

3 A Decolonial Mission for Critical Terrorism Studies

Interrogating the Gendered Coloniality and Colonial Function of the Dominant Discourse on Terrorism

Rabea M. Khan <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0709-6493>

Increasingly popular calls to “decolonise” have also arrived in the field of Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS). As argued in this chapter, such calls can be problematic and counter-productive to the ethos of the school of decoloniality, especially when it comes to a discipline so closely tied to Terrorism Studies. This chapter reflects on the subtle differences between postcolonial and decolonial approaches and contends that CTS cannot and should not aim to “decolonise” but rather challenge and excavate the gendered-colonial implications, imaginations and logics hidden in the dominant discourse on “terrorism”. As such, a decolonial approach to CTS, it is argued, needs to be aimed at challenging the project of Western (colonial-)modernity, which has produced the racialised and gendered, dominant discourse on “terrorism” today. This discourse perpetuates harmful, racist imaginations of the “terrorist” which are also inherently gendered and ultimately serve the global structures of white supremacy. A theoretical framework investigating the so-called “gendered coloniality” is proposed as one way of studying and uncovering the gendered and racial code inherent to and surrounding the discourse on “terrorism”.

Introduction

Calls for “decolonising” various disciplines, curricula, or even the university itself are trending and have become a new buzzword in many academic circles and disciplines, especially those acclaimed as “critical”. While I consider myself a scholar dedicated to the dismantling of coloniality, I contend that calls for “decolonising” Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS) are unattainable, misplaced and potentially problematic. While the language of “decolonising” can be used in a theoretical context to denote and signify decolonial efforts to rid an academic field or discipline of colonial remnants and biases (see Bhabra, Gebrial & Nisancioglu, 2018; Shilliam, 2021), it remains an expression that is over-used, abused and often co-opted. This ultimately distracts from its original Indigenous call for the actual repatriation of Indigenous lands (Fanon, 1961; Tuck and Yang, 2012). Nevertheless, I contend that CTS still needs to engage with decolonial thinking and decolonial efforts if it wants to remain relevant and continue to provide the challenge to Terrorism Studies (TS) it set out to provide upon its inception. I therefore propose a “decolonial mission” for CTS which does not fall into co-optive, performative and/or opportunistic claims of “decolonisation”.

Such a mission, I argue, first needs to acknowledge its limitations. CTS’s limits stem from the coloniality of the discipline it originates from and responds to: Terrorism Studies. I therefore eschew other terms such as “Orthodox” or “Traditional” Terrorism Studies with which to describe Terrorism Studies, because I contend that doing so implies that there is a

“good” or better “Terrorism Studies” that can set itself apart from the “old” ways of doing terrorism research. CTS, however, is not and should not be about forming a new discipline that conducts Terrorism Studies “better”. Aspiring to do so would be based on the premise that “terrorism” is indeed a brute fact rather than a social fact that is produced mainly in discourse (see Jackson, 2008a). Instead, CTS is a field of study dedicated to showing how inherently problematic (and constructed) the very subject of the discipline of Terrorism Studies is and not a field of study that offers better ways of doing it – which consequently would also imply offering better ways of countering the violence imagined as “terrorism”.¹ Although the field of CTS has by now come to encompass work that seemingly seeks to do “Terrorism Studies” better rather than challenging its very foundation, CTS originally set out to study the “productions and constructions of terrorism” (Jarvis, 2009, p. 12). A decolonial CTS, I then argue, would study how these productions and constructions of terrorism uphold the project of Western colonial-modernity.

