The Interactions of International Relations: Racism, Colonialism, Producer-Centred Research

Deep K. Datta-Ray
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Singapore

Abstract

The racial hierarchy underscoring colonialism persists, organises core-periphery interactions and so undermines International Relations' (IR's) purpose of accounting and explaining to mitigate violence. Despite IR's awareness of its colonialism, it reconstitutes in the hermeneutic's deductive and inductive method via aphasia (calculated forgetting) about its heuristic: diplomacy. The result, analytic-violence or the core's heuristic corrupting interaction with the periphery. Yet, its evasiveness testifies to a meaningfulness beyond IR's hermeneutic. Irretrievably corrupted by its heuristic, IR's hermeneutic is ejected for an altogether new hermeneutic: Producer-Centred Research (PCR). Eschewing deduction and induction, and so colonialism, PCR initiates with abduction or a problem arising from theory and practice to resolve it in terms of rationality because of its, and the problem's, significance. Changing "rationality" to "rationalities" registers the core's rationality as colonialism while preventing it from contaminating PCR's collection and assessment of peripheral practices to determine if they cohere into another rationality. Moreover, treating peripheral practitioners authoritatively, as capable of rationalising themselves and thus equal to rationality, further protects PCR from aphasia. Verifying efficacy shows PCR's decolonisation of the hermeneutic is not entirely replicated externally, amongst IR scholars. The core engages PCR, but it incites violence in the periphery which defends rationality and so is colonialism's bastion, now.

Keywords: Diplomacy, Eurocentrism, racism, colonialism, hermeneutics

1. Introduction

On the morning of 26 February 2019, Indian Mirage-2000 nuclear capable fighter-bombers struck Pakistan's Balakot region, but New Delhi called this event "non-military". The paradox of terming the use of strategic airpower as anything but military catalysed analysts and International Relations (IR) into geostrategic simulations of New Delhi's actions. Since geostrategy only considers the material, such as hardware or geography, India's action was rendered a function of Pakistani action in an endless tit-for-tat and so denuded of its history and culture. Compounding this superficiality was analysts and scholars not utilising the terms

and categories used by Indians. The consequence was not even a simulation, but a simulacra,[1] for being limited to the material, which in any case was not represented in India's manner.[2] At stake in this "double-blinding is humanity. After all, there is no brinkmanship greater than a nuclear power striking another. Nor are there any precedents, for even the USSR and USA did not risk a homeland attack during the Cuban Missile Crisis or at any other point during their Cold War. Requisite, then, are in-depth understandings of international politics. Yet such a work for India does exist, is from the periphery, and was well received by the core. Cambridge University's Vere Harmsworth Professor of Imperial and Naval History, at Trinity College, Samita Sen, writes in her review: "This book is a valuable addition to … intellectual history. It is a significant text for historians as well as political scientists and will of course be compulsory reading for international relations experts".[3] SOAS's Professor of World Politics Sir Stephen Chan writes the book is, "a superb rendition of a diplomatic culture which Western observers would normally miss or misunderstand,"[4] and Oxford University historian Faisal Devji writes: "This highly original study represents the first examination of Indian foreign policy as the product of a distinctive political culture … an important corrective to the allegedly universalistic theories of interest that dominate political analysis".[5]

Nevertheless, that the risk of repeating the simulacra resulting from Balakot remains is well illustrated by how the book was actively attacked by the periphery and whose attacks undermined the core. How this paradoxical situation arose begins to become apparent in that core-periphery interaction is hierarchical.[6] Aggravating this is racism, making for racial hierarchy.[7] These abound, but only the European variant valorises and globalises itself.[8] This dual process of being constituted and constituting racial hierarchy transnationally is colonialism and it is violence.[9] It is this process that reduced analysis of Balakot to meaninglessness, but it also enervates IR because colonialism makes the discipline irrelevant in terms of its own metric: to account for and explain the international so as to mitigate violence.

To redirect IR back toward its professed purpose, this article begins with showing disciplinary awareness of colonialism from the origin of its foundational concept, theories, and subject, to the practice of international politics: diplomacy. Racial hierarchy, in short, is implicit in the practice of IR, that is, its hermeneutic's method – abduction and induction. Nevertheless, aphasia – calculated forgetting, in this case, of the racially hierarchical ordering of the core's understanding of diplomacy – ensures that diplomacy remains the heuristic and

---

1   Jean Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006).
2   Deep K. Datta-Ray, "Diplomacy Beyond History: Analytic-Violence, Producer-Centred Research, India," *India Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (2021): 9–24.
3   Samita Sen, "A 'Cosmological' Approach to Diplomacy," *Economic and Political Weekly* 55, no. 49 (2020): 24–6.
4   See cover endorsement by Sir Stephen Chan, Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).
5   See cover endorsement by Faisal Devji, Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*.
6   On hierarchy see: David A. Lake, "Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics," *International Security* 32, no. 1 (2007): 47–79.
7   Race is constituted, but it also constitutes.
8   On caste being race see: Ambrose Pinto, "UN Conference Against Racism: is Caste Race?," *Economic and Political Weekly* 36, no. 30 (2001): 2817–820; On the Indian origins of caste see Nicole Boivin, "Anthropological, Historical, Archaeological and Genetic Perspectives on the Origins of Caste in South Asia," in *The Evolution and History of Human Populations in South Asia*, ed. Michael D. Petraglia and Bridget Allchin (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), 341–61. On the Chinese origins of race see Frank Dikötter, *The Discourse of Race in Modern China* (London: Hurst, 1992). On the European origins of race see Howard Winant, "Race and Race Theory," *Annual Review of Sociology* 26, no. 1 (2000): 169–85.
9   Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam, "Confronting the Global Colour Line: An Introduction," in *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line*, ed. Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda, and Robbie Shilliam (New York: Routledge, 2015), 1–16.

so, inevitably, the hermeneutic utilises and forwards racial hierarchy. Hence the hermeneutic is colonialism, and its attendant, violence. It initiates in the periphery that is India with the hermeneutic imposing the heuristic. The failure to account or explain the periphery escalates violence, which oscillates between mangling the core by creating impossible categories – irrational in their own terms or rendering practice impossible because of the imposition of alien categories – and obliterating the periphery's practices. Patently, this carnival of destruction within and without cannot do, but it does testify to the periphery's excess being meaningful. Why else the need for impossible categories or obliteration?[10] The prevalence of both in the hermeneutic amounts to a syndrome, *analytic-violence*, which only fortifies the periphery's meaningfulness as another diplomacy unavailable to the hermeneutic. These interactions within the hermeneutic and between the core and periphery make for the following diagnosis: awareness cannot decolonise IR's hermeneutic because it is fundamentally corrupted by colonialism and so requisite is an entirely new hermeneutic divorced from the heuristic's racial hierarchy and capable of regenerating IR.

Colonialism in the hermeneutic is treated in the article's second section, which recognises colonialism as the hermeneutic because its deductive and inductive methods are constricted by racial hierarchy and so it cannot navigate the periphery's data. Hence the need to eschew these methods and to form an entirely new hermeneutic: Producer-Centred Research (PCR). This approach deviates from the hermeneutic in four ways: Unlike IR's method, PCR is initiated by a problem, in this case, colonialism, and so PCR does not replicate core concerns when engaging the periphery. While IR's sites are theory and practice, the therapeutic site for PCR is "rationality" because of its, and the problem's, significance. When IR considers rationality, it is singular, but PCR converts it to the plural, rationalities. This ensures colonialism's claim to rationality is maintained, but it is also rendered as one of many, which safeguards against aphasia. Enabled, then, is PCR engaging rationality and its handmaiden, colonialism, while searching for rationalities not colonially but in the form of robust phenomena, arising from practice and made sense of in practitioner terms. This treatment of the periphery as "authoritative sources" further protects against aphasia and is the final deviation from IR's hermeneutic.[11] Next, the treatment's efficacy in decolonising interaction in the periphery that is India is verified via two examples: a misapplication of PCR and its uncovering of the rationale for secrecy. The examples illustrate the way in which PCR deletes colonialism *internal* to core-periphery interaction in that the method is no longer about imposing heuristics. This is how the key concept of "secrecy" is relieved from core presumptions about safeguarding or imperilling the state and instead exposed as simply a status symbol bolstering diplomats' low personal status. The success of this deployment lies in eschewing the violence of imposing core concerns while uncovering practitioners' meaning, and this also explicates how PCR may be replicated.

The final section verifies the treatment's *external* efficacy. Whether PCR ameliorates the violence of IR scholars is gauged via the first deployment of PCR from a PhD proposal to its

---

[10] On the scholarly destruction of the periphery by historians, theoreticians, and participants, see Deep K. Datta-Ray, "The Analysis of the Practice of Indian Diplomacy," in *Political Science: Vol. 4: India Engages the World*, ed. Navnita Chadha Behera and Achin Vanaik (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013), 234–69; and, Deep K. Datta-Ray, "Violence, Hermeneutics and Postcolonial Diplomacy," in *Routledge Handbook of Postcolonial Politics*, ed. Olivia U. Rutazibwa and Robbie Shilliam (New York: Routledge, 2018), 140–56. On analytic-violence into the core, see Priya Chacko, "Srinath Raghavan, War and Peace in Modern India: A Strategic History of Nehru Years," *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 48, no. 2 (2011): 305–07.

[11] Murphy Halliburton, "Gandhi or Gramsci? The Use of Authoritative Sources in Anthropology," *Anthropological Quarterly* 77, no. 4 (2004): 793–817.

reception as an academic monograph. This shows that the core is decolonising but also that PCR is an incitement to violence in the periphery. There is preclusion, that is, when PCR's facts are harnessed to colonialism. The core's openness is also subverted to occlude PCR by a hysterical periphery. Hysteria arises from peripheral reviewers defending rationality because they are invested in the material benefits distributed by the core, for instance, and at the very least, being paid to travel to conferences in the core. Nevertheless, the core states rationality was invented by it and the periphery mimics, thereby rendering the latter counterfeit. The paradox of peripherals defending a rationality which itself denotes them as counterfeit, is exposed by PCR in embarrassing detail. PCR is therefore intolerable to peripheral scholars for exposing their colonialism and discomfort, hence their hysteria. Yet they choose to remain colonised, which is why colonialism's bastion is now the periphery. A glimpse to why is the Indian IR lecturer and militant advocate of non-core IR managing the pain of a presumed slight by resorting to repeatedly stating she is to contribute to a London School of Economics (LSE) publication. In addition, this scholar was only able to afford an apartment in a lower middle-class New Delhi neighbourhood because of a fellowship at a European university.[12] In short, the plight of peripheral scholars is such that they must bear the subservience demanded by colonialism to aspire to a life like that what is only tolerable for core scholars.

