The Power of Social Theory: The Anti-Colonial Discursive Framework

GEORGE J. SEFA DEI and ALIREZA ASGHARZADEH
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto

ABSTRACT: This paper introduces the anti-colonial discourse as a guiding framework for forming alliances and partnerships among anti-oppression activists in the academia and the larger society. To this end, it builds upon insights from narratives of "indigeneity" and traditions of anti-racism theory and praxis. Thanks to the spaces created by Marxist, feminist, post-colonialist, and deconstructionist struggles, the anti-colonial discourse seeks to reclaim a new independent space strongly interconnected with and heavily interlocked to those other spaces. This paper illustrates the interconnectivities, similarities, and dissimilarities between this new anti-colonial space and the spaces created by those other rich traditions. Its aim is to envision a common zone of resistance in which the oppressed and marginalized groups are enabled to form alliances in resisting various colonial tendencies.

RÉSUMÉ: Ce papier présente le discours anti-colonial comme une structure directrice pour former des alliances et des partenariats parmi les activistes d'anti-oppression dans le monde universitaire et dans la plus grande société. Ainsi, il s'élabore sur des idées faites à partir de récits sur la théorie et la pratique des traditions anti-racistes des "indigènes". Grâce aux points forts créés par Marx, par les féministes, par les post-colonialistes et par les luttes contre les démolisseurs, le discours anti-colonial cherche à réclamer une nouvelle place indépendante fortement liée et réellement encrée à ces autres points. Cet écrit illustre les interconnections, les ressemblances et les dissemblances entre ce nouveau point anti-colonial et les points créés par ces autres riches traditions. Son but est de prévoir une zone commune de résistance pour les groupes opprimés et marginalisés incapables de s'unir contre les tendances coloniales diverses.

Introduction

We present this paper as a provocative act to push the theoretical edges of our discourses and to rearticulate the anti-colonial theory vis-à-vis new insights and challenges arising from new

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 35, No. 3, 2001, 297-323

circumstances. As the race for theory has become increasingly fierce in the academia (i.e., schools, colleges, and universities), so have the ramifications multiplied for those who risk being branded atheoretical. This is in part because of the high premium placed on the ability and desire to theorize in certain conventionally established ways. It is also partly due to the insidious attempts to deny the validity of the knowledges shared by certain bodies who may not follow the conventionally accepted methods of theorizing. Our intention in this paper is not to reify theory, but to problematize a conception of theory that has little or no bearing on the lived realities of peoples whose academic and political interests are in contradiction to hegemonic social orders. Our goal is to contribute to the reformulation of an anti-colonial discursive framework that offers an understanding of social reality and practice as understood from the vantage point of the marginalized and subordinated.

Elsewhere (Dei, 2000a), it has been argued that the worth of a social theory should not be measured solely in terms of its philosophical grounding. More significantly, the relevance of a theory should be seen in how it allows us to understand the complexity of human society and to offer a social and political corrective – that is, the power of theories and ideas to bring about change and transformation in social life. Thus, we begin this exploration of social theory by looking at the power of anti-colonial discursive framework to propel social and political action. We are interested in excavating the nuances, subtleties, and messiness in theory building for the purpose of social and political change.

Frantz Fanon (1963) long established that decolonization can only be understood as a historical process that ultimately culminates in changing the social order. It is an initial violent encounter of two forces "opposed to each other by their very nature, which in fact results from and is nourished by the situation in the colonies" (p. 36). Fanon adds that decolonization is a calling into question of the whole colonial situation and its aftermath. This questioning is important, not as a resting place, but in order to make the connection between *what is* and *what ought to be*. Put differently, what we emphasize here is the need to combine discussions about *what is possible* with *what exists*. What exists matters in the sense of offering a critique of the social order and an awareness of our limitations. A social theory should provide a reason and a degree for academic, discursive, and political optimism.

Thiophene (1995) has also argued that decolonization is a "process, not arrival; it invokes an on-going dialectic between hegemonic centrist systems and peripheral subversion of them;

between European ... (imperial) ... discourses and their [anti]-colonial dis/mantling" (p. 95). The process of producing and validating what is knowledge in the academy can be a colonial exercise. Rather than heralding a knowledge that allows learners to develop a counter culture, a colonial process can actually reward the knowledge that inserts learners within existing hegemonic structures and practices. Therefore, a decolonization project in the academy must be aware that the colonization process and colonizing tendencies accede a false status to the colonial subject through the authority of Western canons at the same time as local knowledges are deprivileged, negated, and devalued.

Furthermore, the academic project of decolonization requires breaking with the ways in which the human condition is defined and shaped by dominant European-American cultures. In the absence of an understanding of the social reality informed by local experiences and practices, decolonization processes will not succeed. It is the envisioning of knowledge as power and resistance which is essential for decolonizing praxis (Abu-Lughod, 1990; Moore, 1997; Parry, 1994). Within the colonized peoples' historiography, for instance, the historic past offers an important body of knowledge that can be a means of staking out an identity which is independent of the identity constructed through the Western ideology (Muteshi, 1996). This helps to challenge and resist the continual subordination of other lived experiences and reinforce their status as valid and effectively relevant forms of knowledge. In a similar vein, Wright (1992) has observed the problematic of using colonial and post-colonial periods as points of academic reference for indigenous realities, as if non-western peoples had no history before the coming of Europeans.

Principles of Anti-Colonial Discursive Framework

We prefer discursive to theoretical, given the ongoing postmodernist critiques of the inadequacies of grand, meta-theories in offering a critical and comprehensive understanding of the complexities of today's society (Zeleza, 1997; Parpart, 1995). Thus, we prefer to work within a guiding framework that takes into full account the fact that academic and political questions are continually changing to reflect social realities (Shroff, 1996, p. 23). By placing emphasis on discursive rather than theoretical, we also hope to avoid the rigidity and inflexibility that theory has come to be identified with. We wish to work within a more flexible, transparent, and fluid language that discourse and discursive framework are hoped to provide. We also gesture to the problem of fixation with/in particular intellectual orthodoxies.

The anti-colonial discursive framework allows for the effective theorizing of issues emerging from colonial and colonized relations by way of using indigenous knowledge as an important standpoint. As a theoretical perspective, anti-colonialism interrogates the power configurations embedded in ideas, cultures, and histories of knowledge production, validation, and use. It also examines our understanding of indigeneity, pursuit of agency, resistance, and subjective politics (Foucault, 1983; Moore, 1997).

As pointed out elsewhere (Dei, 2000b), the anti-colonial discursive framework is an epistemology of the colonized, anchored in the indigenous sense of collective and common colonial consciousness. Colonial in this sense is conceptualized not simply as foreign or alien, but rather as imposed and dominating. The anti-colonial approach recognizes the importance of locally produced knowledge emanating from cultural history and daily human experiences and social interactions. The anti-colonial discursive approach sees marginalized groups as subjects of their own experiences and histories (Memmi, 1969; Fanon, 1963; and also Foucault, 1980). Its goal is to question, interrogate, and challenge the foundations of institutionalized power and privilege, and the accompanying rationale for dominance in social relations.

