified vis-à-vis the global North-South divide. To this end, a discourse analysis of the curriculum devised for the subject of World History for international students of the Cambridge education system permits an effective evaluation of how representations operate within highly popular texts of information.

Origin of the captive mind

Academic ‘truths’ were constructed based on a Eurocentric conception of the world (Idemudia, 2011; Memmi, 1974; Said, *Orientalism* , 1978) reflective both of scientific racism (Hobson J. M., 2012; Hira, 2012) and the consequent territorial expansion under the guise of a civilizing mission (Bowden, 2009). The subjugation of mass populations in colonies created dependencies on the

colonizers: military, industrial, economic, intellectual. This article specifically focuses on ‘academic dependencies’ (Alatas S. F., 2011). This is best evidenced by indigenous structures of education which were being systematically deformed or abandoned to make way for those of the colonizing states (Ghosh, 1995; Bartle, 2006; Moolji, 2018). Consequently, power shifted to these alien/foreign modes of knowing and the concomitant knowledge production sites (Leite, 2010; Akena, 2009; Medina, 2014; Selvaratnam, 1988; Johnson & Hirt, 2012). Colonial histories were re-written by the colonizers (Wolf, 1984) who viewed the world through an orientalist lens (Said, 1997; Said, *Orientalism* , 1978). Meanwhile, few notable scholars of the former colonized countries could disseminate knowledge in both English as well as their local languages (Phillipson, 2018; Phillipson, 2008; Fanon, 2004). 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 continues to set the ultimate standard of excellence in post-colonial countries.

In light of this, the theoretical literature on structural imperialism (Galtung, 1980), post-colonialism (Singler, 2016; Chakrabartay, 2000; Fanon, 2004; Said, *Orientalism* , 1978), intellectual imperialism (Alatas S. H., 2000) and the idea of governmentality (Burchell, Gordin, & Miller, 1991) combine to define the process of implicit influence on the resulting ideal subject of the global South i.e. the O-level’s history student. There are certain structural (the core-periphery relations) and discursive (power circulated in discourses) phenomenon that merge to constitute the meaning of varied global events. By means of discourse and discursive practice, certain ideas are expressed as, and thus made into, common knowledge. This knowledge then 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, 1980); carrying some level of ideological baggage which, according to the rules of discourse, is inevitable (Neumann I. B., 1999).

The effects of this discourse can be wide-ranging, particularly given how the uncontested knowledge (re)production processes in the global North work to elevate its academic system to the status of a hegemonic domain. This inadvertently affirms these academic sites to be a multi-cultural academic industrial complex (Hopkins, 2017) or the "intellectual-financial" complex in education (Tikly, 1999), worthy of producing a global and national level discourse. The highest ranking research universities and educational hubs are located in the North (Jackson P. A., 2017) thus evidencing the epistemic privileges they possess (Mignolo, 2002). Though knowledge production is not unopposed globally (Gunaratne, 2009), the positioning of internationally recognized western universities and the accompanied neo-liberal institutional structures, allows them to establish themselves as the sole originators of unbiased knowledge and academia. This leads to epistemic dependence in which the global North finds itself as the producer and disseminator of knowledge and the South becomes the passive absorber (Eduardo, 2006; Slater, 2004) – a state of affairs which ends up marginalizing third world scholarship (Keim, 2011; Merlainen, Tienari, Davies, & Thomas, 2008; Hall C., 2008).

The knowledge producers in the North maintain a unique intellectual vantage point through pedagogical discourses, academic complexes, and uncritical reception of the knowledge they produce. The latter concept has been meticulously explained by post-colonial theorist Syed

Hussein Alatas¹ (Alatas S. F., 1993; Alatas S. F., 1972; Alatas S. H., 1974; Alatas S. H., 2000; Alataas, 2011) who depicts how discourse produced in the West, and irrevocably consumed in developing countries, creates special *mental structures* which are easier *to control*. Alatas refers to these as the *captive mind*, a structure reflecting certain key characteristics such as being uncreative, fragmented, imitative, and subjugated in thought. Thus, Alatas defines a captive mind as “the mind that is imitative and uncreative and whose thinking is based on western categories and modes of thought” (Alatas, 2000). According to him, such minds thrive in the global South where their indigenous understanding, having already been westernized through the colonized experience, is molded by international higher education institutions. Furthermore, this intellectual control-turned-imperialism is not merely reflected in the epistemic obedience (Mignolo, 2009) of the global South’s academic practices but is also ingrained in the circulation and generation of a particular kind of common sense which favors western political thought. The psychological traits of the captive mind translate into a form of sociological system in which post-colonial societies are unable to decolonize (Go, 2013; Alatas S. F., 2011; Medina, 2014; Mignolo, 2002). Following this, the formation of a particular kind of subject in the global South, intertwined with the running and sustainability of such a system, can be understood from three different angles.