2. Assessment and Diagnosis

An assessment of colonialism and IR cannot miss disciplinary awareness of race having been the fundamental ontological unit of colonial politics,[13] nor its centrality to the "Anglosphere," which was a slave-trading organisation. Race became the metric for a global hierarchy because of Anglosphere slave-traders' self-perception of being the "bastion" of European civilization, which underscored their claim of being central to global governance.[14] The slave-trading economy's globalisation extended racial hierarchy across all peoples. Constituted and then naturalised was the boundary between colour-coded European sameness, defined as superior, to non-Europeans. This was operationalised via imperialism's vectors of administration within the colonies, operating within colonial discursive authorisations received from metropoles.[15] Cementing the installation of racial hierarchy as the metric and vector to establish colonialism transnationally was that even its challengers could not transcend it.[16]

Into this context was born IR and its ontology was race. A founding IR figure wrote *The Negro Race and European Civilization*, which assumed physiological differences between black and white brains and stated the former's organic development ceased at puberty.[17] Such works were about biological race, but also imperialism, which made its metric the vector, and so inaugurated IR as colonialism.[18] An IR textbook proclaimed transforming international politics, "to increase the resources of the national state through the absorption or exploitation

[12] Conversation at dinner in Beijing, during an academic conference organised by the Berggruen Institute.

[13] Duncan Bell, "Race and International Relations: Introduction," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2013): 1–4.

[14] Robbie Shilliam, "The Atlantic as a Vector of Uneven and Combined Development," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22, no. 1 (2009): 69–88.

[15] Barnor Hesse, "Racialized Modernity: An Analytics of White Mythologies," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30, no. 4 (2007): 652.

[16] Robert Vitalis, "The Graceful and Generous Liberal Gesture: Making Racism Invisible in American International Relations," *Millennium* 29, no. 2 (2000): 331–56.

[17] Paul Reinsch, "The Negro Race and European Civilization," *American Journal of Sociology* 11, no. 2 (1905): 145–67.

[18] William Olson and A. J. R. Groom, *International Relations Then and Now* (London: Harper Collins, 1991), 75.

of … inferior races".[19] This developed into a morality for colonization.[20] Its imbrication in IR continued in the *Journal of Race Development* becoming *Foreign Affairs*, the discipline's "founding" journal in 1922, and it is still published by the *Council on Foreign Relations*. In other words, IR constituted colonialism because it was the "policy science designed to solve the dilemmas posed by empire-building and colonial administration facing the white Western powers expanding into and occupying the so-called 'waste places of the earth,'" as the periphery is called.[21] That even disciplinary opponents could not transgress colonialism confirmed its hold over the discipline. For instance, the first African American *Rhodes Scholar* sought to undermine colonialism by reversing its claim that race created culture, but in doing so only maintained the colonial category of race.[22]

In the wake of World War II, race was veiled to make colonialism so insidiousness it became neo-colonialism. Once again, IR was aware[23] that the Holocaust rendered biological race untenable,[24] and politics, both global anti-colonialism and internal to the core in the UK and USA, was engulfed by agitation, which is why race had to be camouflaged.[25] This cumulated with UNESCO statements on *The Race Question*, rebranding race as "ethnicity".[26] It was rebranding because replacing naturalist with historicist explanations did not undermine race, but maintained racial hierarchy and since it was also the category of analysis, perpetuated colonialism as neo-colonialism.[27] In keeping with a changing context, IR also embraced neo-colonialism. In 1948, Hans Morgenthau wrote not of race, but of the "politically empty spaces of Africa and Asia".[28] Such seemingly innocuous language proliferated. For instance, "humanitarian intervention," which is neo-colonialism as its claim to morality cloaks racial hierarchy since all morality is presumed to originate in the West. Hence, only the West is mandated to "intervene" to spread morality.[29]

Colonialism continues to order international politics and IR in a multiplicity of manners. An instance is "pre-emption". This defence is restricted to the colonial elite by its concomitant, "rogue states". The subterfuge whereby imposition upon the periphery also denies it its own defence is what makes neo-colonialism insidious. This is apparent in IR's core concept and theories, all of which the discipline is aware of. Discernible in the language of the *Family of Nations* is its racial hierarchy because only those nations are permitted war, and it is waged against those beyond the family – the racial dregs of global society.[30] Their threat is racial hierarchy, and the combination's outcome is IR's foundational concept: *anarchy*. It is "largely assumed to inhere in the 'primitive' politics of the 'inferior' races … of what we'd

---

[19] Paul Reinsch, *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Macmillan, 1900), 14.

[20] Philip Henry Kerr, "Political Relations Between Advanced and Backward Peoples," in *An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, ed. A. J. Grant, Arthur Greenwood, John David Ivor Hughes, Philip Henry Kerr Lothian, and Francis Fortescue Urquhart (London: Macmillan, 1916), 142, 163.

[21] Anievas et al., "Confronting the Global Colour Line", 2.

[22] Jeffrey Stewart, "Introduction," in *Alain Locke: Race Contacts and Interracial Relations*, ed. Jeffrey Stewart (Washington: Howard University Press, 1992), xix-lix.

[23] Howard Winant, *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy Since World War Two* (New York: Basic Books, 2001).

[24] Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

[25] John Solomos, *Race and Racism in Britain,* 3rd ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

[26] Ashley Montagu, *Statement on Race,* 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972).

[27] David Theo Goldberg, *The Racial State* (Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2002).

[28] Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations* (New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948), 369.

[29] Makau Wa Mutua, "Savages, Victims and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights," *Harvard International Law Journal* 42 (2001): 210.

[30] Antony Anghie, "The Bush Administration, Preemption Doctrine and the United Nations," *American Society of International Law Proceedings*, 98 (2004): 326–29. Anthony Anghie, "The War on Terror and Iraq in Historical Perspective," *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 43, no. 1 (2005): 45–66.

now consider the 'third world'". *Anarchy* is racial hierarchy and it threatens the *Family* and this is the foundation for IR's theories, which is why they, too, propagate neo-colonialism in varying forms. *Realism* directs the "construction of a hierarchical racial order to be imposed upon the anarchy arising from the tropics," while *Liberalism* mandates "the imposition of a white racist order on indigenous peoples".[31] Meanwhile, *Constructivism* asserts that the burden of civilising the world rests with the racial elite because it maintains *anarchy*.[32]

IR's racial hierarchy and awareness of it today extends into the discipline to the conceptualisation of its subject, the practice of international politics: *diplomacy*.[33] Here "culture" and "rationality" cloak the racial hierarchy palpable in the acceptance of the "essence of diplomacy" as the "elite culture, comprising the common intellectual culture of Europe," which is why diplomacy is "a *corpus Christianorum* bound by the laws of Christ".[34] In other words, diplomacy is the "attempt to sustain behaviour" in keeping with the "culture of the dominant Western powers,"[35] where culture arises from "rationality in the sense of action that is internally consistent with given goals." The key is "rationality," which fuses racial hierarchy with Europe, culture, and diplomacy. Hence, rationality is why diplomacy's seminal authors are of the colonising core. They must be, because as a core author states, the "world system … came into being in the Italian peninsula and reached its full expression in Europe". Its "goals" are the same as diplomacy's, which is why diplomatic theory "appeared at the same time as diplomacy began to assume its … form in the late fifteenth century".[36]

That diplomacy began at the core as racial hierarchy and its vector makes for colonialism also emerges in diplomacy's "goals". These are set by "European diplomacy's logical frame of reference … the notion that unity is the natural condition of social order, which should be restored through proper mediation among its divided parts."[37] In other words, Europe originates the racial hierarchy that is diplomacy and utilises it to incorporate all. The extravagance of this violent practice of using diplomacy as heuristic and hermeneutic is rooted in Western society's self-proclaimed culture: Christianity, which sets estrangement from God as the origin in the *Old Testament* story of the fall of man. This is universalized as the "brotherhood of man" in the *New Testament*, the semantic shift conflating one man's origin with everyone's. Hence, we are all dependent on God's mediator: Christ. He legitimises the Papacy, uniquely imbuing it with the power to unify us with God. The Papacy establishes spiritual unity in medieval Europe because people believe in the Papacy. Its demise is the Reformation because of the rise in belief of man's direct ability to negotiate unification with God. Significantly, the will to unify remains, despite the fracturing of Christianity into Catholicism and Protestantism. This newfound belief in man's ability to unify results in Christian society fragmenting into states as they usurp the Church's role. Nevertheless, this splintering necessitates the diplomatic system, and its harbinger is the Treaty of Westphalia's appropriation and reproduction of spiritual unity as a secular contract: that is, accept Westphalia's assumptions to mitigate violence.

---

[31] Errol A. Henderson, "Hidden in Plain Sight: Racism in International Relations Theory," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2013): 85–7.

[32] Aaron Sampson, "Tropical Anarchy: Waltz, Wendt, and the Way We Imagine International Politics," *Alternatives* 27 (2002): 429–57.

[33] For the literature on the centrality of diplomacy to IR, see Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 1–26.

[34] Hedley Bull and Martin Wight, *Systems of States*, ed. Hedley Bull (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977), 128.

[35] Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 39.

[36] G.R. Berridge, Maurice Keens-Soper, T.G. Otte, *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger* (New York: Palgrave, 2001), 1-2.

[37] Quoted in, Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 13–6.

Embarrassingly, this heralds diplomacy to realise unity which simultaneously obliterates unity because diplomatic relations regularize Europe's fragmentation. In short, Europe displaces God, but not his logic: a pre-set origin and end remain. Spirituality is abandoned for failing to deliver unity as oneness with God, but the idea of unity persists as a secular diplomatic project. Naturally, and crucially, as promulgator of this transnational system, the core sets the terms for unity. In practice, unity is assimilation, which is projected from the spiritual into the corporeal.[38] The result is unending violence now, initiated by the racial hierarchy of the heuristic, which the hermeneutic must utilise. This duality constitutes colonialism with the IR scholar as its vanguard and the diplomat, its foot soldier. The scholar utilises the hermeneutic to enclose the periphery intellectually, permitting the latter to assimilate whatever remains. This violence is unending, for assimilation's purpose is the impossible ideal of "unity". This makes violence a syndrome: *analytic-violence*.