Like the anti-racist discursive approach (Dei, 1996), the anti-colonial discursive framework acknowledges the role of societal/institutional structures in producing and reproducing endemic inequalities. A key argument in this approach is the notion that institutional structures are sanctioned by the state to serve the material, political, and ideological interests of the state and the economic/social formation. The anti-colonial discursive framework acknowledges the power of local social practice and action in surviving the colonial and colonized encounters. It argues that power and discourse are not possessed entirely by the colonizer. Quite the contrary, the colonized has also the power to question, challenge, and subsequently subvert the oppressive structures of power and privilege. Discursive agency and power of resistance also reside in and among colonized groups (Bhabha, 1995). They always have had a (theoretical and practical) conception of the colonizer and based on such a conception they have engaged in social and political relations with the colonizer.

The anti-colonial discursive framework emphasizes the saliency of colonialism and imperialism and their continuing effects on marginalized communities, for example in the form of reproduction of imperial relations, economic poverty, and so forth. Colonial in this case functions as a set of relations, and imperial as political/

institutional structures that sustain the relations of domination. Homi Bhabha, cited in Parry (1995, p. 43), has rightly observed that an anti-colonial discourse "requires an alternative set of questions, techniques and strategies in order to construct it." As already alluded to, anti-colonialism critiques the reading of histories of Southern peoples strictly in demarcated stages: that is, periodization into pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial epochs. Although anti-colonial thought works with a notion of colonial, nevertheless it is defined in the sense of imposed relations and power inequities engendered by history, tradition, culture, and contact.

The anti-colonial stance fosters the idea that intellectuals should be aware of the historical and institutional structures and contexts which sustain intellectualism. For instance, whereas postcolonial theorists' mainly depend on Western models of analysis, conceptualization, and theorization, the anti-colonial theorists seek to work with alternative, oppositional paradigms based on the use of indigenous concepts and analytical systems and cultural frames of reference. While all texts and discourses (e.g., postcolonial and anti-colonial) are constructed with/in situations and relations of power, each text is constructed differently. As such, an awareness of the specific historical origins that produce theory and text is imperative.

Synthesizing Indigeneity and Anti-Colonial Perspective

The anti-colonial discursive framework is a counter/oppositional discourse to the repressive presence of colonial oppression. It is also an affirmation of the reality of re-colonization processes through the dictates of global capital. It is a way of celebration of oral, visual, textual, political, and material resistance of colonized groups, which entails a shift away from a sole preoccupation with victimization. It engages a critique of the wholesale denigration, disparagement, and discard of tradition and culture in the name of modernity and global space. There is a site of/in tradition, orality, visual representation, material and intangible culture, and aboriginality that is empowering to colonized and marginalized groups. The anti-colonial perspective seeks to identify that site and celebrate its strategic significance.

A politicized evocation of culture and tradition has relevance for a decolonization project. It is by according a discursive integrity to subjects' accounts of their histories and cultures, indigenous languages and knowledge forms that colonial imperialist projects can be destabilized. Contact between the imperial centre and the colonial periphery continues to involve complex and creative encounters and resistances. The myriad resistances help sustain the local human conditionalities of the colonized other.

The idea or notion of nation, community, and citizenship are not simply imagined constructs but are real in their meanings and evocations with profound consequences for colonized and marginalized groups. The anti-colonial discourse works with a notion of indigenousness which may be defined as knowledge consciousness arising locally and in association with long-term occupancy of a place (Dei, 2000c). Such a consciousness emerges from an awareness of the intellectual agency of local subjects as well as from their capacity to articulate their condition in terms of their own geography, history, culture, language, and spirituality. The knowledge so produced can then be used to challenge, rupture, and resist colonial and imperial relations of domination. It can also help to resuscitate oneself and one's community from mental bondage.

Itwaru (1999) has rightly argued that part of the imperial and colonial ecstasies is to see the colonized as the inferiorized other. The other becomes the disauthenticated person or personhood, one devoid of an indigenous identity, ancestry, and history. The imposed order or knowledge is always insecure of its own existence. Consequently, it is always threatened by any oppositional order or knowledge, and thus will move to destroy and devalue critical thought and action. In other words, the imposed order anticipates resistance in the indigeneity of the colonized and moves to destroy it.

One way of destroying such oppositional knowledge is to deny authenticity and an indigenous identity to the self (and the community) that seeks to create a critical body of knowledge (Nash, 1997). As a result, the authority of the indigenous self is questioned and difference is presented for consumption as an artifice. Yet the indigenous must be upheld as referring to those whose authority (not unquestioned authority) resides in origin, place, history, and ancestry. The indigenous identity continuously confronts the colonial/imperial order, and it is through such a perpetual confrontation that a sense of "indigenousness" is acquired.

Throughout human history, there are numerous examples of the use of colonial power to subvert the indigenous identity. Perhaps a contemporary example of the colonialist intention to annihilate indigenous identity of marginalized communities, and also these communities' use of their sense of indigeneity in resisting such annihilation, can be illustrated through the situation of the Kurds in Turkey and the Turks in Iran. Up until a decade ago, millions of Kurdish citizens of Turkey were referred to (by the dominant group) not as Kurds but as "Mountain Turks" (Hasanpour, 1992). The colonialist agenda of the dominant group was to wipe out the

Kurdish identity by roots and stems in the country, to the extent that even the term "Kurd" was not allowed to be used in the dominant discourse, let alone the use of indigenous Kurdish language and cultural forms such as clothing, songs, dances, and so on.

In recent years, however, the Kurdish intellectuals and activists have found it essential to reclaim their indigenous Kurdish identity, that is, first and foremost their Kurdishness, and also their language, culture, and so on, in order to resist cultural annihilation and forced assimilation. Numerous works of literature, poetry, and history have begun to appear in Kurdish, and the Turkish government has been forced to officially acknowledge the use of the Kurdish language in local radio broadcastings and TV channels. The government has also lifted the ban on celebration of *Nowruz*, the first day of the Kurdish new-year which is shared by many other ethnic groups in the region. This is a clear manifestation of the use of indigeneity to resist colonialist agenda of assimilation and annihilation.

Similarly, ever since the establishment of the Pahlavi regime in Iran in 1925, a systematic attempt has been made to demonize the Turks and everything Turkic in Iran. The history of indigenous Azeri Turks in Iran has been fabricated to prove that Iran's millions of Azeri citizens are not of Turkic origin but had originally come from an Aryan ancestry; however, they later became "Turkified" thanks to the Mongol invasion of Iran in the 13th century (Kasravi, 1925; Afshar, 1925). As a result, to read and write in the Azeri language has been prohibited, despicable acts of deculturation and linguicide have been committed, and like the Kurds in Turkey, millions of Azeri Turks in Iran have become subject to Aryanist racism, cultural annihilation, and forced assimilation (Asgharzadeh, 2001).

As an effective strategy to upset the colonialist agenda of the dominant Persian group, in recent years the Iranian Turks have taken advantage of the antiracist polemic in the wake of the Islamic revolution and have started an unprecedented endeavour to revitalize their indigenous history, culture, language, and tradition in Iran. For instance, a well-respected Azeri scholar named Mohammed Taqi Zehtabi has published a two volume history book that traces the indigenous history of Iranian Turks well over 9000 years, challenging thus the legitimacy of the dominant group's denial of indigenous history of Turks in Iran (Zehtabi, 1999). An outstanding professor of Persian language and literature, M.T. Zehtabi has produced his work in Azeri-Turkic, as opposed to Farsi/Persian (the only official language in Iran), emphasizing thus the importance of revitalization of indigenous languages in subverting colonialist agendas.