This means that if CTS wants to adopt “decolonial” approaches it needs to first acknowledge that the whole discipline of Terrorism Studies to which it is a response to and a part of at the same time, is *colonial*.² This, then, leaves the very humble option for CTS to provide a platform and community which is dedicated to dismantling this (colonial) discipline rather than conducting it in better ways. As I have argued previously, CTS has emerged as a “counter-discourse” to Terrorism Studies (see Khan, 2021a), which means it will inevitably be shaped and restrained by the very discourses it sets out to critique. This entrapment in a counter-discourse, I argue, makes it impossible to “decolonise” CTS. However, as I further argue, this need not and should not be the goal for CTS. While CTS cannot “decolonise” in that sense, it can and does offer room to resist dominant power structures, such as the global structures of White Supremacy central to the modern-colonial system we are living in. Recognising our limitations as a discipline that is dependent on these colonial structures could be the first step in embarking on a decolonial mission that stays clear from overly ambitious, and as I would argue misplaced, calls for decolonisation of the field. Thus, I propose an approach that is centred on *deconstruction* rather than *transformation*. While the

¹ As has been noted by other scholars, the purpose of most scholars of Terrorism Studies has been to either debate its definition (which departs from an epistemological position that takes terrorism as a brute fact rather than a social fact) and/or to determine better ways of fighting what is imagined as terrorism – a role that sees the terrorism scholar as a counter-terrorist by other means (see Schuurman 2018)

² Note here that my use of ‘colonial’ is not meant to signify the era of colonialism or colonisation as a practice but rather signifies the colonial structures and logics that have preceded and succeeded this era and are embedded in dominant thinking, writing and speaking, as I explain in more detail further below in this chapter.

former allows for “decolonial approaches” the latter would seek (an unattainable) “decolonisation” of CTS or TS.

I propose that such a decolonial mission, then, should be centred on investigating how the dominant discourses on terrorism uphold and serve the project of Western colonial-modernity. Terrorism, I argue, is embedded in a colonial imagination and discourse even when the language of “terrorism” is not used: other forms of violence, resistance, or protest that have challenged the modern-colonial, Westphalian state’s monopoly on violence have been imagined as terrorism (and consequently were responded to in the same way) long before the current discourse on terrorism was established. Among these are insurgencies, anti-colonial resistance and other protests. As Schotten (2018, see also Chapter 2 in this volume) further notes, early colonial discourses on the native “savage” have fulfilled the same function that discourses on the “terrorist” now do. Nevertheless, it seems that “terrorism” has replaced these earlier discourses of, for example, the “savage” with that of the terrorist (Schotten, 2018). This, I suggest, highlights the importance of making discourse central to any decolonial mission that CTS wants to engage in. For it is the discourse on terrorism that continues to perpetuate coloniality, both in practice and in discourse itself.

Thus, in this chapter, I provide an example of a theoretical framework that is centred on excavating the colonial foundation upon which the dominant discourse on terrorism is built. This is an approach that is decolonial in its ethos but postcolonial in its methodology. This example is one I employed for my doctoral thesis which sought to excavate the colonial origin and function of the popular category “religious terrorism” in Terrorism Studies.³ This framework – the gendered coloniality – is a discourse-centred approach with the larger aim of deconstructing and excavating coloniality and gendered-colonial origins in concepts central to dominant discourses in Terrorism Studies.

In what follows, I begin with an introduction to coloniality as articulated by Quijano (1992) and further developed by Mignolo (2007) but also formulated in different terms by indigenous, feminist scholars like Rivera Cusicanqui (2012). Here I explain the decolonial mission which I, as a CTS scholar, seek to embark on and introduce my own framework of what I refer to as a “gendered coloniality”, inspired by the work of Lugones (2010) and Oyěwùmí (1997). Unlike Lugones and Oyěwùmí, however, I focus on the structural and not embodied aspect of gender as central to reproducing colonial structures, especially within the

3 The gendered coloniality of the Religious Terrorism Thesis: A Critical Discourse Analysis of religious labels and their selective use in Terrorism Studies (unpublished). PhD Thesis submitted at University of St Andrews.

dominant discourse on terrorism. Here I also provide an overview of and explain the differences between postcolonial and decolonial approaches. In the next section, I explain in more detail how gender as a unit of analysis is useful in understanding how many of the colonial, and consequently racial and racist, logics are kept in place through gendered language and thinking. Importantly, however, I demonstrate how gender is only key as a unit of analysis and structuring principle akin to race because of the colonial-Western idea and imagination of it. Both “race” and “gender” sit under the colonial order that has birthed, upheld and developed them. This makes employing the framework of a “gendered coloniality” useful for understanding and subsequently challenging colonial remnants and associations in dominant discursive constructs that structure and dictate Terrorism Studies. I conclude by reflecting on the centrality of discourse and how to analyse (colonial) discursive constructions, which have become real in their consequences and harmful upon utterance as they perpetuate and uphold colonial power constructs.