That analytic-violence now qualifies as interaction is illustrated by the periphery that is India. It is managed in the genres of memoire, history, and theory, which are suffused with violence as wonderment, incoherence, and a combination of deletion, dismissal, and denigration.[39] The violence of wonderment stems from converting this pathic experience into an agential and intellectual phenomena or rationality[40] via nativism. Memoirists rationalise their wonderment as superiority, replacing core with periphery to make their experience substantive. Yet the entire process is contained within, and perpetuates, colonialism.[41] Buttressing colonialism is wonderment's irrationality, an example of this are two Indian diplomats who are so entranced with themselves that both, in the same anthology, claim to have invented a policy everyone knows originates elsewhere.[42]

The violence of incoherence is inaugurated by the impulse to identify diplomacy's rationality, which is so self-evident that it can only be glimpsed in its absence, such as when a historian explains, "even with archive material, our speculations may be hard to verify since Indian strategic decision-making appears to be mostly oral".[43] The unavailability of documentary facts is significant only because it disallows uncovering rationality, or "strategic decision-making" and thus there is "speculation," or the process of inducing. This is illogical in at least two ways. Factual error renders speculation incoherent,[44] and despite professing to be led by empirical evidence, speculation manifests as the imposition of core concepts. The insufficiency of these concepts is why they are mangled into ontologically incompatible categories such as *Liberal* and *Realist*.[45] This violence directed at the core is a necessary by-product of containing the periphery. A variation of incoherence is distinguishing between rationality as core and practice as "non-conventional" in core terms, because practice is forced into an incompatible rationality.[46] Prevalent, too, is the incoherence of futurism, or the wish

---

[38] Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 16–21.

[39] For a survey till 2013, see Deep K. Datta-Ray, "The Analysis of the Practice".

[40] Wolff-Michael Roth, "Astonishment: a Post-Constructivist Investigation into Mathematics as Passion," *Educ Stud Math* 95 (2017): 97–111, 106.

[41] A recent example is: Shyam Saran, *How India Sees the World: Kautilya to the 21st Century* (New Delhi: Juggernaut Books, 2017).

[42] Sunanda K. Datta-Ray, "Twenty Years of Looking East," *Business Standard*, July 14, 2012, http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/sunanda-k-datta-ray-twenty-yearslooking-east/480356/.

[43] Dewan C. Vohra, *India's Aid Diplomacy in the Third World* (New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1981), 173.

[44] Krishnan Srinivasan, "Special Bond," *The Telegraph*, January 31, 2014, https://www.telegraphindia.com/1140131/jsp/opinion/story_17876883.jsp#.WJCH40navIU.

[45] Priya Chacko, "Srinath Raghavan".

[46] Priya Kumari, "India as a Normative Power: The Mixed Migration Crisis of the Indian Ocean," *International Studies* 51, no. 1 (2014): 180–94.

that the core could order the periphery, which raises the question of how the hermeneutic can operate in the periphery now since its heuristic does not even exist there?[47] Such colonialism is occasionally overt,[48] as is the aspiration to incorporate India into colonialism.[49]

Other commonplace forms of incoherence include the colonialism of ascribing to Indians incompetence in mimicking the core[50] or passivity towards the core,[51] and even when Indians are found to be neither incompetent nor passive, their practice is limited to colonialism's purpose of unity.[52] Patently, incoherence flourishes in the hermeneutic, claiming to induce but really imposing the heuristic. An example of this is the assumption that India, like the core, seeks *great power* status, or does so because of how *great powers* enforce themselves upon India, or that this is India's purpose since it is the *great powers'* purpose. Significant is not India's desire for sameness but rather the fact that these assertions originate in the hermeneutic, not in practice.

Indeed, practice is deleted, dismissed and denigrated because rationality is imposed upon the periphery since IR's approach is analytic-violence. This violence is both inward and outward with *Liberalism's* deployment to contain India, but it is slippery and so the theory's integrity is broken to make it account for phenomena that it ordinarily cannot.[53] Increasingly popular is *Realism*. As with *Liberalism*, *Realism* is violence toward both itself[54] and the periphery in imposing itself upon India.[55] Both make for incoherence. In *Realism*, this is most startling in its claiming that Indians and Pakistanis are different in terms of rationality, but then accounting for both with *Realism*![56] Moreover, Indian slippages haunt *Constructivism* so that it is enslaved to *Realism*.[57] Regardless of which theory is being discussed, what distinguishes their violence is the vanishing subject. For instance, India's nuclear diplomacy is, for *Realists*, about material security,[58] but for *Postcolonials*, it is about status-seeking.[59] Both eradicate, in turn, Indian material concerns or Indian leaders' long history of status-seeking. Exacerbating this is that both theories assume India begins *Liberal* and is becoming *Realist* by learning from the masters of nuclear diplomacy.[60] This infantilising of India is

[47] For a recent example, see Sumit Ganguly, "India's Foreign and Security Policies," in *The Oxford Handbook of the International Relations of Asia*, ed. Saadia Pekkanen, John Ravenhill, and Rosemary Foot (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 411–26.

[48] Purnendra Jain, "Energy Security in Asia," in Pekkanen, Ravenhill, and Foot, *The Oxford Handbook,* 547–68.

[49] Harsh V. Pant, "The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process, and Great Power Politics," *Asian Security* 5 (2009): 273–95.

[50] P.R. Kumaraswamy, "National Security: A Critique," in *Security Beyond Survival: Essays for K. Subrahmanyam*, ed. P. R. Kumaraswamy (New Delhi: Sage, 2004). Mimicry is the premise in a recent overview, see Atul Kohli and Prerna Singh ed., *Routledge Handbook of Indian Politics* (New Delhi: Routledge, 2013). Similarly, mimicry is used to explore every aspect of the Indian state in another recent overview, see Shipping Hua ed., *Routledge Handbook of Politics* (New York: Routledge, 2018).

[51] Jingdong Yuan, "Nuclear Politics in Asia," in Pekkanen, Ravenhill, and Foot, *The Oxford Handbook,* 505–23. For an earlier rendition see Andrew B. Kennedy, "India's Nuclear Odyssey: Implicit Umbrellas, Diplomatic Disappointments, and the Bomb," *International Security* 36 (2011): 120-53.

[52] Jonathan Holslag, *India and China: Prospects for Peace* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009).

[53] R. Bhaskaran, "The Philosophical Basis of Indian Foreign Policy," in *Foreign Policy of India: A Book of Readings*, ed. K.P. Mishra (New Delhi: Thomson Press, 1977).

[54] T.V. Paul, "Integrating International Relations studies in India to Global Scholarship," *International Studies* 46, no. 1-2 (2009): 129–45.

[55] George Perkovich, *India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact on Global Proliferation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

[56] Sumit Ganguly, *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions since 1947* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).

[57] Arndt Michael, "Realist-Constructivism and the India-Pakistan Conflict: A New Theoretical Approach for an Old Rivalry," *Asian Politics & Policy* 10, no. 1 (2018): 100–14.

[58] Sumit Ganguly, "India's Pathway to Pokhran II: The Prospects and Sources of New Delhi's Nuclear Weapons Program," *International Security* 23, no. 4 (1999): 148–77.

[59] Itty Abraham, *The Making of the Indian Atom Bomb: Science, Secrecy and the Post-Colonial State* (London: Zed Books, 1998). Itty Abraham ed., *South Asian Cultures of the Bomb: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009). Karsten Frey, *India's Nuclear Bomb and National Security* (Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge, 2006).

[60] C. Raja Mohan, *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2003).

colonialism and it occurs because regardless of the theory in question, the hermeneutic utilises a heuristic that constitutes racial hierarchy whereby rationality originates in the core and is mimicked by the periphery. Even self-conscious attempts to avoid this by not imposing the hermeneutic results in colonialism because core concepts are smuggled in with an Indian guise,[61] or are limited because the parameters are from the core.[62]

Though nothing redeems the numerous forms of analytic-violence, its occurrence does substantiate the core's shortcomings in its interactions with a periphery that clearly remains evasive. Moreover, the frequency of the core's slippages in these interactions signifies an altogether alternate rationality. Sanctioning this are flashes of meaning in the work of Sunanda K. Datta-Ray on India's annexation of Sikkim, relations with Singapore,[63] and practices of secrecy.[64] In all three instances, Datta-Ray initiates with "issues" and proceeds with practitioners and official documents, reading them in conjunction. Unfortunately, this corpus does not systemise meaning beyond specific historical processes and individual practices to the level of the state and towards rationality. Perceptible, though, is that in addition to the core's limits in both hermeneutic and heuristic, there exists the possibility of a new hermeneutic that avoids violence and so returns to IR's metric.

The diagnosis for the analytic-violence pervading core-periphery interaction in memoires, histories, and theories, cannot be self-awareness. IR *is* aware of the colonialism of its components: origin, concept, theory, and the practice of diplomacy. All that remains is the process that combines these components: the hermeneutic. Evidently, it is analytic-violence's vector, but it cannot simply convey violence since its components have been cleansed by self-awareness. The hermeneutic must therefore constitute violence. In other words, the very practice of IR as inducing or deducing pivots on its heuristic, diplomacy, which is understood as racial hierarchy, thereby necessarily negating self-awareness about its components and so restoring violence. This is "aphasia," or "calculated forgetting," and it is not new to IR.[65] "Racial aphasia" was invoked for the components of IR in the post-War period in order to continue to utilise them.[66] Moreover, the manoeuvre's success is what renders self-awareness insufficient for neutralising colonialism in practice via more self-awareness. For these reasons, the diagnosis is that the hermeneutic is irretrievably compromised as deducing and inducing in practice and theory by the recurrence of aphasia about diplomacy. In short, what is requisite is a completely new hermeneutic to restore IR to its metric.

3. Treatment and Internal Efficacy

The treatment proposed to eradicate colonialism, including neo-colonialism, from the hermeneutic is "Producer-Centred Research" (PCR) because it is neither inductive nor deductive. The former accounts for the violence of wonderment and incoherence because

---

[61] Kanti Bajpai, "Indian Conceptions of Order and Justice: Nehruvian, Gandhian, Hindutva and Neo-Liberal," in *Order and Justice in International Relations*, ed. Rosemary Foot, John Gaddis, and Andrew Hurrell (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 236–61. Kanti Bajpai and Siddharth Mallavarapu ed. *International Relations in India: Bringing Theory Back Home* (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2004).