First, is the inadvertent conditioning of the student’s mind via discourse that creates a predilection for imitation and analytical dependence (Walters & Lerner, 2004; Walters, 2012). Students are able to govern themselves according to the rationality imbibed *from* that discourse. In other words, the discourse (for instance of History or International Relations) modifies the socio-political conduct of the student. Second, neo-liberal education policies have emerged as a key source of this

¹ In this paper I have referred to the works of both Syed Hussein Alatas, the famous Malaysian academician and sociologist along with the reference to the works of another sociologist, his son, Syed Farid Alatas (also referred to Al-Attas). Although the core theory is attributed to Hussein, Fareed has continued to work on the same theoretical model.

governmentality in modern societies under the rationale of producing ‘golden collars’ (Connell & Dados, 2014; Moolji, 2014; Olssena & Peters, 2005), underscoring how the global expansion of American neo-liberalism is vested in education systems producing capitalist subjects or international/global citizens. This indicates that the discourse not only seeps into the cultural and political realms overall, but also controls the beings, behaviors, and way of thinking of the subjects themselves (Pupala & Kaščák, 2011). These subjects (O-levels students in Pakistan) function as currency for the neo-liberal market. Through the marketization of education and the discourse thus imbibed, a desirable self-governing subject is formed.

Finally, the captive mind is “fragmented in its outlook” i.e. its *representational identity* is blurred, a state from which the student may be rescued by being imbued with an indigenously rooted identity. However, since s/he is constantly consuming Euro-American discourse, s/he is unable to identify *their* history to his/her ‘reality’. Such a circumstance creates an ideal gap for European development discourses which proceed to paternalistically dictate the conditions and principles required for governance, trade, economics etc. (Doty R. , 1999). In explaining the concept of curriculum of dislocation, Beltran writing about her student’s inability to comprehend her identity through the history textbook, says that the text taught her about her own people but through a stereotypical representation meant for western audience. The internationalization of education, like the Cambridge exams system, brought common curriculums to classrooms where people from global north and south study the *same* syllabus (text). Sure, a student located in USA can perhaps easily understand his identity as the peace maker who is against the racist Nazi-like Iranians and radicalized Iraqis but a Pakistani O-levels student aligned with the Muslim/Asian identity gets driven to identify with the Middle East which paints him/her as a ‘west hating extremist’. Therefore, he/she is *dislocated* from the history.

Representation lies at the core of every discourse governing the exchange of meaning i.e. meanings are produced by *relation* of such representational practices, which also inform a broader landscape of discursive practice, culture and, by extension, identity (Hall S. , 1997). Therefore, such representations are central to the meanings and concepts produced in the cognition of the reader (Hall, 1997; Saussure, 1983). Signifying practices determine the meanings constructed through language and the individual's interpretation of it; certain words, phrases and terminologies standing for or referring to a particular symbol, sign, and/or phenomenon. For example, "Osama bin laden", "Taliban", "9/11", "Islamic Jihad", are all signs in circulation which were accorded a certain meaning. Language, through representational practice, symbols, and signifiers, thus helps in constructing and 'conceptualizing a culture' for example an 'American war against terrorism'. In an attempt at fixing meaning, the blank (discursive) spaces in historical discourse are given a 'convenient form' of representation or attached with loosely articulated labels (Fierke, 2002; Wolf, 1984). In policy papers, or even academic research, words like "under-developed", "failed states", "third world", "rogue states" etc. are attached to unexplored and foreign identities A veritable collective of people and countries thus falls under one single representational practice, an occurrence that in turn holds great value for national securitization practices.