Coloniality: The Western Project of Modernity

The discipline of IR – of which Terrorism Studies is an offshoot – has colonial origins; was designed to fulfil colonial functions; and therefore, cannot simply be “decolonised”.⁴ The coloniality inherent to it, however, can be excavated (see Anievas, Manchanda, & Shilliam, 2015). The same, I argue, goes for Terrorism Studies. We can excavate the coloniality upon which Terrorism Studies has been built. This means that a decolonial approach to Terrorism Studies, as I propose, would be one whose main mission is to reveal the colonial structures, discourses and functions in and of Terrorism Studies. However, what exactly is coloniality to begin with?

Coloniality is a term which was coined by Quijano (1992) and further developed by Mignolo (2007; 2011) although it has been articulated in different terms by Latin American feminist authors like Rivera Cusicanqui (2012) as well. Coloniality describes the logic and intellectual and structural foundation of Western civilisation (from the Renaissance until today) which enabled the activity of colonialism but also preceded and succeeded it. It could be described as the mindset and intellectual but also structural framework which has enabled the conditions which initiated colonialism. As Gani (2017, p. 11, emphasis in original) further explains, “[u]nlike the historical event of colonisation, coloniality relates to epistemologies, ways of thinking, and *where* one is doing that thinking”. Colonialism therefore only constitutes one aspect or outcome of the larger framework, i.e., coloniality, which it is

4 For more information on IR’s colonial origins see also Vitalis (2015).

embedded in. Dominant ideas about race, more specifically racial hierarchies and racist epistemologies, are central to this larger framework of coloniality. However, the so-called “matrix” of coloniality also includes other structures of power which together constitute the foundational structure of Western civilisation (see also Gani, 2017). One of these, which I pay particular attention to, is gender as a structuring principle.

As Mignolo (2011) further notes, coloniality is constitutive of what we call “modernity” today. Indeed, coloniality constitutes modernity’s constitutive “darker side” which is composed by the different nodes that tie together capitalist, patriarchal, racist and religious hierarchies into the so-called colonial matrix of power. Thus, coloniality constitutes the untold, hidden but constitutive side of modernity. Modernity itself is therefore best understood as a complex “narrative that builds Western civilization by celebrating its achievements while hiding at the same time its darker side, ‘coloniality’” (Mignolo 2011, pp. 2–3). As Mignolo (2011, p. 3) therefore notes, there is no modernity without coloniality. In fact, the “modernity” which Europe draws its self-identity from is “so deeply imbricated in the structures of European colonial domination over the rest of the world that it is impossible to separate the two” (Bhambra 2014, p. 115). The reason I therefore refer to “colonial-modernity” instead of just “modernity” on many occasions in this chapter, is to emphasise exactly this inextricability of modernity from its darker side. I also do this to emphasise that “modernity” is not a neutral signifier of an era, spearheaded and embodied by Europe, but carries problematic imaginations and ideas that serve to reinstate Western superiority and non-Western inferiority. It also, as Glissant (1989) has pointed to, is an ongoing project. The dominant discourse on terrorism, as I argue, serves to uphold this ongoing project of Western modernity.