[62] David M. Malone, C. Raja Mohan, Srinath Raghavan, *The Oxford Handbook of Indian Foreign Policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

[63] Sunanda K. Datta-Ray, *Smash and Grab: Annexation of Sikkim,* 2nd ed. (New Delhi: Westland, 2013); Sunanda K. Datta-Ray, *Looking East to Look West: Lee Kuan Yew's Mission India* (Singapore: ISEAS, 2009).

[64] Sunanda K. Datta-Ray, *Waiting for America: India and the US in the New Millennium* (New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2002), viii-ix.

[65] Ann Laura Stoler, "Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France," *Public Culture* 23, no. 1 (2011): 121–56.

[66] Debra Thompson, "Through, Against and Beyond the Racial State: the Transnational Stratum of Race," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2013): 133–51.

the hermeneutic starts at the periphery and examines its results for implications to develop an inference that some rationality is operative. However, this is nearly always undermined by the truism that observation is necessarily informed by rationality, which in this case is particularly malignant: colonialism. In short, induction cannot handle the vicissitudes of colonialism. Meanwhile, deduction accounts for the violence of deletion, dismissal, and denigration because the hermeneutic starts with colonialism and proceeds through the periphery to arrive at a result which either demonstrates colonialism or falsifies it. However, falsification never arises as violence is enhanced to enforce conformity. Instead, PCR initiates with neither colonialism nor tainted data, but with consequences, and then constructs reason.

For instance: The surprising fact that the hermeneutic does not keep to its metric, is observed. But if the periphery exceeds the hermeneutic, then the hermeneutic not keeping to its metric becomes a matter of course. Hence, there is reason to suspect that the periphery exceeds IR.[67] Thus, PCR initiates with the perception of surprise. At issue is not theorising the surprise, but rather choosing which hypothesis to follow. This is indicated by the relationship between observations, which, in the case of core-periphery interaction, points to IR's subversion by colonialism despite awareness and peripheral excess. Hence, the hypothesis is that the hermeneutic is compromised. This makes PCR, at its inception, abductive. Its utility is that it transgresses inductive and deductive reason because it is initiated by "an act of *insight*, although of extremely fallible insight."[68]

Hence the need to establish PCR precisely. PCR's initiator is surprise, and it is related to other observations, either as a hidden cause and effect, as a phenomenon like others already experienced and explained in other situations, or of creating new general descriptions. Surprise takes two forms: novelty and anomaly. In colonialism's case, it is the latter since IR's metric is subverted. The depth, extent, and tenacity of the subversion is why it is not viewed in the terrain of theory or practice, but as "rationality". Embedded in rationality is "culture" and "diplomacy," and rationality is the operational location of choice for retired bureaucrats, historians, and theorists, who, in turn, misunderstand, seek, and impose it. Moreover, as the extent of analytic-violence intimates, the periphery exceeds colonialism and, at a minimum, is meaningful. Despite its prevalence and because it is pregnant with meaning, the vague use of rationality is refined to "loose and implicit practical-cum-theoretical pattern networks of knowledge, based on the experience of physical instances,"[69] or "an ideas toolkit". It is not just "a phenomenon to be accounted for," but also "one that accounts".[70] The treatment, and thus the interaction, is not undermined by using rationality. Being a colonial concept does not foreclose its usage for maintaining colonialism. That is as absurd as stating that perceiving, eating, or blinking is colonial. The error is assuming these concepts are internal to colonialism when they are external. In short, rationality in the singular is rejected for rationalities in the plural, hence colonialism is not rationality, but rather one of its forms. Yet, given the very embeddedness of rationality in the society that produces it, colonialism may be forgotten via aphasia, which is rampantly labelled as *common sense*. This necessitates further elaboration to make for movement between rationalities without imposing colonialism across rationalities.

---

[67] Charles Peirce, *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vol. 5, Pragmatism and Pragmaticism*, ed. C. Hartshorne and P. Weiss (Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press, 1934), 117.

[68] Ibid., 181.

[69] Maurice Bloch, *How we Think they Think: Anthropological Approaches to Cognition, Memory and Literacy* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998), 6.

[70] Quoted in, Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 109–10.

Required is inoculation against confirmation bias, which is to consistently remind oneself it is rationalities rather than rationality.

Constantly self-conscious, the final inoculation begins to become apparent in the accounting for the anomaly. This starts with examining the discipline itself, as has been done by engaging its origins, concepts, theories, and practice, to understand how the heuristic furthers racial hierarchy and organises the hermeneutic to make for colonialism. Also involved is examining the subject. This raises the issue of how to determine if it is rationality or rationalities in the absence of induction and deduction. The answer is that rationality as singular or plural is expressed in real-life, micro-sociological situations composed of practices.[71] The implication is to be aware of one's own rationality and simultaneously explore for another via practices. On the former, knowledge of, but not the privileging, of rationality's theories is recommended in contrast with deduction's emphasizing one and induction's claiming to eschew all. A plurality of theories assists, at a minimum, in fostering self-consciousness about rationality. For instance, only a deep familiarity of *Liberalism*, *Marxism*, and *Global History* engenders awareness of their colonialism, expressed as paternalistic sentimentalism; similarly, only awareness of *Postcolonialism* and *Postmodernism* uncovers their egocentric fantasias' foundation in a profoundly colonial narrative of unending violence. In short, rationality is all too familiar to PCR's practitioner, who therefore cannot allow it to taint the engagement with sociological practices.

How these are engaged completes the break with the hermeneutic and reveals the second inoculation against aphasia. While the hermeneutic cannot contemplate the periphery as capable of generating "authoritative sources," PCR not only can but does by treating the periphery as capable of generating practice and rationalising it. In short, the periphery is placed on par with theory and core. That this step arises from engaging rationality reiterates that it should inform empirical work, which should also be in consonance with rationality – only, not as deduction or induction. They negate the self-awareness of "grounded" disciplines such as Sociology and Anthropology and restore colonialism in their hermeneutic. For instance, Anthropologists collect data, but interpret via core personalities, rather than, say, Mahatma Gandhi or Chairman Mao Zedong, or local texts that have for thousands of years been part and parcel of Asian societies.

In other words, PCR is not "grounded research," but it accounts for an anomaly arising from interaction and so proceeds to investigate in terms of rationality, disciplinary practice, and the practices of the periphery. What reinsulates the latter is that practices are not just collected to verify if they accrue into patterns to determine if they are robust enough to indicate a rationality and to then verify whether this constitutes colonialism. Rather, the entire process is made sense of in terms of the practitioners: their practices are interpreted by them while also referring to rationality. In short, aphasia, even as common sense, is actively countered in the hermeneutic that is PCR. The result, therefore, is not "Agent-Based Modelling" because it is ignorance-preserving, abstract, and exploratory. PCR in contrast creates knowledge, albeit on another register, is grounded, but not in induction or deduction, and is conclusive because hypotheses arising from theory's interaction with the periphery are explained by the latter's data being self-explanatory.[72]

---

[71] Emile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss, and Benjamin Nelson, "Note on the Notion of Civilization," *Social Research* 38, no. 4 (1971): 810–12.

[72] Matus Halas, "In Error We Trust: an Apology of Abductive Inference," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 28, no. 4

The novelty of the treatment's dissolution of the hermeneutic's colonialism necessitates demonstration to evaluate efficacy and illustrate proper conduct. The first example is Ashis Nandy's practice, which initiates with establishing secularists and Hindu-nationalists, despite their violent differences about the status of Muslims in India, as one and the same for they are locked in a "'historical' battle [and so] understand each other perfectly" because the battleground is "empirical, verifiable history". But of course, the historical facts are impossibly contested. Nandy's cure is to negate empiricism by the "point of view" articulated by the Indian monk, Swami Vivekananda, to manage the pain of verifiable empirical "fact" through an "ahistorical" "moral": principled forgetfulness.[73] Within Vivekananda, this form of pain-management to survive the present affirms the power of the moral in managing "fact," and in doing so, affirms the concept of "timeless truths". Evidently, Nandy has begun, as PCR does, with the anomaly of two divergent practices, history and principled forgetfulness, to alleviate violence. Moreover, Nandy makes the therapeutic site rationalities, signified by history and principled forgetfulness, because the latter is an abomination to history's purpose of laying bare the past as a frame of reference. Therefore, Vivekananda is either insane or a practitioner of "doublethink".[74] But neither category describes him without analytic-violence, either branding him insane or, via imposition, straitjacketing him in rationality.

Next, Nandy accounts for principled forgetfulness not by the impossibility of eschewing rationality, but by utilising it rationally since his deployment of the "historical imagination" never exceeds its archival limits.[75] Paradoxically, Nandy uses history to account for *ahistory*, and does so by presenting the Bengali, Girindrasekhar Bose, in the proper way of historians, by contextualizing him in his society, elements of which search for their own empirically-verifiable history. Of significance is that Bose finds the *puranas* – ancient Indian mythical texts – to be a type of truth beyond history whose importance lies not in empirical fact but in their presenting alternative theories which possibly indicate an alternative rationality. Significantly, all of this is not to raise dead theories as a gift to rationality, but to account for an anomaly to reduce violence now.[76]

It is here, in verifying if myths make for a rationality, that Nandy is subverted by aphasia into imposing a totally alien tool-kit: psychoanalysis. This is not only because psychoanalysis is, even in Europe, a new invention, or that it is a personal invention, but also because it is entrenched in the intersection of the cultures of the *Enlightenment* and *Romanticism*.[77] In other words, Nandy uses the historical method but it produces aphasia, drawing him further into rationality, and so colonialism follows in the imposition of the core on hundreds of millions of the periphery's denizens. Of course, they might fit into the core's matrix, but what is certain is that Nandy wilfully eschews the "superabundance" of textual material that has been compiled over millennia and is utilised by Indians daily, just as Nandy's example of Bose demonstrates.[78] The betrayal of Bose is that he thinks he can explain himself by referring to his society's productions, but Nandy consciously forgets this by way of aphasia.

(2015): 701–20.