In summary, the anti-colonial discourse points to the relevance of using indigenous language and knowledge forms to create social understanding that draws and combines literature with politics, culture, history, economics, and understandings of spirituality. Indigenousness refers to the social norms and values, and the social and mental constructs which guide, organize, and regulate a people's ways of living and making sense of their world. The notion of indigenousness highlights the power relations and dynamics embedded in the production, interrogation, validation, and dissemination of global knowledge. It also recognizes the multiple, collective, and collaborative dimensions of knowledge and affirms that the interpretation or analysis of social reality is subject to different and sometimes oppositional perspectives (see also Dei, Hall, & Goldin Rosenberg, 2000).

Colonialism and Its "Post:" A Funeral for the Wrong Corpse

In the contemporary ideological and theoretical marketplace, perhaps no "post" is as problematic as the one in post-colonialism. Despite numerous attempts to explain away this particular post or to somehow obscure its awkward position (see for example Slemon, 1995; Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1989), the fact remains that post-colonialism signifies a break from the colonial past and a plunge into a different state of being, a post-colonial world. For as Lyotard (1992, p. 90) has pointed out, the prefix "post" in any designation alludes to a kind of conversion, a way of forgetting or repressing the past, a stage of initial forgetting.

The "post" symbolizes an unrealistic rupture, a break, a move away from one condition to the next. Inherent in its esoteric and exoteric meaning is a notion of development, a kind of progression from one state of being into a supposedly more developed state of being, from one familiar domain to a new unfamiliar dimension. And it is this kind of break, this kind of demarcation and the accompanying sense of progression that we seek to critique. We interrogate the "post" not to deny its theoretical validity but in order to pose new and critical questions. In fact, there are several aspects of post-colonial theory and discourse that help illuminate the importance and effectiveness of lived experiences in contemporary context. And we welcome all these contributions.

There can be little doubt that a small group of diasporic migrants may have experienced this new dimension, this new state of being, which for them is quite unique and different, extraordinarily complex

and hybrid. They are the spokespersons for this hybridity, for the articulation of this new "subaltern" (Spivak, 1999), "ambivalent" (Bhabha, 1994), "melange and hotchpotch" (Rushdi, 1991) post-colonial dimension. We welcome this new discourse for articulating fresh issues and original concerns. The big question we pose, though, is: Can these handful of hybridist post-colonialists be realistic representatives of the globe's millions of immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers – not to mention the great majority of the southern peoples who continue to live under severe conditions of poverty and deprivation?

A point has already been made that post-colonial metaphorization is all but "a matter of class" (Ahmad, 1995, p. 16). The majority of refugees and immigrants who find themselves at the shores of "the brave new world," from their point of arrival find themselves too preoccupied with providing a roof over their heads and grappling with a multitude of psychological, racial, economic, and cultural issues. These victims of colonialism and neo-colonialism cannot afford to articulate their conditions of post-coloniality. The languages that rearticulate post-colonial issues are not their languages. Those individuals who do these articulations bear no resemblance to the millions of displaced persons' linguistic, cultural, economic, and emotional states of being. These languages that so passionately talk about heterogeneity, fluidity, and decentrism are themselves deeply rooted in privilege and opulence and are mainly understood by a highly specialized audience.

In an article titled "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse," Benita Parry (1995) interrogates the works of Spivak, Bhabha, and JanMohammed for their relentless representation of the native. Apparently disturbed by such questioning, Gayatri Spivak responds: "She has forgotten that we are natives too" (1999, p. 190). In fairness, invocations of notions of nativity and representation should not be exaggerated to the extent of silencing voices of criticism, opposition, and resistance. On the other hand, it should also be emphasized that there are oceans of difference and privilege that divide and separate those who have the gift of a voice from those who do not have such a gift; who in fact cannot dream of having a voice.

Despite its glamorous claim to inclusivity, the multitude of diversely marginalized and colonized subjects know that post-colonial theory is not and cannot be inclusive of our uniquely complex experiences. Such an inadequacy on the part of post-colonialism might be located, to some extent, in its poorly inadequate articulation of the term "colonial" itself. In fact the

majority of colonized and oppressed peoples of Africa, Asia, and America realize that there is nothing "post" about colonialism. As the editors of *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* have pointed out, postcolonialism is based

> In the 'historical fact' of European colonialism, and the diverse material effects to which this phenomenon gave rise .... Indeed the diffusion of the term is now so extreme that it is used to refer to not only vastly different but even opposed activities. In particular the tendency to employ the term 'post-colonial' to refer to any kind of marginality at all runs the risk of denying its basis in the historical process of colonialism. (Ashcroft, et al. 1995, p. 2)

Defined so narrowly and exclusively in terms of "the 'historical fact' of European colonialism," post-colonialism becomes embarrassingly incapable of addressing the problems of the majority of globe's population who still continue to live under the colonialist and imperialist conditions of bondage and dependency. For instance, rather than using the post-colonial theory, millions of people in ex-Soviet satellites have now come to articulate their situation in terms of what is referred to as "post-Glasnost" discourse, among many other discursive frameworks including the anti-colonial stance (see for example Nesibzade, 1997).

The term post-colonial is also unable to account for unbearable colonialist relations in variously diverse southern countries and in millions of uniquely colonized and subjugated peripheries within those countries, those places out of touch and out of reach to whom W.J.M. Mackenzie (1982) has referred as "peripheries within peripheries." For instance, if you happen to be a Chechen currently resisting Russian colonialism, you would find very little comfort, if any at all, in post-colonialism's fanciful analyses. In order to get a glimpse of the painful plight of thousands of colonized groups like the Chechens, let's pause here for a minute and see how a member of the dominant Russian group depicts the colonized Chechens:

> We shouldn't have given them time to prepare for the war. We should have slaughtered all Chechens over 5 years old and sent all the children that could still be re-educated to reservations with barbed wire and guards at the corners .... But where would you find teachers willing to sacrifice their lives to re-educate these wolf cubs? There are no such people. Therefore, it's much easier to kill them all. It takes less time for them to die than to grow. (Reynolds, 2000)

Similarly, if you happened to be a Kurd, the largest colonized nationality in the world without a homeland (see also Hasanpour, 1992), you would find no resemblance between your colonized status

and the post-colonialist narrative. And how many in the so-called decolonized Africa, the Middle East, and Asia find any relevance between their daily struggles and post-colonial narrativizing? In a way, post-colonialism appropriates the struggles and resistance of variously colonized subjects, only to represent them in a risk-free and respectable fashion, palatable particularly to those who are not at the receiving end of oppression.