In relation to this, and due to the inherent processes of discursive productivity, it may be said that 'discourses carry a memory of their own' (Neumann I. , 2008). As stated about the discursive memories forge to play a larger role in the creation of an academic 'common sense' which translates into policy practices. Those challenging the universalization of such 'commonsensical' knowledge are seen as ideological nativists or ideologically committed intellectuals (Espasito & Voll, 2000); their act of 'indigenization of discourses' is labeled as 'nationalist rebellion' as opposed to the rationale of academic revision. This *discursive* memory morphs into the *collective*

memory of all the disciplines involved in the social sciences. For instance, post 9/11, a generalizing discourse, “all Muslims are terrorists”, started circulating in the west; gaining momentum over the past decade which gradually allowed it to emerge as the pivotal representation of Muslims worldwide. It did not develop overnight: an orientalist discourse of the people belonging to the 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 already carried by the populace. This allows us to highlight how the otherization of Muslims as the new American foe was ripe for the picking, as further reflected in US foreign policy actions (Jackson R. , 2007). The common sense of a generation requires a collectivity of textual representations, media imaging and academic discourses. This case study narrows its focus to one particular academic text circulating internationally – text which portend to represent a ‘modern’ world view of history.

Analysing the discourse

The core content of O-Level ‘modern world history’ opens with the heading ‘20th century International Relations since 1919’- the year which is contestably identified as marking the end of empires (Cooper & Burnak, 2019). Typical configurations of International Relations take the post-World War II scenario as the starting point for explaining international politics (Bell, 2009) leading to the critical observation that in mainstream IR ‘...they locate agency and history with the great powers’ (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006) p.340 . Negation has been at the centre of this historical discourse. The core subject content reads: ‘modern *world* history’ but there are instances of negation of agency to more than half the world, and an obscurantism of the politics of the global South, an occurrence not uncommon in knowledge production (Agnew, 2007). Despite its dense Euro-centricity, historical representation of what is usually classified as the ‘third world’ is not

completely absent from the discourse of the curriculum. The global South is represented primarily through a larger discourse on the Gulf War in Chapter 7 (p.146), Vietnam (p.110); with a focus on the two Middle Eastern countries of Iran and Iraq. The curriculum entails a constant creation of the Euro-American-self versus the non-west-other (Hall S. , 1996; Neumann I. B., 1999).

The missing representations create problems of theorization (Bilgin & Morton, 2002), a view supported by revisionist historians (Frankopan, 2016; Hobson J. M., 2004). By means of judicious use of juxtaposition, it is shown how certain truths are rendered dominant through the suppression of other articulations and explanations. These *missed* representations mask the context of British colonial rule wherein the processes of imperial encounter transformed both the west as well as the rest of the world (Capan, 2016; Saurin, 2006). The exclusion of a sizable chunk of historical reality is a glaring lacuna in the colonial past (Wolf, 1984; Chakrabartay, 2000; Prakash, 1990; Acharya, 2011). The resultant discourse cannot aid a young mind in forming a more impartial understanding of the theorization of International Relations (Tickner, 2003; Smith S. , 2002; Chen, 2010) and this is why we see a scholarly revival of International relations from the perspective of post-colonial countries (Tamang & Hazarika, 2013; Peters, 2017). A demonstrative example of this whitewashing of crucial international relations events in the given text, is of that of Bandung Conference during the cold war. It is startling to note how a major third world conference, conducted in the exact same vein as sessions of the League of Nations or the UNO, and similarly looking to restructure 20th century world order, has been omitted altogether from the premise of a history curriculum portending to chalk the course of IR. Other historically significant events of the modern world for instance the Asian Relations Conferences (1947 & 1949) as well as the Arab League and Organization of African Union (OAU) are excluded by the core text of history. As Beltran observes these exclusionary practices in history text books, she writes: “The curriculum of

the global in this school did not talk about the strategic alliances and networks created by the oppressed peoples of the South at that time...” (Beltran, 2018: 279).