73 Ashis Nandy, "History's Forgotten Doubles," *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (1995): 47–54.

74 George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1949), Part I, Chapter 3, 32.

75 Roger Smith, "Reflections on the Historical Imagination," *History of the Human Sciences* 13, no. 4 (2000): 103–08.

76 Indebted for this insight to Ersel Aydınlı.

77 Quoted in, Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, ft. nt. 70, 300.

78 Of just one such text it has been written: "It would not be an exaggeration to say that the people of India have learnt to think and act in terms of the Mahabharata." R.N. Dandekar, Quoted in Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 109. The *Mahabharata* is how Indian diplomats today make sense of their work. See Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 110–16.

It occurs because Nandy refuses to treat, starting with Bose, the periphery's inhabitants as "authoritative sources". That the self-avowedly peripheral Nandy recognises rationalities but denies them to the periphery reaffirms colonialism's insidiousness. It is unsurprising, then, that this is so regular an occurrence in IR that one academic proclaims: "When shit happens – events defy conventional language, fit no familiar pattern, follow no conception of causality – I reach for Virilio's cosmology."[79] The writer epitomises a core that cannot reach out to the people making shit happen, for doing so is to admit rationality exists in the plural and that colonialism undermines the practice of IR in terms of its own metric.

What Nandy should do to restore efficacy is evident in the final example, secrecy in theory and practice, in India. The concept of "secrecy" for *Realists*, safeguards democracy, but it is undermined by secrecy, according to *Postcolonials*. Meanwhile, in practice, the Indian Prime Minister's calls for "declassification" and also says so in conversation.[80] The combination of all three makes for anomaly and thus commences PCR. A way to surmount this impasse between theories and practice by viewing the practitioner as an equal to theory is to continue with PCR. Its completion begins with another practice: the refusal to allow my travel with Indian diplomats to Bombay during my fieldwork at India's Ministry of External Affairs because of, as the Foreign Secretary explained, secrecy.[81] On the diplomats' return, they refused to engage in conversations mundane to the point of banality about Bombay. Questions were about the stay, sightseeing, the ocean – which was new for several – and the visit to Bombay's nuclear facilities, about which my inquisitiveness was limited to "what is it like?" One bureaucrat muttered "national secrecy" as if that were an explanation – as it is for *Realists* and *Postcolonials* since they interpret in their own terms, rather than the periphery's. Another bureaucrat added that their oath of secrecy denies the Constitutional right of free speech, which interlinks all of us. This wall of silence was punctured by a young female diplomat who giggled, "they don't want to talk about it because it gives them status(!)" and added: "I was talking to one of the [nuclear] scientists and he was saying … 'Why for all this secrecy? It's just to hide *incompetencies* here. And as for this national security business … we use all these private contractors and all their records are public. If any Chinese want to find out what we do, all they have to do is go look at the private company's records!' These peoples' [the new officials] heads are spinning now with all this secrecy!"[82]

To treat the quote as an equal to rationality, as "authoritative" counters aphasia as common sense and provides an avenue to interrogate the rationality for secrecy in the periphery that resolves the anomaly between *Realism*, *Postcolonialism*, and periphery. Secrecy's accounting in peripheral terms is what authorizes the contention that secrecy is an ostentatious display of high status. Reinforcing the contention is a wealth of data about bureaucrats' pre-bureaucratic lives being peripheral, which makes them status-seekers. Secrecy enables positive differentiation, thereby negating low status which continues into the bureaucrat's life from pre-bureaucratic times. This is because low racial and economic status cannot be compensated for by a newly-acquired job status. It requires constant bolstering, and so secrecy. In other words, secrecy enables and empowers, which is democracy's purpose.

---

[79] Quoted in Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 22.

[80] "PM: To aid research, may consider declassification," *Indian Express*, April 18, 2006, http://archive.indianexpress.com/news/pm-to-aid-research-may-consider-declassification/2732. Manmohan Singh, Conversation, 7 Racecourse Road, New Delhi, October 12, 2009.

[81] Shivshankar Menon. Email, July 27, 2007.

[82] IFS Probationer 23, Conversation, Foreign Service Institute, New Delhi, 2007.

Secrecy delivers democracy and so has nothing to do with *Realism's* and *Postcolonialism's* presumptions about state-level operations. In short, PCR mitigates analytic-violence not by imposing rationality, but by utilising it to account for and explain a significant IR concept in the periphery. This establishes efficacy in practice, for PCR dissolves colonialism internal to the hermeneutic and so aligns core-periphery interaction with IR's metric. Moreover, PCR also lends itself to comparing, and also cross pollination, between multiple rationalities, as has been done for the concept of *ritual* in diplomacy in the core, India, and China.[83]

4. External Efficacy and Conclusion

Alignment's external dimension is if PCR ameliorates the colonialism of its context. Establishing this completes efficacy's evaluation, however, it is complicated by PCR possibly generating irrationality in rationality's terms while addressing it, raising the spectre of occlusion or preclusion. To elaborate, in eradicating colonialism, PCR is an "authentic homegrown" hermeneutic that can unearth "authentic homegrown" rationalities,[84] as it does with "secrecy". This is efficacious for operating beyond colonialism and so revealing what is actually going on, but this may elude the context's colonialism, or it may obstruct PCR from progressing. To assess this, the first self-conscious monograph-length deployment of PCR, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism* (New York: OUP, 2015) is viewed in its context: scholars, primarily of IR. Their practices are made sense of in terms of PCR by treating its producers as "authoritative sources". However, they are not engaged with as extensively as the producers in the monograph are. Hence, relative to the monograph, this section is speculative. Furthermore, managing context as core and periphery is not to endorse colonialism's racial metric, but to map its operation, flow, and "bastion" now.

The monograph's origins suggest that IR's neo-colonialism dominated the core in 2005, when a proposal for a PhD was rejected outright by dozens of prospective supervisors primarily in the departments of IR, Anthropology and Sociology at the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, the LSE, and elsewhere in the United Kingdom over the course of numerous meetings. Only a Politics professor at SOAS was receptive, contingent on co-supervision with a colleague experienced in fieldwork within NGOs. The former's enthusiasm switching to rejection indicates PCR eluded his colleague. As the professor explained after discussions with his colleague, "the larger rationale - the motivation for the study - needs to be better articulated."[85] To overcome the impasse, with "sly civility" the proposal was civilized into a test for Foucauldian theory.[86] In short, rationalities were subsumed to rationality and so submitting to colonialism was a prerequisite for entering the core. This is how proposal became project at the University of Sussex. Revelation of true intent led to two supervisors quitting the project, and indeed a brief expulsion from the University. Another academic, Dr. Fabio Petito, frankly stated in a meeting the need for a proper IR framework, and since his proposal did not disable PCR, it was accepted. Within four years, Professor Kees van der Pijl and Sir Stephen Chan passed the project "with no corrections". Professor van der Pijl commented that the claim to an alternative hermeneutic is IR proper. Sir Stephen enquired

---

[83] Deep K. Datta-Ray, "India's Diplomacy is Absentia: Offence, Defence, Violence,"in *Bridging Two Worlds: Comparing Classical Political Thought and Statecraft in China and India,* ed. Daniel A. Bell and Yan Xuetong (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, forthcoming).

[84] Ersel Aydinli and Gonca Biltekin, "Widening the World of IR: a Typology of Homegrown Theorizing," *All Azimuth* 7, no. 1 (2018): 45–68.

[85] Email, February 1, 2005.

[86] Homi K. Bhabha, "Sly Civility," *October* 34 (1985): 71–80.

why the project was not activated at my undergraduate school, SOAS, and, upon learning why, said he would report my performance to his dissenting colleague. The heady pleasure of completion, heightened by champagne, was punctured within minutes by an IR academic commenting: "What?! … Not even any spelling mistakes?" It was the final instance of routine, everyday neo-colonialism. Prior to completion, the project was selected for publication by a core academic publisher who stated his ideal book is about lesbian terrorists murdering white men. In other words, the project arrived at the cusp of publication by manoeuvring around and ignoring neo-colonialism, which was trumped by capitalism and profit.

Since publication, five years have elapsed, during which the monograph has been reviewed, criticised, and utilised over thirty times by academia and the media. In comparing favourably with the average citation count of approximately twelve for "authentic homegrown" work,[87] it appears the monograph is dissolving the colonialism of core-periphery interaction. A slim but solid track between monograph and core is evident in that it understands, welcomes, and utilises PCR. The contrast with 2005 is interaction without dissimulation. The core's openness to revision is apparent in reviews of the book. Professor Ian Hall's review in Australia's *Asian Studies Review* finds the monograph "extraordinary," notes PCR requires "considerable persistence and high-level intervention," that "specialists in the field set aside practically all the assumptions that underpin our understanding of international relations," and that: "Each of the latter chapters could have been books in themselves." Hall also incisively writes that more can be made of the data, "fascinating for what they reveal … about the social contexts" that make India and its denizens into "individuals wrestling with" entrenched poverty, superficialities, misogyny, and racism.[88]

Colonialism's waning in the core of cores is attested to by the United States' *Association of College and Research Libraries* stating, "few are as determined or as ambitious" as the author and that the "effort is commendable and bold".[89] Singapore's *The Straits Times* concurs.[90] *The Round Table's* reviewer writes the book is, "highly rewarding … raises fascinating questions … about diplomacy … the very idea of modernity [and] will be a critical resource for scholars and practitioners everywhere."[91] *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy* notes that the book does "retrieve the non-Eurocentric origins of diplomacy, to illustrate how mythical principles of negotiating a unified cosmos offered valuable diplomatic principles before, during, and after the colonization of India."[92] An article in *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*[93] agrees, as does a monograph by OUP New York.[94] Furthermore, scholars endorse PCR by using its facts about, for instance, Mughal diplomacy to support the idea of rationalities rather than rationality.[95] The track cutting through the Anglosphere's colonialism extends to the Francosphere with

[87] Aydinli and Biltekin, "Widening the World of IR".

[88] Ian Hall, "The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism," *Asian Studies Review* 42, no. 2 (2018): 378–79; Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, Chapter 2.

[89] A. Ahmad, "Datta-Ray, Deep K.: The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism," *CHOICE: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries* (March 2016): 1081.

[90] Asad Latif, "Unique Insights into the Making of Indian Diplomacy," *The Straits Times*, May 16, 2015.

[91] Anton Harder, "The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism," *The Round Table* 109, no. 5 (2020): 648–52.

[92] Costas M. Constantinou and Paul Sharp, "Theoretical Perspectives in Diplomacy," in *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*, ed. Costas M. Constantinou, Pauline Kerr and Paul Sharp (London: Sage, 2016), 21.