A discourse which originally was intended to be a problem of English departments and teachers of English literature, raising issues in regard to commonwealth states and ex-British colonies (Said, 1993, 1991), has now become a sort of canonized meta-theory, seeking to explain "all aspects of the colonial process from the beginning of colonial contact" (Ashcroft, et al., 1989, p. 2). It appears that what the current post-colonial narrativizing has done is to usurp and appropriate the realms which traditionally have belonged – and currently does belong – to anti-colonial discourse and praxis. True, the-postcolonial theory has enriched our insight regarding issues around voice and multiplicity of voices, notions of meta-narrativity, problems of text and textuality as well as issues around hybridity, non-essentialism, and so forth. It has also enhanced our understanding of colonial relations.

Nevertheless, what is particularly lacking in post-colonial conceptualization is perhaps a redefinition of the term "colonial," upon which the entire foundation of the post-colonial discipline is built. Oddly enough, post-colonialism which claims to be a champion of hybridity, fluidity, and non-essentiality of cultures, languages, and texts has completely failed to apply this very logic to the term "colonial." It appears as if colonial in post-colonial metaphorization is somehow frozen in time and in ice. This notion of fluidity and non-fixity that constitutes the backbone of post-colonial thought seems to have overlooked the definition of the very term "colonial" that it claims to be centred on. The problematic of the colonial part is that it has been defined solely and exclusively by reference to the fact of European colonialism; nothing more; nothing less. As if European colonialism was the only colonial order that has bestowed the term "colonial" its unchangingly essential characteristics. And the problem lies in this fixity, unchangeability and rigidness attributed to the definition of the term "colonial." After all, even Charles Darwin had observed that:

> An organic species is not a permanent entity, defined by unchanging 'essential characteristics;' yet neither are its representative exemplars associated merely by our own arbitrary verbal decisions. And the same is true, equally, of a society, a

> culture, or a language. Rather, each is a historical entity: i.e., an individual whose component elements are at all times subject to diversification. (cited in Toulmin, 1972, p. 341)

Now that everything is subject to diversification and hybridization, could not the definition of the very term colonial follow the same logic? Can we not redefine the term "colonial" to include all forms of dominating and oppressive relationships that emerge from structures of power and privilege inherent and embedded in our contemporary social relations? Of course we can. And it is through the realization of such a necessity that, throughout this paper, colonial is defined not simply as foreign or alien, but more importantly as dominating and imposing. Seen under this new light, colonial relations can no longer be limited to British or European classical colonialism alone; they ought to encompass much, much more. And they do.

Colonial relations emerge from relations of power and domination, and so far, humanity has not been able to create a society not characterized by power relations (Giddens, 1981). The limit, end, or termination of colonialism and colonial relations that is explicitly and implicitly implied through the "post" of postcolonialism is all but an illusion. It appears as if postcolonialists are in the process of conducting a funeral procession for the imaginary corpse of colonialism. However, evidently they are mistaken. This funeral is for the wrong corpse. There is nothing post about colonialism; there has never been, and there will never be, as long as our social relations are marked by relations of power and domination structured along the lines of race and other forms of difference (gender, sexuality, religion, language, and class).

Race, Racism, and Xenophobia

Along with such other categories as class, gender, and sexuality, race continues to be one of the most salient sites for exploitation and oppression. Notwithstanding that bio-genetically determined notion of race is now completely discredited (Bower, 1991; Lopez, 1995), race still continues to matter as significantly and as saliently as ever (see also Omi & Winant, 1986; West, 1994; Dei, 1996). Throughout history, race has been and continues to be socially constructed in order to pave the way for colonialist and dominating ambitions of one kind or another. As Lord Roseberry put it two centuries ago, "What is Empire but the predominance of race?" (cited in Childs & Williams, 1997, p. 189).

The lessons of history reveal how the dominant has used biological, physical, and cultural characteristics to inferioritize and subsequently dominate that which is different, which is "the other,"

now resorting to religious dogma, now to skin colour, imaginary bio-genetic differences or illusory scientific explanations, and now to sophisticated forms of cultural and linguistic racisms (Fanon, 1970). Racist ideologies have been used to justify colonization and subjugation of peoples, lands, and continents. By way of racism, entire communities, languages, and cultures have been eradicated. Deadly diseases have been introduced into the fabric of indigenous, non-western, non-white communities. Despicable acts of enslavement, genocide, linguicide, and deculturation have taken place in order to prove the presumed superiority of one race over the others.

Race, racism, and xenophobia lie at the heart of all colonialist and imperialist enterprises. Historically, race and racism have been invoked to justify the subordinate and the superordinate positions of the colonized and the colonizer. Such racist inventions as "the superior race," "the divine race," "the best race," and other similar designations have been used to justify the enslavement of non-white, non-Indo-European peoples. As Nietzsche's Zarathustra puts it,

> Oh blessed be distant time when a people said: "I want to be master over peoples!" For, my brothers: the best shall rule, the best also wants to rule! And wherever the teaching is otherwise, there the best is absent! (Nietzsche, 1892/1969, p. 20)

It is a pity that Nietzsche did not live to see his philosophy of "mastery of the best" put into practice by Hitler's National Socialists. Suffice it to say that, all faithful followers of (presumably) "the best," "the pure,"and "the superior" have been passionately working to materialize Zarathustra's wish. Despite the increasing irrelevancy of bio-genetically determined race, race and racism are still at the core of any valid and sensible analyses concerning social inequality. The socially constructed race entails numerous privileges, rewards as well as liabilities and punishments that are associated with one's colour of skin, place of birth, language, religion, nationality, ethnicity, and identity. Contrary to the claim of those who are not at the receiving end of oppression, whiteness is not synonymous with "colorless," but is a site of an enormous degree of power, prestige, and privilege (Kovel, 1970; Gordon & Newfield, 1995; Feagin & Vera 1995).

The anti-colonial discursive framework views race as an independent (and yet co-determinant) category that, while maintaining its autonomy, interrelates and interconnects with such other autonomous sites as class, gender, and sexuality. Following certain Marxist thinkers such as Althusser and Marcuse, some respected scholars seek to assign to race a "relatively autonomous"

status in relation to "the material base." Just as Althusser (1995) argued that cultural and ideological superstructures have some degree of relative autonomy compared to material structure, so too many see race as a relatively autonomous category in relation to class and material conditions (Hall, et al., 1978).

Much like their articulation of gender-based oppression, Marxian perspectives explain race and race-related issues through economic-materialistic lenses. Despite the attempts made on the part of recent neo-Marxist theories to move away from the reductionism of orthodox Marxian tradition, the fact remains that Eurocentrism, economic determinism, and class reductionism still continue to be serious challenges posed for Neo-Marxist work (Gabriel & Ben-Tovim, 1978; Robinson, 2000).

Aside from their overt and covert intellectual hegemony and paternalistic philosophy, it can be argued that some forms of class-based explanations serve to nurture a self-righteously narcissistic world-view that is theoretically exclusionary, ideologically dominating, and practically oppressive. Any attempt to subordinate a social fact as significant and as pervasive as race to class struggle can be an intellectually limiting act with no concrete tactical or strategic aim for mobilization, solidarity, and collective action. For if race and racism were an epiphenomenon of class, why then should one bother fighting against racism at all? Would it not be utterly irrational, illogical, and senseless to fight against racism which itself is presumed to be a by-product of class relations? Why not abandon all other struggles and focus the undivided attention on class alone? Conceivably, some in society have already adopted this position.