Coloniality — modernity’s other side — then, is much more than colonialism. It is what gets “reproduced in books, in schools and universities, in cultural and esthetic [sic] standards, in common sense” (Resende, 2018, p. 2). Thus, and as I argue, it is upheld by the dominant discourse. This discourse facilitates and aids the reproduction of coloniality and as I argue reproduces the colonial logic inherent to concepts like “terrorism”.⁵ Thus, my primary concern as a CTS scholar is with coloniality/modernity and the reproduction of colonial logics in concepts central to Terrorism Studies, beginning with “terrorism” itself but encompassing other concepts like “religion”, “radicalisation” and “extremism”. Challenging

5 It is also inherent to concepts like “religion” as I have argued elsewhere (Khan, 2022). In my doctoral thesis (2021c-b) I therefore investigated the concept “religious terrorism” which as I demonstrated is built on the problematic, modern-colonial invention of “religion” in post-Westphalian Europe.

the dominant discourse that has upheld and the coloniality that has constructed the dominant discourse on “terrorism” is a form of resistance to this coloniality and therefore also to the structures of white supremacy, central to modernity today. Making this challenge to coloniality central to my mission when studying constructs and discourses central to Terrorism Studies, is the decolonial mission I envision for CTS.

A Gendered Coloniality

As indicated further above, I further seek to emphasise the essential part which the dominant Western imagination and invention of “gender” plays within colonial-modernity. While gender is already implied within the concept of coloniality, as developed by Quijano (2000) and Mignolo (2011), as one of many nodes that form the matrix of coloniality/modernity, I contend that it needs to be foregrounded in a more constructive way which makes the full extent of the coloniality of gender clear. I therefore build on the important work of Maria Lugones (2010) who has extended Quijano’s concept by introducing “the coloniality of gender”. Here, Lugones (2010) argues that an important part of colonisation was the introduction of the European concept and understanding of gender to the colonised. Not only did the European man invent the colonised as subjugated, inferior and non- or sub-human, but he also invented them as colonised non- or sub-human *men* and *women*. Thus, the colonial project further imposed a particular European understanding of gender (embedded within racialised imaginations) onto colonised societies (Lugones, 2010, p. 743). In this process, previously existing systems or concepts of gender and sexuality were erased and replaced by a specifically European one, which is predicated on a masculinity and femininity that are strongly, binarily and hierarchically opposed (see also Oyěwùmí, 1997).

As Bhabra (2014, p. 119) sums up, Lugones “demonstrate[s] how coloniality not only divides the world according to a particular racial logic, but also creates specific understandings of gender that enable the disappearance of the colonial/raced woman from theoretical and political consideration”. As Lugones herself (2010, p. 742) further states, “I understand the dichotomous hierarchy between the human and the non-human as the central dichotomy of colonial modernity”. However, she then clarifies how this dichotomy was accompanied by the Western dichotomous hierarchical distinction between men and women: “This distinction became a mark of the human and a mark of civilization. Only the civilized are men or women”. Thus, adding Lugones’ (2010, p. 745) coloniality of *gender* to Quijano’s approach of “coloniality” means “complicat[ing] his understanding of the capitalist global system of power”. Although Lugones mainly uses her theoretical framework to theorise about

the colonised woman and the implications of the coloniality of gender more generally for individuals and collective individuals, she also frames her theory in more general terms. I take this as the starting point for theorising about a *gendered coloniality* for the purpose of excavating the coloniality behind much of the dominant discourses on terrorism.

Lugones (2010, p. 748) and Oyěwùmí (1997) both note how gender constitutes a “colonial imposition”, and how colonialism introduced a gender(ed) order that did not pre-exist in the colonised societies it was introduced in. While this has important implications for the relations, positions and social movement for women (and men) in these societies and Women of Colour today, I am more concerned with the implications of the coloniality of gender beyond the individual level and how it has implications on a more abstract level. I seek to dismantle how colonial gender identities have been inscribed into concepts like “terrorism”. This means that I interrogate how the Western-colonial imagination of gender has enabled the colonial, racialised construction of “terrorism”, but also that of “religion” and/or “religious terrorism” more specifically.