[93] Costas M. Constantinou, "Visual Diplomacy: Reflections on Diplomatic Spectacle and Cinematic Thinking," *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 13, no. 4 (2018): 404.

[94] Thorsten Wojczewski, *India's Foreign Policy Discourse and its Conceptions of World Order: The Quest for Power and Identity* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018).

[95] Christophe Jaffrelot and Laurence Louër, "Introduction: The Gulf-South Asia Religious Connections: Indo-Islamic Civilization vs. pan-Islamism?," in *Pan-Islamic Connections: Transational Networks Between South Asia and the Gulf*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot and Lawrence Louër (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 1–20.

a review in *Politique étrangère*,[96] and PCR is recommended in *Sciences Po's*, *Manuel de diplomatie*.[97] The core also enforces its openness on the periphery that is Pakistan, where the author's failure to secure a review is dramatically overturned by an Englishman, Dr. David Taylor.[98] All of this is presaged by Canada's *Pacific Affairs'*, to use colonialism's metric, "ethnic" reviewer with ancestors from the periphery writing that PCR is "a highly original formulation [which] demonstrates clearly the need for IR scholars to venture into unfamiliar theoretical and methodological terrains."[99]

Interaction also results in preclusion, but this violence is not colonialism when the integrity of rationalities is maintained, as it is when PCR's facts service core academic work on kinship,[100] neo-institutionalism,[101] and surveys.[102] Preclusion's violence is colonialism when unreflective usage shatters integrity. It is smashed in a core academic book attributing the monograph to a "patriotic desire," because the presumption is the author mimics European nationalism and so, too, rationality.[103] Another instance of such violence is to use the book to state that Indian rationality utilises European institutions to make for "hybridity"; regardless of this sentiment being repeated in journals, it is disproved by the book detailing comprehensive appropriation and subsummation of Mughals and their diplomatic apparatus by the British.[104] PCR's results are also precluded by being harnessed to a hunt for *great power*, which constitutes colonialism since there is no evidence that India seeks unity.[105] Accounting for these preclusions might be a lack of understanding, but colonialism lurks beneath. Instructive was the comment, "I was reading your work again, but it's *too* theoretical," because the speaker is an ethic-Indian theorist of Indian IR. He epitomises what passes for the periphery's engagement with theory, or for that matter, fact: months later he published, blissfully unaware that his use of PCR's facts refutes his mimicry of rationality, that India seeks to be a *great power*.[106]

Evidently the core is open to revision, but the periphery responds with violence ranging from disengagement and sabotage to occlusion via instrumentalism. Moreover, that the periphery is consistently the source of all opposition signals colonialism is untethered to the core and that if it flows, it is from the periphery. For instance, while the core reviewed, the periphery refused.[107] An instance is India's *Economic and Political Weekly* (EPW). A new

[96] Isabelle Saint-Mézard, "Book Review: The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism," *Politique étrangère* 80, no. 4 (2015): 210–11.
[97] Christian Lequesne, "Les États et leur outil diplomatique," in *Manuel de diplomatie*, ed. Thierry Balzacq, Frédéric Charillon and Frédéric Ramel (Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2018),143–61.
[98] Ammar Ali Qureshi, "The Roots of Indian Foreign Policy," *The News on Sunday*, Pakistan, January 27, 2019, http://tns.thenews.com.pk/roots-indian-foreign-policy/#.XUwgQegzbIU.
[99] Sinderpal Singh, "Political Science. Volume 4, India Engages the World. ICSSR Research Surveys and Explorations," *Pacific Affairs* 88, no. 1 (2015): 143–44.
[100] Francesca R. Jensenius, "Kinship in Indian Politics: Dynasties, Nepotism and Imagined Families," in *Kinship in International Relations*, ed. Kristin Haugevik and Iver B. Neumann (Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge, 2019),138–53.
[101] Mélissa Levaillant, "The Contribution of Neo-Institutionalism to the Analysis of India's Diplomacy in the Making," in *Theorizing Indian Foreign Policy,* ed. Mischa Hansel, Raphaëlle Khan and Mélissa Levaillant (Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge, 2017), 160–80.
[102] Bernhard Beitelmair-Berini, "Theorizing Indian Strategic Culture(s): Taking Stock of a Controversial Debate," in Hansel, Khan, and Levaillant*, Theorizing Indian Foreign Policy,* 91–111.
[103] Alyssa Ayres, *Our Time Has Come: How India in Making its Place in the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 41–3.
[104] Karin M. Fierke, "Introduction: Independence, Global Entanglement and the Co-Production of Sovereignty," *Global Constitutionalism* 6, no. 2 (2017): 167–83; Karin M. Fierke, "Contraria sunt Complementa: Global Entanglement and the Constitution of Difference," *International Studies Review* 21, no. 1 (2018): 146–69.
[105] Bharat Karnad, *Staggering Forward: Narendra Modi and India's Global Ambition* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2018).
[106] Kanti Bajpai and Byron Chong, "India's Foreign Policy Capacity," *Policy Design and Practice* 2, no. 2 (2019): 137–62.
[107] A chapter on PCR in another book is favourably reviewed, see Sanjeeb Mukherjee, "The State of the Science of Politics in Contemporary India," *Economic and Political Weekly* 51, no. 51 (2016): 34.

editor, Paranjoy Guha Thakurta, was amenable to reviewing the book but his attacks on the powerful, industrial, Adani Group resulted in his removal by the academic Romila Thapar colluding and working hand-in-glove with the Adanis.[108] The colonialism undergirding action was visible in that EPW finally acquiesced to a review, but only at the prompting of a reviewer who is indisputably of the core, Trinity College Cambridge's Vere Harmsworth Professor of Imperial and Naval History, Samita Sen.[109] That colonialism drives the periphery and explains why the book was not reviewed is reinforced by Professor Sen's call for the book to be read by the academy beyond IR. That colonialism is a peripheral quality is further reiterated in the three peripheral scholars, that is, located in the periphery, who were commissioned by three core journals to write reviews neither delivering nor explaining, which suggests sabotage. This is active in the case of the review commissioned by the core IR journal *Political Studies Review*, for the review is subverted by a periphery reviewer studiously avoiding evaluation and thus occluding. Compounding this is the error of presumption, imposition, and everything but PCR, evident from the outset in the reviewer imposing his Hindustani meaning upon the "K" in my name.[110]

The periphery is also where the only academic dismissal of PCR arose from a scholar who is, and this is perhaps not incidental, an immigrant to the core.[111] Thornstein Veblen who himself was an immigrant to the core, noted that immigrant scholars dismiss what they leave behind so to fit into their new homelands.[112] In the case of PCR, Veblen's insight does not make for a correlation, but does suggest an instrumental form of colonialism, for the book was rejected to entrap rationalities in rationality and so to forward integration of the peripheral scholar into the core. This is also suggested by another scholar, also an immigrant, noting the book in a journal but attributing it[113] in another journal not to the puzzle at the core of the book but to a will to create "Indian IR" which yet again highlights intent as maintaining colonialism by containing rationalities within rationality.[114]Related is occlusion in reverse, or maintaining colonialism but with India on top, which accounts for tensions in a media review by a possible immigrant.[115] However, these flows of colonialism need not be permanent. An "ethnic," and thus relative to the immigrant, integrated scholar, used in an academic monograph PCR's conclusion that Mahatma Gandhi influences Jawaharlal Nehru's foreign policy to argue that this constitutes an intellectual line from the *Mahabharata* to the Non-Aligned Movement. The claim's significance lies in it breaking peripheral colonialism which concocts – because it contradicts everything each said about the other – that Nehru's usage of Gandhi is instrumental in an effort to impose rationality.[116] There is also occlusion

---

[108] Paranjoy Guha Thakurta, Email, March 27, 2017.

[109] Samita Sen, Email, August 29, 2019.

[110] Pankaj Kumar, "Book Review: The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism," *Political Studies Review* 15, no. 1 (2016): 103–04.

[111] Vineet Thakur, "Panditji Knows Best," in *Postscripts on Independence: Foreign Policy Ideas, Identity, and Institutions in India and South Africa,* ed. Vineet Thakur, Siddharth Mallavarapu, Himadeep Muppidi, and Raymond Duvall (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019).

[112] Thornstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men* (New York: B.W. Heubsch, 1918), 4. See too, Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 18.

[113] Amitav Acharya, "Theorising the International Relations of Asia: Necessity or Indulgence? Some Reflections," *The Pacific Review* 30, no. 6 (2017): 824.

[114] Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan, "Why is there no Non-Western International Relations Theory? Ten Years On," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 17 (2017): 360.

[115] Jaideep A. Prabhu, "There's an Indic Way of Thinking About Foreign Policy But We are Doing It the Wrong Way," *Swarajya*, January 14, 2017, https://swarajyamag.com/books/theres-an-indic-way-of-thinking-about-foreign-policy-but-we-are-doing-it-the-wrong-way.

[116] Bhakti Shringarpure, *Cold War Assemblages: Decolonization to Digital* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2019), Chapter 1. See

not by colonialism but by self-imposed methodological limits in a journal article,[117] and in a memoire,[118] but it was colonialism which made for a former Indian Foreign Minister's[119] and a Foreign Secretary's[120] occlusion in their reviews.

The periphery's novel combinations of violence crescendo in hysteria only because of another iteration of the core's waning colonialism: the commissioning of a review beyond IR in *Philosophy East and West*. Once again, the periphery reviewer subverted the review, using it instrumentally to redirect the reader to his research agenda. Instrumentalism accounts for occlusion, but only colonialism accounts for the reviewer's conspicuous violence obvious in, for instance, the virulence of the assertion that "the book is poorly written in terms of logic of arguments and development of thoughts in a systematic and coherent way". Along with other such assertions, what emerges is that at issue is rationalities, which the reviewer submerges for rationality and so mandates colonialism, whose inevitable violence comes to personify the reviewer. This reviewer must act so for he accepts rationality but its inventor, the core, deems rationality is a derivative in the periphery because it mimics. That ensures perpetual insecurity, twice over, for the reviewer. He must constantly educate himself about the core since it changes constantly, which in turn also entails constant vigilance of slippage, revealing what he was before becoming rational.[121] The need for both is directly enhanced by the book unveiling the periphery for what it is and doing so in embarrassing detail, evident in the practice of keeping "secrecy" and about what Hall, politely, calls "social contexts".[122] What the interaction reveals, then, is that the reviewer's violence is to neutralise the threat of PCR from revealing the counterfeit status of the reviewer, and since he cannot, violence becomes the purpose –not just to occlude, but to erase all trace of the book. It is another replaying of his demonstrated instrumentalism, only now the instrument of violence is also the purpose.