Here the practice of negation - denial of agency to the South - is maintained. Consequently, modern world historicization (Bilgin & Morton, 2002) concerning International Relations not only misses the most important historical events pertaining to the global South, but also omits pertinent narratives which may serve to offer alternative explanations vis-a-vis the current state of geopolitics (Narain, 2017). This tendency is not limited to curricular texts specifically geared towards higher education but rather is reiterated, and thus compounded, across a range of discursive sites. Texts circulated in international media such as newspapers, magazines, and infotainment websites, reinforce the same truth about the non-western other and it constricts the space for other explanations for global politics to emerge like the post-colonial take on IR-history (Capan, 2016). Pedagogical practice draws on such multiplatform extra reading materials in a bid to facilitate the student and enable him/her to better frame his/her understanding of the world. Hence, any discourse is industriously re-produced in all domains geared towards educating the receptive young learner. This gives us an idea of the importance of the *representational practices* embedded in these textual materials.

This study attempts to enable a better understanding of their mode of operation by using discourse analysis to evaluate the IGSCE curriculum for the history of the modern world pertaining to international relations. The key text analysed for ascertaining historical representational practices relevant to the global South is found in Chapter 7 (Baumann, 2013), where the events of the Gulf War form the prime subject matter under examination. The inclusion of this chapter in the course curriculum reportedly aims to give O-levels student a background of American and British foreign policy interventions in the region. In lieu of this, predicate analysis is employed to reveal the nature

of the text, serving to further highlight the nature of the underlying signifying practices. Some predicates can be differentiated from one another on the basis of the value they entail (Ahall & Borg, 2012) such as emotion predicates, identity predicates, repression predicates, and violent predicates etc. Thus viewed, the predicates also assign value to the representation of certain discursive spaces, prompting ‘social construction of space and (of) geopolitical reasoning’ (Neumann I. B., 1999; Milliken, 1999) Furthermore, this study highlights excerpts of paragraphs and texts that leads the reader to cognize an ‘us versus them’ identity conflict, thence proceeding to view her/himself through the eye of the other. Select phrases and sentences entailing representation of individuals belonging to the global South are enlisted below. Note the following: ‘predicates’ i.e. verbs, adverbs, adjectives defining the subject are underlined, while oft repeated words of the text are shown as (abcdefg); ‘representational phrases’ are given in underlined italics (*abcdefg*); and repetitive discursive practices are presented in bold lettering (**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.”

Underlying mechanisms at play:

The text, which presents an explanation spanning twenty pages on the precise importance of the Gulf War as an event, exhibits highly repetitious use of key words i.e. ‘oil’ , ‘Islam’, ‘control’, ‘terror’, ‘repression’, ‘nationalization’, ‘Muslim’, and ‘violence’. Some emotion predicates used are ‘hope’, ‘fear’ and ‘greedy and uncaring’. These can act as the author’s pre-suppositional standpoints, given their convenient portrayal of certain underlying motivations for select political actions. The practice 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, particularly since the student may be assumed to derive his initial analytical charge from the text itself (especially material introduced as part of the curriculum). The predicates used in this academic text are 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 directed towards the west) and actions/reactions (terror/repression, freedom). The author gives a sketch of the leaders

of Iraq and Iran, in addition to one of the general populations of each. All are represented as ‘anti-west in their sentiments’, a prejudice claimed to then further result in ‘irrational’ foreign policy decisions. In the light of this irrationality, the US is presented as having sole recourse to the unfortunate option of war. The chapter representing the Gulf War is the continuation of some ‘background knowledges’ circulating in academia, newspapers, and policy texts about the same topic.

Within the text, attachment of adverbs like ‘revolutionary’, ‘nationalist’, ‘religious’, ‘Islamic’, ‘terrorizing’, ‘controlling’ etc. is indicative of *signs* that are attached to certain nouns like Muslims, Iraqis, Iranians, and Arabs etc. The predicates in the text then provide 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 become key to formulating the primary conceptualization about the persons or things which are the subject of texts. For instance, Saddam Hussein is represented as a Stalinist; it being specifically 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 characteristics of Stalin i.e. ruthlessness, murder, and torture etc. with Saddam, equating him not just with Stalin’s *persona* but also with his *ideology*.