While post-structural feminists have done important work (as I show further below in this chapter) in pointing to how gender identities are inscribed into more than just men and women and how gender therefore matters on a more abstract level in the transnational realm, they have largely failed to acknowledge gender as a colonial imposition and therefore as part of the coloniality of power. I therefore employ the contributions of post-structural thought on discourse and gender for a specifically decolonial purpose. This warrants a more detailed discussion on the difference between postcolonial and decolonial approaches. Although I frame my approach as decolonial in its mission and ethos, its methods and theoretical approach might best be considered predominantly postcolonial because it still utilises postmodern theories, thinkers and thought rather than radically departing from Western-dominated literature and scholarship. Indeed, completely “delinking” from it, I argue, is not possible in a discipline like CTS which continues to be dependent on (and responsive to) the discourse dictated and produced by Terrorism Studies. This is another reason calls for “decolonisation” are misplaced and unattainable for CTS.

Decolonial versus Postcolonial Approaches

Mignolo (2007) explains the difference between a postcolonial and decolonial approach by implying that a decolonial approach goes beyond the mission of postcolonialism (see also Tlostanova 2010). Postcolonialism is still “heavily dependent on post-structuralism as far as Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan and Jacques Derrida have been acknowledged as the

grounding of the post-colonial canon: Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha” (Mignolo, 2007, p. 452; see also Passada, 2019, pp. 3–4). While postcolonial theory is focused on “scholarly transformation within the academy”, a decolonial project is a project of “delinking” and drawing from sources outside of the Western-centric academy (Mignolo, 2007, p. 452). This main criticism of postcolonialism, then, is that it still relies on the same resources which have also been used to produce colonial logics in the first place. Postcolonial scholars, such as Chakrabarty (2000, p. 4), have acknowledged this dilemma of criticising Eurocentric knowledge production of the academy, while still writing from within this European intellectual inheritance themselves.

Postcolonialism has also been accused of being more limited with the time period it is concerned with as it is mainly focused on the colonial developments in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and its implications. Decolonial approaches on the other hand extend this time period to the much earlier, first European incursions to the Americas in the fifteenth century (Bhambra, 2014, pp. 115–119). It is also not only focused on the activity of colonialism per se but rather its preceding and enabling structures (i.e. “coloniality”). Postcolonial theory on the other hand is criticised for actually (re)centering colonialism: on the one hand the very assumption of the prefix “post” implies an “inadequate temporality” and suggests that colonialism has been overcome today; on the other hand, it also makes colonialism “the marker of historical difference” (Ahmed, 2000, p. 10). Both are aspects which decolonial scholarship seeks to challenge and work against.

Even more interesting is Aijaz Ahmad’s (1995) critique of postcolonialism. He argues that postcolonialism’s focus on colonialism as a marker of time ultimately serves to recentre capitalist modernity “as the primary engine in determining historical change” (Ahmad as cited in Ahmed, 2000, p.10). Instead, colonialism “is almost incidental to this history insofar as modernisation took place whether or not particular nation-states were colonised by the Europeans” (Ahmad, 1995, p. 7 as cited in Ahmed, 2000, p. 10). What matters the most in determining history is capitalist *modernity* which happened to take the colonial form in some places but not all. Sara Ahmed (2000, p. 10) further implies the importance of focusing on the “constitution of modernity” more generally, which included colonialism among other things. This is very much in line with decolonial thinking (see Mignolo, 2007 and Quijano, 2000). Coloniality is positioned as the other side of modernity and signifies everything (including and especially capitalism) that enabled colonialism in some places and at particular times but did not necessarily occur everywhere and in the same form. Thus, decoloniality provides a platform for de-centering colonialism and its inadequate focus on it as primary.

Tlostanova (2010, p. 20) further argues that postcolonialism still often limits itself by relying on postmodern approaches, rather than looking beyond Western Europe and Northern America for knowledge production. Rather than limiting itself to merely criticising or critiquing Western-centric knowledge production, decolonial approaches aim to *deconstruct* Eurocentrism (Tlostanova 2010, p. 21). Nevertheless, both postcolonialism and decoloniality are united in their goal to radically depart from colonial knowledge production, be it through transformation or deconstruction. This is why I frame my approach to CTS as one that is decolonial in its mission (centred on the dismantling of modernity/coloniality), even when the methodologies and approaches available to us as CTS scholars are likely to remain predominantly postcolonial, given that we (have to) continue to respond to TS and therefore Western-centric discourses and scholarship.