Violence as purpose inevitably overcomes peripheral reviewers and renders them hysterical. This is apparent in another peripheral reviewer for whom, once again, it is rationalities that is at stake. This is clear in the rhetorical question of whether the book is an "elaborate hoax," for repeated is the age-old ascribing of irrationality by the coloniser. This is, however, insufficient to safeguard the reviewer, particularly since he was an Indian diplomat, which carries the implication that he is a direct target of the book's exposure of compromising details. Hence, the previous reviewer's violence is necessary and rises to overcome the reviewer, for the only alternative he has is to reveal himself as counterfeit. A moderate line from the review is: "The trees that gave up their lives to get [the book] printed died meaningless deaths."[123] In other words, peripheral reviewers maintain colonialism to partake in rationality's benefits, but this mandates that they are only fakes with all that it implies. Just how fraught their situation is, is exposed by PCR, heightening their precariousness. Hence, they attack.

Deep K. Datta-Ray, *The Making of Indian Diplomacy*, 205–6.

[117] Vikas Kumar, "Recovering/Uncovering the 'Indian' in Indian Diplomacy: An 'Ancient' Tadka for a Contemporary Curry?," *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs* 5, no. 2 (2018): 197–215.

[118] Shivshankar Menon, *Choices: Inside the Making of India's Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2016).

[119] Shashi Tharoor, "Diplomatically Hindu," *Open* (23 May 2016): 59–61.

[120] Krishnan Srinivasan, "Different Worlds: Looking Beyond the Zero-Sum Game," *The Telegraph*, September 15, 2015, https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/different-worlds/cid/1443847.

[121] Homi K. Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," *Discipleship: a Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (1984): 125–33.

[122] Ananta Kumar Giri, "The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism (review)," *Philosophy East and West* 68, no. 3 (2018): 1020–023.

[123] Satyabrata Pal, "In Search of Roots in the Epic," *The Book Review* (2015): 9-10.

To conclude, the book affects colonialism within the hermeneutic and in its context. The book's efficacy is its aligning the hermeneutic with the purpose of eradicating violence and this licenses the treatment that is PCR for general usage. If deployed outside IR, PCR may stem IR's slide into irrelevance, evident in its imports from, far exceeding its exports to, other disciplines, and which is widely known.[124] Indeed, PCR may prove regenerative, for on offer is the generation of new theory – not as abstractions, but from PCR's practice, and so capable of accounting, explaining, and becoming models all the more relevant for being material. PCR can even reconstitute diplomacy as an entirely new heuristic, with the potential to transform interstate relations itself. The possibilities are limitless, but they are contingent on managing the external dimension. Its core is engaging, which is suggestive in the quelling of violence by PCR, yet it incites in the periphery violence artful in circumscribing the core's openness, but also visceral and hysterical. That renders the book's ability to stem colonialism by overcoming preclusion and occlusion in the periphery ambivalent, at best. Yet all may not be lost, for one peripheral voice in one of the periphery's newspapers, concludes *The Making of Indian Diplomacy* is a "brilliant and innovative narration".[125]

Bibliography

Ahmad, A. "Datta-Ray, Deep K.: The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism." *CHOICE: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries* (March 2016): 1081.

Abraham, Itty. *The Making of the Indian Atom Bomb: Science, Secrecy and the Post-Colonial State.* London: Zed Books, 1998.

Abraham, Itty, ed. *South Asian Cultures of the Bomb: Atomic Publics and the State in India and Pakistan.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009.

Acharya, Amitav. "Theorising the International Relations of Asia: Necessity or Indulgence? Some Reflections." *The Pacific Review* 30, no. 6 (2017): 816–28.

Acharya, Amitav, and Barry Buzan. "Why is there no Non-Western International Relations Theory? Ten Years On." *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 17 (2017): 341–70.

Anghie, Antony. "The Bush Administration, Preemption Doctrine and the United Nations." *American Society of International Law Proceedings*, 98 (2004): 326–29.

———. "The War on Terror and Iraq in Historical Perspective." *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 43, no. 1 (2005): 45–66.

Anievas, Alexander, Nivi Manchanda and Robbie Shilliam. "Confronting the Global Colour Line: An Introduction." In *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line*, edited by Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda, and Robbie Shilliam, 1–16, New York: Routledge, 2015.

Aydinli, Ersel, and Gonca Biltekin. "Widening the World of IR: a Typology of Homegrown Theorizing." *All Azimuth* 7, no. 1 (2018): 45–68.

Ayres, Alyssa. *Our Time Has Come: How India in Making its Place in the World.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Babu, B. Ramesh. "Dealing with the World, Indian Style." *The Hindu*, November 1, 2015. https://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-features/tp-sundaymagazine/dealing-with-the-world-indian-style/article7828083.ece.

Bajpai, Kanti. "Indian Conceptions of Order and Justice: Nehruvian, Gandhian, Hindutva and Neo-Liberal." In *Order and Justice in International Relations*, edited by Rosemary Foot, John Gaddis, and Andrew Hurrell, 236–61. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

---

[124] For a summation, see Muznah Siddiqui, "Assessing the Claim That the Development of International Theory Is Over," *E-International Relations*, March 15, 2019, https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/15/assessing-the-claim-that-the-development-of-international-theory-is-over/.

[125] B. Ramesh Babu, "Dealing with the World, Indian Style," *The Hindu*, November 01, 2015, https://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-features/tp-sundaymagazine/dealing-with-the-world-indian-style/article7828083.ece.

Bajpai, Kanti, and Byron Chong. "India's Foreign Policy Capacity." *Policy Design and Practice* 2, no. 2 (2019): 137–62.

Bajpai, Kanti, and Siddharth Mallavarapu, ed. *International Relations in India: Bringing Theory Back Home*. New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2004.

Barkan, Elazar. *The Retreat of Scientific Racism: Changing Concepts of Race in Britain and the United States between the World Wars*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Beitelmair-Berini, Bernhard. "Theorizing Indian Strategic Culture(s): Taking Stock of a Controversial Debate." In Hansel, Khan, and Levaillant, *Theorizing Indian Foreign Policy*, 91-111.

Bell, Duncan. "Race and International Relations: Introduction." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2013): 1–4.

Berridge, G.R., Maurice Keens-Soper, and T.G. Otte. *Diplomatic Theory from Machiavelli to Kissinger*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." *Discipleship: a Special Issue on Psychoanalysis* 28 (1984): 125–33.

———. "Sly Civility." *October* 34 (1985): 71-80.

Bhaskaran, R. "The Philosophical Basis of Indian Foreign Policy." In *Foreign Policy of India: A Book of Readings*, edited by K.P. Mishra. New Delhi: Thomson Press, 1977.

Bloch, Maurice. *How we Think they Think: Anthropological Approaches to Cognition, Memory and Literacy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1998.

Boivin, Nicole. "Anthropological, Historical, Archaeological and Genetic Perspectives on the Origins of Caste in South Asia." In *The Evolution and History of Human Populations in South Asia*, edited by Michael D. Petraglia and Bridget Allchin, 341–61. Dordrecht: Springer, 2007.

Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Bull, Hedley, and Martin Wight. *Systems of States*. Edited by Hedley Bull. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977.

Chacko, Priya. "Srinath Raghavan, War and Peace in Modern India: A Strategic History of Nehru Years." *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 48, no. 2 (2011): 305–07.

Constantinou, Costas M. "Visual Diplomacy: Reflections on Diplomatic Spectacle and Cinematic Thinking." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 13, no. 4 (2018): 387–409.

Constantinou, Costas M., and Paul Sharp. "Theoretical Perspectives in Diplomacy." In *The Sage Handbook of Diplomacy*, edited by Costas M. Constantinou, Pauline Kerr, and Paul Sharp, 13–27. London: Sage, 2016.

Datta-Ray, Deep K. "The Analysis of the Practice of Indian Diplomacy." In *Political Science: Vol. 4: India Engages the World*, edited by Navnita Chadha Behera and Achin Vanaik, 234–69. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013.

———. "Diplomacy Beyond History: Analytic-Violence, Producer-Centred Research, India." *India Quarterly* 77, no. 1 (2021): 9–24.

———. "India's Diplomacy is Absentia: Offence, Defence, Violence." In *Bridging Two Worlds: Comparing Classical Political Thought and Statecraft in China and India,* edited by Daniel A. Bell and Yan Xuetong. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, forthcoming.

———. *The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. "Violence, Hermeneutics and Postcolonial Diplomacy." In *Routledge Handbook of Postcolonial Politics*, edited by Olivia U. Rutazibwa and Robbie Shilliam, 140–56. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Datta-Ray, Sunanda K. *Looking East to Look West: Lee Kuan Yew's Mission India.* Singapore: ISEAS, 2009.

———. *Smash and Grab: Annexation of Sikkim,* 2nd ed. New Delhi: Westland, 2013.

———. "Twenty Years of Looking East." *Business Standard*, July 14, 2012. http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/sunanda-k-datta-ray-twenty-yearslooking-east/480356/.

——. *Waiting for America: India and the US in the New Millennium*. New Delhi: Harper Collins, 2002.

Dikötter, Frank. *The Discourse of Race in Modern China*. London: Hurst, 1992.

Durkheim, Emile, Marcel Mauss, and Benjamin Nelson. "Note on the Notion of Civilization." *Social Research* 38, no. 4 (1971): 808–13.

Fierke, Karin M. "Contraria sunt Complementa: Global Entanglement and the Constitution of Difference." *International Studies Review* 21, no. 1 (2018): 146–69.

———. "Introduction: Independence, Global Entanglement and the Co-Production of Sovereignty." *Global Constitutionalism* 6, no. 2 (2017): 167–83.

Frey, Karsten. *India's Nuclear Bomb and National Security*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2006.

Ganguly, Sumit. *Conflict Unending: India-Pakistan Tensions since 1947*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

———. "India's Foreign and Security Policies." In Pekkanen, Ravenhill, and Foot, *The Oxford Handbook,* 411–26.

———. "India's Pathway to Pokhran II: The Prospects and Sources of New Delhi's Nuclear Weapons Program." *International Security* 23, no. 4 (1999): 148–77.