Within the text, the reader can find certain sets of dichotomies subtly operating to create and fix the general political interpretation, drawing primarily on the realist tradition in IR. The explanation for the Gulf War falls largely in the ambit of the Huntington formula i.e. the clash of civilizations thesis (Mustafa & AlHamdi, 2007; Orsi, 2018). It follows the basic trajectory of analyzing the Gulf War as a ‘West versus Non-West’ problem, rather than presenting it within a broader cold war context, or incorporating alternative reasoning such as elements of anti-colonial struggle and the accompanying global socio-economic background. In addition to this, it represents the *other* and

its geo-political history as something inherently volatile, aggressive and dangerous, attributing the subjects of discourse with opposing adverbs and adjectives (use of emotional predicates) as this emotional aspect of othering has been observed by scholars (Klien, 2003; Bilgin, 2004). For example, the author represents the Americans as ‘terrified’, and ‘fear’ (-full) in comparison with the Iraqis and Iranians, the Iraqi leader Saddam being represented as ‘terrorizing’ and ‘hope’ (-full). The following list of binary word pairings has been lifted directly from the text:

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------|
| • | Islamic | Un-Islamic, |
| • | Pro-west | Anti-west, |
| • | Anti-British | Pro-British |
| • | Repression | Freedom |
| • | Saddam | Bush |
| • | Muslim Scholar | Atheist |
| • | Muslim religious leaders | Non-Muslim West |
| • | Good | Evil |

‘Arab nationalism’ is mentioned in the text as if constitutive of another brand of nationalism distinct from the more well-known variants. Therefore, the ‘freedom’ or self-rule element of the decolonization struggle is replaced by an antagonistic, and somewhat violent, brand of indigenous nativism; the consequent de-contextualization of historical events further misleads the young reader. Actors in the Gulf War are represented without reference to the conflict’s colonial historical background, thus adding to the general lack of attention given the full scope of Britain’s involvement in the global South. Though there is mention of a ‘British mandate’ and ‘British

protectorate', the representation of colonialism as an experience or a context serving as one of the background reasons for the war itself is absent. The situation in the Middle East and subsequent US involvement is codified using a smattering of dualistic binaries (mentioned above) that come together to make a promising case for foreign interventionism (Barkawi & Laffey, 2006; Doty R. L., 1996) A contrasting picture may be drawn using existing alternative discourses willfully omitted from the curriculum's design.

Robert Fisk, a prominent British journalist who has thoroughly covered the Middle East issue in his op-ed column articles and books (Fisk, 2008; Fisk, 2006), presents a pertinent example. The author for the IGCSE 'O' Levels syllabus book on modern world history uses extracts from Fisk's articles as sources for supplementing his explanation of both the Iranian Revolution and the Gulf War; here authorial selection indicates how the curriculum tends to create 'logic-chains' (Milliken, 1999). The assertion here is that the selection of Fisk's texts is one-sided. The passages, intended to broaden the analytical prowess of student, end up streamlining a single hegemonic point of view concerning the Middle East. In order for the text to be considered free of political bias, *all* perspectives (truths) on an issue must be given due representation. The following are selections from chapter passages quoting Fisk concerning Iran and Iraq, presented under the overarching heading of hegemonic discourse as that is what they represent. In order to reveal the aforementioned one-sided hegemonic practices, I have also taken specific alternative passages from referential texts authored by Fisk on the exact same subject matter. A reading of both hegemonic/subjugated knowledge(s) allows for effective comparative analysis:

Hegemonic discourse I- Example 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 I:

Fisk on Middle East and the neo-imperial ways of 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- Example Pg. 150: “...Iraqi Hangmen were dispatching victims to the gallows at the rate of a hundred every six weeks”

Alternative/Subjugated knowledge II: Fisk on Post American occupation Pg.1282 (Fisk, 2006) :

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 ...

Also,

“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)

These ‘subjugated’ passages pinpoint the practice of silencing and exclusion of alternative political perspectives vis-à-vis the curricular text, the impact of which does not distort the image of history itself but also mutates accompanying fields of scholarship, with particular bearing on the discipline of International Relations (Elman & Elman , 2008). If such underlying omissions in signification portending Euro-centricity are not addressed, the analytical imagination of academic scholarship will be made subject to racial stereotypes, religious prejudices, and a general disinclination to regard post-colonial scholarship as capable of bringing about an innovative change in academic texts.