Now that theologians, scientists, and biologists are united in dismissing the concept of race, the ever increasing significance of race as a social fact must be emphasized by social scientists and students of social inequality. The anti-colonial thought realizes this need to highlight the multiplicity of race's real life effects as both a social construction and a social fact. Seen this way, race cannot be a mere false consciousness, a fallacy, deception, illusion, or figment of imagination. Race and racism are to be understood as autonomous social facts with real material, psychological, and social consequences which cannot be reduced to, or subdued by, other economic and social relations. Similarly, nor can race and racism be essentialized in a way to undermine the autonomous nature of other sites of difference and exploitation such as class, gender, sexuality, and so on.

Class Oppression, Marxism, and Anti-Colonial Thought

The anti-colonial thought entails a counter-hegemonic movement seeking to upset systems of oppression inherent in racialized, classed, and gendered societies. Oppression, in all its forms and shapes, is a dehumanizing condition that must be eliminated, and class-based oppression is no different than any other oppressive condition. The problem, however, surfaces when certain class-based analyses seek to subordinate other categories such as race, gender, and sexuality to material conditions. In the traditional Marxian view, for instance, it is the material structure that, in the final analysis, determines the ideological/cultural/discursive superstructure. "The mode of production of material life,"Marx (1904) has argued, "determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life."

So also, in contemporary Marxist theories, the cultural/discursive superstructure is accorded a "semi-autonomous" (Marcuse, 1969) or "relatively autonomous" status. In fact, the Althusserian notion of "structural causality" was forwarded to moderate the sharp economic deterministic and class reductionist views of orthodox Marxism vis-à-vis "the relative autonomy" of ideological, theoretical, philosophical, literary, political, cultural, and discursive "superstructure" (1995; see also Balibar, 1994).

Obviously, these kinds of "big brotherly" stances in relation to other sites of oppression such as race and gender cannot be endorsed by an anti-colonial counter-hegemonic movement. Any kind of monolithic approach to social inequality such as the ones based only on class, race, or gender methodologies entails a self-righteous and self-congratulatory ideological force which in essence is exclusionary, silencing, and dominating.

The anti-colonial thought realizes the interlocking nature of various systems of oppression and rejects the privileging of any one single site over and above the others. Such a realization comes from the acknowledgment that our social lives are profoundly affected by relations of power and domination, which are oppressive and colonial by nature and which are products of multiplicity of forces, structures, actions, ideologies, and beliefs. Class oppression is all but one of the manifestations of colonial relations: that is, relations of power and domination. And as Max Weber (1894) has pointed out, "In the last analysis, the processes of economic development are struggles for power" (cited in Grabb, 1997, p. 33; see also Ritzer, 1992).

It goes without saying that there is a profound history of anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist struggle in Marxist traditions. While

acknowledging this valuable tradition, the anti-colonial thought questions the Euro-centrism inherent in conventional/dominant theorizing that continues to take place in our academies. It also interrogates the notion of Marxian universalism, which it sees as grounded in Euro-centrism. The leading post-structuralist thinker Jacques Derrida reminds that "deconstructionism in the figure it initially took ... would have been impossible and unthinkable in a pre-Marxist space" (1994, p. 92). This has, however, not prevented deconstructionists and post-structuralists from critiquing and interrogating many aspects of the spectres of Marx, including the claim to universality.

In a similar gesture, in its uncompromising critique of Marxian Euro-centric/universalistic tradition, the anti-colonial thought shares a common ground with post-structuralists. Similar to post-structuralism, the anti-colonial thought also maintains that a Euro-centric, class-based and economic reductionist Marxism could be harmful to diversity, hybridity, and heterogeneity of cultures, communities, collectivities, and languages.

However, unlike poststructuralism, and in common with Marxism, the anti-colonial thought realizes the necessity of solidarity, and hence, of collective struggle against hegemonic colonial relations. The anti-colonial thought contends that solidarity, grounded in a common zone of resistance against domination, is not only possible but necessary. In other words, in sharp contrast to deconstructionists, post-structuralists, and even post-modernists, the anti-colonial thought rejects the Nietzschean view of the world that calls upon its followers to "rest their swords" and remain indifferent to oppression and injustice. As Nietzsche's Zarathustra puts it,

> There is much justice and injustice: he who sees it becomes angry. Looking down and striking hard – that becomes one and the same thing: so go away into the forests and let your sword rest! Go your ways! And let the people and peoples go theirs! (Nietzsche, 1892/1969, p. 20)

Whereas in Marxist tradition solidarity is solely and predominantly based on the privileging of class struggle and material conditions, in anti-colonial discourse collective action is based on common individualistic and collective desire for emancipation. Such a desire is achieved not through essentializing of any one single category, but through resistance against that which is dominating, imposing, and dehumanizing: that is, that which is colonial.

From this clear point of departure, the anti-colonial thought forwards a notion of critical gaze that which could be maintained on any single category such as race, class, or gender, at the same time

can refrain from subduing or subordinating other categories and sites of oppression. Such a gaze is not concrete and fixed. It is fluid and transparent. It constantly sees and observes colonial relations of power and domination, shifts from one site onto the other, resists all of them, but maintains a relatively heavier presence on any chosen category in a strategic gesture to be more effective.

Seen this way, any attempt to subsume the autonomous desires for emancipation of individuals and groups under a single category such as class struggle can, in and of itself, become an act of colonialism and marginalization, albeit under the banner of fighting oppression. What ties the common struggles together is not some superficial historical law, or law of nature, or dictate of economic conditions, but a clairvoyantly transparent and non-essentially critical gaze that constantly sees sites of oppression, and resists them. To connect the anti-hegemonic struggles together, we need alliances and coalitions from broader economic, political, and socio-cultural spectrums. And in order to achieve such coalitions, we first need to achieve that non-essentializing gaze. The challenge lies in the ability to acquire such a gaze, to obtain such a vision which is conscious, aware, and responsible; but not oppressive, and not totalizing. Social identities are complex, multi-layered, and complicated; and so is the nature of dominations. Fighting against any form of domination is fighting against all dominations; and all dominations ought to be fought together if any one domination is to be successfully resisted.

Gender Inequality and Feminism

Notwithstanding the persistence of systems of patriarchy and their ongoing attempt to obscure signs and signals of gender inequality, the inequality based on gender has long reached the analytical level of inequalities based on race and class (Spender, 1981; Stacey, 1983; Crompton & Mann, 1986; Farnham, 1987; Chafetz 1990, among many others). More than this, in certain circumstances, historical junctures, localities, and situations, gender inequality has actually become more salient compared to inequalities based on class, race, age, religion, language, and so on (Rubin, 1975; Hartsock, 1983; Harding, 1986; Scott, 1988; Davis, Leijennar, & Oldersma, 1991). Such a fact illustrates that there are situational and contextual variations in intensities of oppression.

The inequality based on gender has acquired such importance because, along with race, class, and age, "gender is and probably has always been the most salient marker of human beings in virtually all societies" (Chafetz, 1990, p. 14). Included in the category of gender

inequality are also other forms of sexualized and gendered bodies like gays, lesbians, transsexuals, and others who, while challenging the hetero-sexist male/female binary oppositionism, are themselves openly subject to discrimination and oppression in all power-oriented human interactions.