Giri, Ananta Kumar. "The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism (review)." *Philosophy East and West* 68, no. 3 (2018): 1020–023.

Goldberg, David Theo. *The Racial State*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 2002.

Halas, Matus. "In Error We Trust: an Apology of Abductive Inference." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 28, no. 4 (2015): 701–20.

Hall, Ian. "The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism." *Asian Studies Review* 42, no. 2 (2018): 378–79.

Halliburton, Murphy. "Gandhi or Gramsci? The Use of Authoritative Sources in Anthropology." *Anthropological Quarterly* 77, no. 4 (2004): 793–817.

Hansel, Mischa, Raphaëlle Khan, and Mélissa Levaillant. *Theorizing Indian Foreign Policy.* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2017.

Harder, Anton. "The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism." *The Round Table* 109, no. 5 (2020): 648–52.

Henderson, Errol A. "Hidden in Plain Sight: Racism in International Relations Theory." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2013): 71–92.

Hesse, Barnor. "Racialized Modernity: An Analytics of White Mythologies." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30, no. 4 (2007): 643-63.

Holslag, Jonathan. *India and China: Prospects for Peace*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Hua, Shipping, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Politics.* New York: Routledge, 2018.

Jaffrelot, Christophe, and Laurence Louër. "Introduction: The Gulf-South Asia Religious Connections: Indo-Islamic Civilization vs. pan-Islamism?" In *Pan-Islamic Connections: Transational Networks Between South Asia and the Gulf*, ed. Christophe Jaffrelot and Lawrence Louër, 1–20. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Jain, Purnendra. "Energy Security in Asia." In Pekkanen, Ravenhill, and Foot, *The Oxford Handbook*, 547-68.

Jensenius, Francesca R. "Kinship in Indian Politics: Dynasties, Nepotism and Imagined Families." In *Kinship in International Relations*, edited by Kristin Haugevik and Iver B. Neumann, 138-53. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge, 2019.

Karnad, Bharat. *Staggering Forward: Narendra Modi and India's Global Ambition*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2018.

Kennedy, Andrew B. "India's Nuclear Odyssey: Implicit Umbrellas, Diplomatic Disappointments, and the Bomb." *International Security* 36 (2011): 120-53.

Kerr, Philip Henry. "Political Relations Between Advanced and Backward Peoples." In *An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*, edited by A. J. Grant, Arthur Greenwood, John David Ivor Hughes, Philip Henry Kerr Lothian, and Francis Fortescue Urquhart, 141–82. London: Macmillan, 1916.

Kohli, Atul, and Prerna Singh, ed. *Routledge Handbook of Indian Politics*. New Delhi: Routledge, 2013.

Kumar, Pankaj. "Book Review: The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism." *Political Studies Review* 15, no. 1 (2016): 103–04.

Kumar, Vikas. "Recovering/Uncovering the 'Indian' in Indian Diplomacy: An 'Ancient' Tadka for a Contemporary Curry?" *Journal of Asian Security and International Affairs* 5, no. 2 (2018): 197–215.

Kumaraswamy, P.R. "National Security: A Critique." In *Security Beyond Survival: Essays for K. Subrahmanyam*, edited by P. R. Kumaraswamy. New Delhi: Sage, 2004.

Kumari, Priya. "India as a Normative Power: The Mixed Migration Crisis of the Indian Ocean." *International Studies* 51, no. 1 (2014): 180–94.

Lake, David A. "Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics." *International Security* 32, no. 1 (2007): 47–79.

Latif, Asad. "Unique Insights into the Making of Indian Diplomacy." *The Straits Times*, May 16, 2015.

Lequesne, Christian. "Les États et leur outil diplomatique." In *Manuel de diplomatie*, edited by Thierry Balzacq, Frédéric Charillon and Frédéric Ramel, 143-61. Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2018.

Levaillant, Mélissa. "The Contribution of Neo-Institutionalism to the Analysis of India's Diplomacy in the Making." In Hansel, Khan, and Levaillant*, Theorizing Indian Foreign Policy,* 160–80.

Malone, David M., C. Raja Mohan, and Srinath Raghavan. *The Oxford Handbook of Indian Foreign Policy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Menon, Shivshankar. *Choices: Inside the Making of India's Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press, 2016.

Michael, Arndt. "Realist-Constructivism and the India-Pakistan Conflict: A New Theoretical Approach for an Old Rivalry." *Asian Politics & Policy* 10, no. 1 (2018): 100–14.

Mohan, C. Raja. *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy*. New Delhi: Penguin, 2003.

Montagu, Ashley. *Statement on Race* 3rd ed*.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Morgenthau, Hans. *Politics among Nations*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.

Mukherjee, Sanjeeb. "The State of the Science of Politics in Contemporary India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 51, no. 51 (2016): 27–35.

Mutua, Makau Wa. "Savages, Victims and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights." *Harvard International Law Journal* 42 (2001): 201–45.

Nandy, Ashis. "History's Forgotten Doubles." *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (1995): 44–66.

Olson, William, and A. J. R. Groom. *International Relations Then and Now*. London: Harper Collins, 1991.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1949.

Pal, Satyabrata. "In Search of Roots in the Epic." *The Book Review* (2015): 9-10.

Pant, Harsh V. "The US-India Nuclear Pact: Policy, Process, and Great Power Politics." *Asian Security* 5 (2009): 273–95.

Paul, T. V. "Integrating International Relations Studies in India to Global Scholarship." *International Studies* 46, no. 1-2 (2009): 129–45.

Peirce, Charles. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce. Vol. 5, Pragmatism and Pragmaticism*. Edited by C. Hartshorne and P. Weiss. Cambridge. MA: Harvard University Press, 1934.

Pekkanen, Saadia, John Ravenhill, and Rosemary Foot, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of the International Relations of Asia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Perkovich, George. *India's Nuclear Bomb: The Impact on Global Proliferation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.

Pinto, Ambrose. "UN Conference against Racism: is Caste Race?" *Economic and Political Weekly* 36, no. 30 (2001): 2817–820.

Prabhu, Jaideep A. "There's an Indic Way Of Thinking About Foreign Policy But We Are Doing It The Wrong Way." *Swarajya*, January 14, 2017. https://swarajyamag.com/books/theres-an-indic-way-of-thinking-about-foreign-policy-but-we-are-doing-it-the-wrong-way.

Qureshi, Ammar Ali. "The Roots of Indian Foreign Policy." *The News on Sunday*, Pakistan, January 27, 2019. http://tns.thenews.com.pk/roots-indian-foreign-policy/#.XUwgQegzbIU.

Reinsch, Paul. "The Negro Race and European Civilization." *American Journal of Sociology* 11, no. 2 (1905): 145–67.

———. *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century.* New York: Macmillan, 1900.

Roth, Wolff-Michael. "Astonishment: a Post-Constructivist Investigation into Mathematics as Passion." *Educ Stud Math* 95 (2017): 97–111.

Saint-Mézard, Isabelle. "Book Review: The Making of Indian Diplomacy: a Critique of Eurocentrism." *Politique* étrangère 80, no. 4 (2015): 210–11.

Sampson, Aaron. "Tropical Anarchy: Waltz, Wendt, and the Way We Imagine International Politics." *Alternatives* 27 (2002): 429–57.

Saran, Shyam. *How India Sees the World: Kautilya to the 21ˢᵗ Century*. New Delhi: Juggernaut Books, 2017.

Sen, Samita. "A 'Cosmological' Approach to Diplomacy." *Economic and Political Weekly* 55, no. 49 (2020): 24–6.

Shilliam, Robbie. "The Atlantic as a Vector of Uneven and Combined Development." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 22, no. 1 (2009): 69–88.

Shringarpure, Bhakti. *Cold War Assemblages: Decolonization to Digital*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2019.

Siddiqui, Muznah. "Assessing the Claim That the Development of International Theory Is Over." *E-International Relations*, March 15, 2019. https://www.e-ir.info/2019/03/15/assessing-the-claim-that-the-development-of-international-theory-is-over/.

Singh, Sinderpal. "Political Science. Volume 4, India Engages the World. ICSSR Research Surveys and Explorations." *Pacific Affairs* 88, no. 1 (2015): 142–44.

Smith, Roger. "Reflections on the Historical Imagination." *History of the Human Sciences* 13, no. 4 (2000): 103–08.

Solomos, John. *Race and Racism in Britain,* 3rd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Srinivasan, Krishnan. "Different Worlds: Looking Beyond the Zero-Sum Game." *The Telegraph*, September 15, 2015. https://www.telegraphindia.com/opinion/different-worlds/cid/1443847.

———. "Special Bond." *The Telegraph*, January 31, 2014. https://www.telegraphindia.com/1140131/jsp/opinion/story_17876883.jsp#.WJCH40navIU.

Stewart, Jeffrey. "Introduction." In *Alain Locke: Race Contacts and Interracial Relations*, edited by Jeffrey Stewart, xix-lix. Washington: Howard University Press, 1992.

Stoler, Ann Laura. "Colonial Aphasia: Race and Disabled Histories in France." *Public Culture* 23, no. 1 (2011): 121–56.

Thakur, Vineet. "Panditji Knows Best." In *Postscripts on Independence: Foreign Policy Ideas, Identity, and Institutions in India and South Africa,* edited by Vineet Thakur, Siddharth Mallavarapu, Himadeep Muppidi, and Raymond Duvall. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Tharoor, Shashi. "Diplomatically Hindu." *Open* (23 May 2016): 59–61.

Thompson, Debra. "Through, Against and Beyond the Racial State: the Transnational Stratum of Race." *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26, no. 1 (2013): 133–51.

Veblen, Thornstein. *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: B.W. Heubsch, 1918.

Vitalis, Robert. "The Graceful and Generous Liberal Gesture: Making Racism Invisible in American International Relations." *Millennium* 29, no. 2 (2000): 331–56.

Vohra, Dewan C. *India's Aid Diplomacy in the Third World*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1981.

Winant, Howard. "Race and Race Theory." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26, no. 1 (2000): 169–85.

———. *The World is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy since World War Two*. New York: Basic Books, 2001.

Wojczewski, Thorsten. *India's Foreign Policy Discourse and its Conceptions of World Order: The Quest for Power and Identity*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2018.

Yuan, Jingdong. "Nuclear Politics in Asia." In Pekkanen, Ravenhill, and Foot, *The Oxford Handbook*, 505–23.