Conclusion:

This article explores the reasons for the deformed understanding of global history of students of O-levels in Pakistan. It also tends to explain how the elite cadre of societies in the global South are highly influenced by pedagogic systems located in the west which naturally feeds into the marginalization of third world academia and creates epistemic hierarchies. This automated acquisition of knowledge is studied by analysing the structural orientation of the colonized mind and its attendant pedagogical foundations. Using discourse analysis as a method, an attempt is

made to emphasize on key representational practices in academia which serve to reproduce and circulate a brand of 'hegemonic' knowledge, to the exclusion of alternative, subjugated 'truths'. This is done with the help of a theoretical underpinning of a pedagogical post-colonial theory: Intellectual imperialism. This, in turn, enables an exploration of how certain ideas and representations in political history become dominant. The article asserts that because of the de-contextualization of the colonial past, such history books have created a class of neo-liberal conformists in schools, by cognitively and affectively impacting the reader to result in the formation of a 'captive mind'.

The reason why this paper explores these structural and discursive phenomenon is because in order to understand the unbridgeable gulf between the values and norms taught and inculcated by former colonial masters and those that are generally practiced in post-colonial societies at large, subsequently leads to the creation of deformed identities. This leads to a confused and distorted political and ahistorical analysis on the part of the student, merely mimicking what they have been taught in text. 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 asserting *their* norms and values such as this notion that "West is mature; wants peace and the Non-west is emotional and wants war". Thus, textual analysis of a key chapter from the IGCSE history textbook for O-levels' students is incorporated to reveal the discursively underlying academic contribution to intellectual imperialism.

References

Acharya, A. (2011). Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 619-637.

- Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds; A New Agenda for International Studies. *International Studies Quaterly*, 1-13.
- 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 for Indigenous 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. (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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Aziz, K. K. (1993;2004). *Murder of history : A critique of history textbooks used in Pakistan*. Lahore: Vanguard Books.
- 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 .
- Bell, D. (2009). Writing the world: Disciplinary History and Beyond. *International Affairs*, 3-22.
- Beltran, A. C. (2018). The nowhere of global curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry* , 273-292.
- 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. (2004). Is the "Orientalist" Past the Future of Middle East studies? *Third World Quaterly*, 423-433.
- 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.
- Bowden, B. (2009). *The Empire of Civilization, the Evolution of Imperial Idea*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.
- Burchell, G., Gordin, C., & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault Effect; Studies in governmentality*. University of Chicago 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. (2000). *Provincializing Europe, Post Colonial thought and historical difference*. NewJersey : Princeton University Press.
- Chen, C. C. (2010). The absence of non-western IR theory in Asia reconsidered. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 1-23.
- 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 .

- 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.
- Doty, R. (1999). *Imperial Encounters*. New York: Minnesota Press.
- Doty, R. L. (1996). *Imperial encounters: The politics of representation in North-South Relations*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Duffler, J., & Frey, M. (2011). *Elites and Decolonization in the 20th century*. New York: Palgrave Mcmillan.
- Durrani, N. (2007). Forging Identities through Schooling: Tensions and Contradictions between Religious and National Identities in Pakistan. *International Journal of Diversity in organizations*, 249-256.
- Durrani, N. (2008). Schooling the 'other': the representation of gender and national identities in Pakistani curriculum texts. *Compare: a journal of comparative and international education*, 595-610.
- Eduardo, I. C. (2006). 'Organization Studies and Epistemic Coloniality in Latin America, thinking otherness from the margins. *organizations*, 463-88.
- Elman, M. F., & Elman, C. (2008). The Role of History in International Relations. *Millenium Journal of International Studies*, 357-364.

- Espasito, J. L., & Voll, J. O. (2000). Islam and the West: Muslim Voices of Dialogue. *Millinium Journal of International Studies*, 613-639.
- Fanon, F. (2004). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Groove Press.
- Fierke, K. M. (2002). Links across the Abyss: Language and Logic in International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 331-354.
- Fisk, R. (2006). *The great war for civilisation: The conquest of the Middle East*. London: Harper Perennial.
- Fisk, R. (2008). *The Age Of The Warrior: Selected Essays*. London: Harper Collins.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-77*. (C. Gordon, Ed.) Newyork: Pantheon Books.
- Frankopan, P. (2016). *Silk Roads: A New History of the World*. London: Bloomsbury.
- 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.
- Halliday, F. (2005). *Middle East in International Relations; power, politics and Ideology* . Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- 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). *The eurocentric conception of world politic, western international theory 1760-2010*. cambridge university press.