According to feminist literature, gender inequality exists because patriarchy is a universal feature of all known societies. Patriarchy "essentially refers to any society, or pattern of social relations in society, in which males have power over and thereby dominate females" (Grabb 1990, p. 199). Thus, gender inequality is manifested in relationships between males and females which may be patriarchal in nature and which may contain the means of subordination and subjugation of one sex (namely female) by the other. By the same gesture, paternalistic power relations may also exist among heterosexist males and females on the one hand, and other sexualized bodies such as gays and lesbians on the other (Bennett, 1992; Atkins, 1998).

General theories of social inequality, along with mainstream feminist literature, put forward numerous approaches that seek different explanations for the maintenance and persistence of systems of patriarchy and male domination. There are, for instance, those who, following Engels (1942/1972), recognize the rise of private property and, therefore, the economic power as the major factor in female subordination (Bologh, 1990; Blumberg, 1991). Some also identify political power as the major factor determining women's societal position (Millet, 1969; Collins, 1988). There are those who cite ideological basis for gender inequality and persistence of patriarchy (Reuther, 1974; Ritzer, 1988; Richardson 1998; Richardson & Taylor, 1989). And there are still those who single out specific characteristics such as women's reproductive capacity (O'Brien, 1981), or female sexuality (Hartsock 1983), or women's social position in providing domestic services (Hartmann, 1979) as important markers in explaining gender inequality.

Regardless of the richness and diversity of literature articulating gender inequality, in recent years mainstream feminist literature has become a site of contestation and an arena for opposing views. The articulate, white, middle-class western feminism is all but stripped of any legitimacy or authenticity to speak on behalf of a universalized singular woman. Various women's groups in southern countries, African feminists, radical third world feminists, as well as migrant and diasporic women all over the world have long questioned the paternalism and Eurocentricity inherent in western feminist theory and praxis (Steady 1981; Suleri 1992; hooks 1994;

Afshar, 1996; Alexander and Mohanti 1997; Nnaemeka 1998, among many others).

The mainstream western feminism is critiqued for its insensitivity to the needs and experiences of non-white, non-western women. It is also interrogated for its relegation of the female sex to a universally singular monolithic subject modeled and shaped after the experience and needs of an opulent minority group in western countries. A unilateral view of universalized female sex has, no doubt, ignored the wealth of diversity of experiences, histories, and geographies that differentiate among women and distinguish them from one another. Writing from her personal experience, Angela Gilmore has spoken of the problematic of a "universal woman" and her own sense of disconnectedness from the mainstream feminism:

> In September 1990 I attended a lecture given by a noted feminist scholar. Her topic was women's bodies as portrayed by the fashion industry. I did not have the same reactions to pictures of thin, young, carefree models featured in fashion magazines as did the "universal woman." An audience member's question clarified my confusion: "What woman are you talking about?" When the lecturer admitted that she was talking about straight, white, middle-class women, I realized that it was no wonder that I, a black lesbian from a working class background, could not connect with the experiences of the lecturer's "universal woman." (Gilmore, 1995, p. 51)

The feminist movement has thus become fraught with divided loyalties. Concerns and questions such as the following abound in various feminist narratives: Is resisting western imperialism more important than resisting patriarchal nationalism at home? How are the differences in race and class accounted for within mainstream feminist literature? How differently does the current globalizing trend affect women in the impoverished south vis-à-vis other women in the opulent north? How are the uniquely experienced and extraordinarily complex histories, living conditions, and daily struggles of black women, women from the so-called third world countries and women in underdeveloped regions of the world accounted for, articulated, and represented in the mainstream feminist movement? How are other sexualized bodies and non-conventional forms of sexuality represented within the paradigm concerning gender inequality? How can solidarity and collective action be possible in the face of numerous divided loyalties and opposing views that continue to fragment the women's movement?

Understandably, the feminist movement cannot offer a single, grandiose answer, a grand narrative, or a ready-made prescription for all these legitimate questions, concerns, and challenges. Perhaps

one common thread running through the various feminist narratives is the fact of the existence of patriarchy at the core of all social formations. However, it goes without saying that, much like racial and material exploitation, patriarchy, too, is all about control and domination. It is about imposing one's will on others for the purpose of dominating them. Patriarchal relations are colonial relations. And as such, the anti-colonial stance may offer the most effective method for subverting patriarchal and paternalistic relations of control and domination.

Defined primarily in terms of their imposing and dominating characteristics, colonial relations are detected in all forms of human interaction, from macro-level oppressions such as imperialism, colonialism, and chauvinistic nationalism down to micro-level individualistic macho-type patterns of behaviour. By combating that which is colonial, the anti-colonial stance calls for an end to divisive loyalties based on such binary oppositions as us/them, local/global, national/international, individual/collective, and so on. Not only global imperialistic tendencies are to be resisted and combated, but equally important, colonialist and paternalist approaches within one's own country, town, and community are to be challenged and subverted. Through an anti-colonial approach, imperialistic global relationships are challenged, just as paternalistic oppression based on race, class, gender, and sexuality are fought against.

Various sites of oppression intersect and interconnect together. In their connectivity they form a wholeness that is not easily reducible to anyone of its constituent parts. Separation of any part from this whole could be an artificial construct that will harm the cause of solidarity and common struggle. Oppression should be looked at as a site encompassing varieties of differences, categories, and identities that differentiate individuals and communities from one another and at the same time connects them together through the experience of being oppressed, marginalized, and colonized. All kinds of oppressions and dominations are dehumanizingly vicious phenomena that each and every one of them should be fought with the aim of eliminating all oppressive conditions in their entirety.

Conclusion

The modern social theory, from "The Marx-Nietzsche-Freud nexus" down to "The Holy Trinity" of the colonial and post-colonial discourse, namely Said, Bhabha, and Spivak (see also Young, 1995), fails to provide a ground on which the silenced majority, or as Fanon put it, "the wretched of the earth" are empowered to come to voice. From Plato's Republic, Marx's Communistic Society, and Derrida's

Deconstructed/Post-structuralist World down to post-colonialism's "hybridized, ambivalent state of being," nothing represents "the wretched of the earth" except for a terrifying "lack." The anti-colonial discourse is a realization of such a repressive "lack" and an attempt to help fill it up.

The anti-colonial discourse comes out of the realization that a multiplicity of forces, structures, and relations govern human interaction. Individuals, groups, and communities are situated differently within the structures of power and domination, distinguished from one another by their specificity of histories, complexity of geographies, and divisiveness of designated social categories such as class, race, gender, sexuality, and so forth. The aim of anti-colonial discourse is to provide a common zone of resistance and struggle, within which variously diverse minoritized, marginalized, and oppressed groups are enabled to "come to voice," and subsequently to challenge and subvert the hegemonic systems of power and domination.

The anti-colonial framework compels one not to ignore the interdependence and interrelatedness of sites like race, gender, class, sexuality, age, (dis)ability, and all other categories that serve as potential areas for oppression. Along with casting our gaze on race and racialization processes, the anti-colonial approach encourages us to interrogate the interlocking nature of systems of power and domination, of how dominance is reproduced and maintained, and how the disempowered are subjugated and kept under constant control.

While directly tackling pyramids of power and hegemony, the anti-colonial framework calls into question all relations of domination emanating from racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, ageism, ableism, and all dominant forms of social relations. On the one hand it allows us to interrogate notions of class exploitation, colonialism, imperialism, and the exploitative functioning of global capital. On the other, by exposing and challenging all forms of patriarchy, patronization and hegemony (including its theoretical, intellectual, and philosophic variants), it permits us to subvert various class/race/gender-reductionist and economic-deterministic tendencies. As such, it rejects the prioritization and privileging of a single category such as class, and calls into question the traditional "class-only" models or more contemporary "class-first" methodologies.

The anti-colonial discursive framework realizes the need to go beyond the notion that race and racism are relatively autonomous social phenomena; it acknowledges the irreducibility of race and

racism to class and economic relations. It views race as an autonomous category standing independently of other categories such as class and gender. At the same time, it sees race as interconnected with those other categories, particularly in forming a common zone to resist oppression.

Regarding unequal relations of sex and gender, the anti-colonial approach seeks to challenge all systems of patriarchy and male domination. By defining colonial as imposing and dominating, it allows us to interrogate various sexual relations from non-consensual sex down to subtle patterns of behaviour in the privacy of one' own bedroom. How sexual acts are conducted, how housework is divided, how the household is managed, and how different sexes, forms of sexualities, and gendered bodies are positioned in a social unit, such as a bedroom, a house, or the larger society, can be scrutinized and interrogated through an anti-colonial discourse.

By way of an anti-colonial discursive framework we learn that there is no such thing as self-professed impartiality, non-partisanship, and indifference; that discursive practices are never neutral or apolitical and that historical accounts and narratives are shaped and socially conditioned by particular interests, histories, desires, and politics. The knowledge gained through this insight enables us to interrogate conventional notions of objectivity, impartiality, and positivist methodology. The anti-colonial discursive framework allows us to shift our attention from abstractionism and discursive gymnastics to lived experiences of individuals and collectivities. It also opens the door for hitherto discredited notions of spirituality, emotionality, and sentimentality, so that these modes of expression are also validated as legitimate forms of knowledge, emerging from lived experiences of the bodies.

It is no secret that many contemporary theories continue to regard any invocation of indigeneity, tradition, indigenousness, and aspects of identity relying on or emerging from such invocations, as synonymous with a return to essentialism or even fundamentalism. Far from such a view, the anti-colonial discourse and praxis allocate a central place for many aspects of indigeneity and tradition that particularly serve as profound sites of empowerment, and hence of struggle and resistance, against imposed hegemonies.

There are forms of indigeneity, such as vernacular languages, indigenous cultures, and traditional world-views that are very empowering for marginalized, minoritized, and oppressed communities. In view of the fact that inferiorization, belittlement, humiliation, and mockery of indigenous values are essential for the maintenance and persistence of colonialism, imperialism, and

domination, a revitalization of indigenous values can be very pivotal in resisting the dominant order.

The anti-colonial thought helps to revive and revitalize the revolutionary aspects of indigenous knowledges by bringing into focus the emancipatory potential of indigenousness vis-à-vis imposed norms and values. Cultures are extraordinarily fluid and non-essentially hybrid phenomena that transcend limitations of time and space. And no culture should ever be allowed to bleed to death in the clutches of racism, oppression, and domination.

REFERENCES

Abu-Lughod, L. (1990). The romance of resistance: Tracing transformations of power through Bedouin women. *American Ethnologist, 17*(1), 41-55.

Afshar, M. (1925). Aghaznameh. *Ayendeh, 1*(1), 5-12.

Afshar, H. (Ed.). (1996). *Women and politics in the third world*. London: Routledge.

Ahmad, A. (1995). The politics of literary postcoloniality. *Race and Class, 3*(36), 1-20.

Althusser, L. (1995). The object of capital. In L. Althusser & E. Balibar (Eds.), *Reading Capital* (*Lire le capital*, B. Brewster, Trans., pp. 71-198). London: NLB.

Alexander, M.J. & Mohanty, C.T. (Eds.). (1997). *Feminist genealogies, colonial legacies, democratic futures*. London: Routledge.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (1989). *The empire writes back: Theory and practice in postcolonial literature*. London: Routledge.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (Eds.). (1995). *The postcolonial studies reader*. London: Routledge.

Asgharzadeh, A. (2001, May). *Linguistic racism and its ramifications: The Iranian case*. Paper presented at the Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities, Universite Laval, Quebec.

Atkins, D. (Ed.). (1998). *Looking queer: Body image and identity in lesbian, bisexual, gay and transgender communities*. New York: Harrington Park Press.

Balibar, E. (1994). *Masses, classes, ideas: Studies on politics and philosophy before and after Marx* (J. Swenson, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Bennet, K. (1992). Feminist bisexuality: A both/and option for an either/or world. In E.R. Weise (Ed.), *Closer to home: Bisexuality and feminism* (pp. 205-233). Seattle: Seal Press.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (1995). Signs taken for wonders. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Thiophene (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 29-35). New York: Routledge.

Blumberg, R.L. (1978). *Stratification: Socioeconomic and sexual inequality*. London: Routledge

Blumberg, R.L. (Ed.). (1991). *Gender, family, and economy: The triple overlap.* London: Routledge.

Bologh, R. (1990). *Love or greatness: Max Weber and masculine thinking – A feminist inquiry.* London: Unwin Hayman.

Bower, B. (1991). Race falls from grace. *Science News,* 380.

Chafetz, J.S. (1990). *Gender equity: An integrated theory of stability and change.* London: Sage Publications.

Childs, P. & Williams, P. (1997). *An introduction to post-colonial theory.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Collins, R. (1988). *Theoretical sociology.* San Diego, CA: University of San Diego Press.

Crompton, R. & Mann, M. (Eds.). (1986). *Gender and stratification.* Cambridge: Policy Press.

Davis, K., Leijennar, M., & Oldersma, J. (Eds.). (1991). *The gender of power.* London: Sage Publications.

Dei, G.J.S. (1996). *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Dei, G.J.S. (2000a). The role of indigenous knowledges in the academy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4*(2), 111-132.

Dei, G.J.S. (2000b). Recasting anti-racism and the axis of difference: Beyond the question of theory. *Race, Gender & Class,7*(2), 39-56.

Dei, G.J.S. (2000c). African development and indigenousness. In Dei, G.J.S., B. Hall & D. Goldin Rosenberg (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge in global contexts: Multiple readings of our world* (pp. 111-132). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Dei, G.J.S., Hall, B., & Goldin Rosenberg, D. (Eds.). (2000). *Indigenous knowledge in global contexts: Multiple readings of our world.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Derrida, J. (1994). *Specters of Marx* (P. Kamuf, Trans.). New York: Routledge.

Engels, F. (1972). *Origins of the family, private property and the State.* New York: International Publishers. Original work published 1942.

Fanon, F. (1963). *Black skin, white masks* (C.L. Markmann, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.