- Hopkins, A. G. (2017). Globalization and Decolonization. *The journal of Imperial and common wealth history*, 729-745.
- 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 .
- Jackson, R. (2007). Constructing Enemies: ‘Islamic Terrorism’ in Political and Academic Discourse. *Government & opposition*, 394-426.
- Jamil, B. R. (2009). Curriculum Reforms in Pakistan – Glass Half full or empty. *School Curriculum Policies and Practices in South Asian Countries* (pp. 1-27). New Delhi: NCERT.
- Johnson, A. T., & Hirt, J. B. (2012). Universities, dependency and the market: innovative lessons from Kenya. *Comapre: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 230-251.
- Keim, W. (2011). Counterhegemonic currents and internationalization of sociology: Theoretical reflections and an empirical example. *International Sociology*, 123-145.
- Klien, C. (2003). *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination 1945-1961*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Koukkanen, R. (2008). *Reshaping the University : Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*. UBC Press.
- Leask, B. (2015). *Internationalizing Curriculum*. Oxon: Routledge .

- 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.
- Medina, L. R. (2014). *Centers and Peripheries in Knowledge Production*. NewYork: 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.
- 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. (2002). The Enduring Enchantment: (or the epistemic previlige 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 & Methods. *European Journal of International Relations*, 225-254.
- Moolji, S. K. (2014). Producing neoliberal citizens: critical reflections on human rights education in Pakistan. *Gender and Education*, 103-118.
- 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.
- Olssena, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 313-345.

- 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/>
- Peters, M. A. (2017, October 20). Manifesto for the postcolonial university. *Editorial*. Educational Philosophy and Theory.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). The linguistic imperialism of Neoliberal Empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 1-43.
- Phillipson, R. (2018). Linguistic Imperialism. *Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, 1-7.
- Prakash, G. (1990). Writing Post-Orientalist Histories of the Third World: Perspectives from Indian Historiography. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 383-408.
- Pupala, B., & Kaščák, O. (2011). Governmentality – Neoliberalism Education- the risk perspective. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 145-60.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon books.
- Said, E. (1997). *Covering Islam*. London: vintage books.
- 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.
- Savage, G. (2017). Neoliberalism. Education and Curriculum.
- Selvaratnam, V. (1988). Higher education co-operation and Western dominance and knowledge creation flow in third world countries. *Higher Education*, 41-68.

- 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.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indegenious people*. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, M. W. (1999). Teaching the 'Third World': Unsettling Discourses of Difference in the School Curriculum. *Oxford Review of Education*, 485-499.
- Smith, S. (2002). United States and International Relations "Hegemonic country,Hegemonic discipline" . *International Studies Review*, 67-85.
- Taiwo, O. (1993). Colonialism and Its Aftermath: The Crisis of Knowledge Production. *Callaloo*, 891-908.
- Tamang, D., & Hazarika, O. B. (2013). *International Relations, Perspectives for the Global South*. New Delhi: Dorling Kindersley.
- Thiong'o, N. w. (1998). Decolonising the Mind. *Diogenese*, 101-104.
- Tickner, A. (2003). Seeing IR differently: Notes from the third world. *Millinnium: Journal of International Studies*, 295-324.
- Tikly, L. (1999). Postcolonialism and Comparative Education. *International Review of Education*, 603-621.

- Ul-Haq , S., & Westwood, R. (2011). The politics of knowledge, epistemological occlusion and Islamic management and organization knowledge. *Organization*, 229-257.
- Vanessa , V. d., Stein, S., Hunt, D., & Ahenakew, C. (2015). Mapping interpretations of decolonization in higher Education. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 21-40.
- Vazir, N. (2003). Curriculum as practiced in Pakistan. *Journal of Educational Research*, 177-183.
- Walters, W. (2012). *Governmentality Critical Encounters*. London: Routledge.
- Walters, W., & Larner, W. (2004). *Global governmentality; Governing Global Spaces*. New York: Routledge.
- Westad, O. A. (2005). *Global Cold War Third world interventions and the making of our times*. Newyork: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolf, E. (1984). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zaidi, S. M. (2011). Polarisation of social studies textbooks in Pakistan. *The Curriculum Journal*, 43-59.