Farnham, C. (Ed.). (1987). *The impact of feminist research in the academy.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Feagin, J.R. & Vera, H. (1995). *White racism: The basics.* New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews, 1972-77.* Brighton: Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1983). The subject and power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gabriel, J. & Ben-Tovim, G. (1978). Marxism and the concept of racism. *Economy and Society, 7*(2), 18-54.

Giddens, A. (1981). *A contemporary critique of historical materialism. Vol 1. Power, property, and the State.* London: Macmillan.

Gilmore, A.D. (1995). It is better to speak. In M. Awkward (Ed.), *Negotiating difference: Race, gender, and the politics of positionality* (pp. 51-63). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Gordon, A. & Newfield, C. (1994, Summer). White philosophy. In *Critical Inquiry, 20*, 737-757.

Grabb, E.G. (1997). *Theories of social inequality: Classical and contemporary perspectives.* Toronto: Harcourt, Brace & Company.

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1991). The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In A. King (Ed.), *Current debates in art history 3: Culture, globalization and the world-system* (pp. 41-68). New York: Routledge.

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). *Representation: Cultural representation and signifying practices.* London: Sage/Open University.

Hall, S., et al. (1978). *Policing the crisis: Mugging, the State, and law and order.* London: Macmillan Press.

Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism.* London: Cornell University Press.

Hartmann, H. (1979). Capitalism, patriarchy, and job segregation by sex. In Z. Eisenstein (Ed.), *Capitalist patriarchy and the case for socialist feminism* (pp. 73-89). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Hartsock, N. (1983). *Money, sex and power: Toward a feminist historical materialism.* New York: Longman.

Hasanpour, A. (1992). *Nationalism and language in Kurdistan, 1918-1985.* New York: Mellen Research University Press.

hooks, B. (1994). *Outlaw culture: Resisting representations.* New York: Routledge.

Itwaru, A. (1999). *Creativity, resistance, transformation: An instance in the life of an othered other.* Paper presented to the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies, OISE/University of Toronto, Speaker Series.

Kasravi, A. (1925). *Azeri ya Zaban-e Bastani-ye Azerbaijan.* Tehran: Taban.

Kovel, J. (1970). *White racism: A psychohistory.* New York: Pantheon.

Lopez, I.J. (1995). The social construction of race. In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 191-203). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lyotard, J.F. (1992). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press.

Mackenzie, W.J..M. (1982). Peripheries and nation-building: The case of Scotland. In P. Torsvik (Ed.), *Mobilization, center-periphery stuctures, and nation-building: A volume in commemoration of Stein Rokkan* (pp. 158-170). Bergen: Universitets-Forlaget.

Marcuse, H. (1969). *An essay on liberation.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Marx, K. (1904). *A contribution to the critique of political economy.* Chicago: C.H. Kerr.

Memmi, A. (1969). *The colonizer and the colonized.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Millet, K. (1969). *Sexual politics.* London: Abacus.

Moore, D.S. (1997). Remapping resistance: 'Ground for struggle' and the politics of place. In S. Pile & M. Keith (Eds.), *Geographies of resistance* (pp. 87-106). London: Routledge.

Muteshi, J. (1996). *Women, law and engendering gesistance: A pedagogical project*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto (OISE/UT).

Nash, J. (1997). The reassertion of indigenous identity: Mayan responses to State intervention in Chiapas. *Latin American Research Review*, 7-41.

Nesibzade, N. (1997). *Bolunmush Azerbaijan/Butov Azerbaijan*. Baku: Ay-Ulduz.

Nietzsche, F. (1969). *Thus spoke Zarathustra* (R.J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin. Original work published 1883-1892.

Nnaemeka, O. (Ed.). (1998). *Sisterhood, feminisms, and power: From Africa to the Diaspora*. New York: Red Sea Press.

Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, gender and society*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

O'Brien, M. (1981).*The politics of reproduction*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Omi, M. & Winant, H. (1986). *Racial Formations in the United States*. New York: Routledge.

Parpart, J. (1995). Is Africa a postmodern invention? *Issue: A Journal of Opinion, 23*(1), 16-18.

Parry, B. (1994). Resistance theory/theorising resistance, or two Cheers for nativism. In F. Barker, P. Hulme, & M. Iversen (Eds.), *Colonial discourse/postcolonial theory* (pp. 172-196). Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Parry, B. (1995). Problems in current theories of colonial discourse. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Thiophene (Eds.). *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 36-44). New York: Routledge.

Reynolds, M. (2000, Sept. 17). Sunday report: An interview with Russian soldiers and commanders. *Los Angeles Times*, part A, part 1, p. 1.

Richardson, L. (1998). *The dynamics of sex and gender: A sociological perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.

Richardson L. & Taylor, V. (1989). *Feminist frontiers 2: Rethinking sex, gender, and society*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Ritzer, G. (1988). *Contemporary sociological theory* (2nd ed.). New York: Alfred Knopf.

Ritzer, G. (1992). *Classical sociological theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Robinson, C.J. (2000). *Black Marxism: The making of the black radical tradition*. London: Zed Books.

Rubin, G. (1975). The traffic in women: Notes on the political economy of sex. In R. Reiter (Ed.), *Towards an anthropology of women* (pp. 36-53). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Ruether, R. (1974). *Religion and sexism*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Rushdi, S. (1991). *Imaginary homelands*. London: Granta/Penguin.

Said, E. (1991). *Orientalism: Western conceptions of the Orient* (3rd ed.). London: Penguin.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and imperialism.* New York: Alfred Knopf.
Scott, J. (1988). *Gender and the politics of history.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Shroff, F. (1996). *New directions in Canadian health policy: Lessons of holistic medicine.* Unpublished Ph.D dissertation. Department of Sociology, OISE, University of Toronto.
Slemon, S. (1995). The scramble for post-colonialism. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Thiophene (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 45-52). New York: Routledge.
Spender, D. (Ed.). (1981). *Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Spivak, G.C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Stacy, J. (1983). *Patriarchy and socialist revolution in China.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Steady, F.C. (Ed.). (1981). *The black woman cross-culturally.* Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Books.
Suleri, S. (1992). Woman skin deep: Feminism and the postcolonial condition. *Critical Inquiry, 18*(4), 27-42.
Thiophene, H. (1995). Post-colonial literatures and counter-discourse. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Thiophene (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp. 95-108). New York: Routledge.
Toulmin, S. (1972). *Human understanding.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
West, C. (1994). *Race matters.* New York: Vintage Books.
Wright, H.K. (1992). Critical pedagogy and education in the African contexts. Draft Paper. Department of Curriculum, OISE, University of Toronto.
Young, R.J.C. (1995). *Colonial desire: Hybridity in theory, culture and race.* London: Routledge.
Zehtabi, M. (1999). *Iran Turklerinin Eski Tarixi. Ikinci chap.* Tebriz: Nehsr-e Akhtar.
Zeleza, T. (1997). Fictions of the postcolonial: A review article. *CODESRIA Bulletin, 2,* 15-19.

George J. Sefa Dei is Professor, Associate Chair, and Graduate Co-ordinator of the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. His work and teaching areas are in: anti-colonial thought, anti-racism and minority schooling issues, international development and Indigenous knowledges.

Alireza Asgharzadeh is a graduate student (Ph.D.) in the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. His areas of concentration and research include: socio-linguistics, social inequality, and sociology of education.