Consequently, to be decolonial as a CTS scholar would mean relying on Gani's (2017, p. 11) and Maldonado-Torres's (2011, p. 2) seemingly broader understanding of a decolonial approach as an approach which focuses on coloniality and the dismantling of it as its prime mission. Maldonado-Torres's (2011, p. 2) for example argues that a "decolonial turn" must not necessarily be constituted by one and the same theoretical school, "but rather points to a family of diverse positions that share a view of coloniality as a fundamental problem in the modern (as well as postmodern and information) age, and of decolonization or decoloniality as a necessary task that remains unfinished". CTS, I therefore argue, can be decolonial if it aims to *deconstruct* rather than transform. As I contend, Terrorism Studies cannot be transformed (i.e. made "better"), and the field of CTS should not be seen as one such transformation but rather a platform for deconstruction.

In the following I will outline, in more detail, how insights of post-structural feminists can be employed and improved through a decolonial lens. These insights are important as they explain in more detail some of the important mechanisms that uphold coloniality, especially through notions of masculinity encoded in Western discourses. Post-structural feminist theory might have pointed to how gender on this structural level and within language is indeed a Western characteristic of the post-Westphalian, modern world we live in. They have largely failed, however, in acknowledging these as clearly and inherently colonial by default. The next section will explain how gender is indeed everywhere and not just one of many nodes that uphold Western modernity but more accurately imagined as a code through which it is upheld (and therefore much more important in a way that is recognised by scholars like Lugones and Oyěwùmí).

Gender as a Structuring Principle in the Modern-colonial World

The idea of gender, as post-structural feminists have pointed out before, is a construct and has been and can be re-negotiated. It continues to function as a tool for power and as an organising principle. However, what is not always acknowledged or focused upon by feminist scholars is that gender is also a (modern-)colonial invention. One of the most well-known examples for this is provided by Oyěwùmí (1997, p. 31) who explains how in Yoruba society (in present day Nigeria), “gender was not an organizing principle [...] prior to colonization by the West”. Yoruba categories for “man/male” and “woman/female” were not binarily opposed or hierarchical in the way they are in our (Western) modern understanding (Oyěwùmí, 1997). Consequently, patriarchal structures, such as the exclusion of women from the public sphere were then often imported into the colonies from the West.

What the colonial example of the introduction of gender to Yoruba society illustrates is how the Western concept of gender functions as an organising principle that is based on the dichotomous and hierarchical distinction between masculinity and femininity. This Western idea of gender, just like race, also functions as a structuring principle more generally which means that it goes beyond just relating to individuals (i.e. “men” and “women”). Gender not only signifies a structure of “unequal power relationships between women and men” but also signifies a “system of social hierarchy in which masculine characteristics are more valued than feminine ones” (Tickner, 2014, p. 260). Gender identities, then, are not just inscribed onto “male” and “female” bodies but also, as post-structural feminists have pointed out, inscribed on states and institutions as well as concepts, such as foreign policy and war-making (see Peterson & Runyan, 2010, p. 3; Peterson, 1992, 2007; Sjöberg, 2013, p. 79; Tickner, 1992). The feminisation of certain non-state actors or institutions and the masculinisation of certain (usually Western and white) states, the army, military institutions and actors has consequences for international relations and is based on the Western idea of gender as hierarchical and binarily opposed.

The Western idea of gender implies the valorisation of masculine traits, which is dependent on the devalorisation of feminine traits. Thus, a feminisation of states or other actors within International Relations has consequences and as I argue, is closely tied to the racialisation of the same. Inscribing femininity onto a state within IR also means making it “less white”, I argue. An example for this is the discourse on “failed states” in IR. Traits associated with masculinity, i.e. strength, autonomy, power, independence, use of force and rationality are also the traits commonly most valued in the conduct of international politics (Tickner, 1992,

p. 6). Thus, states seen to observe these traits in the international system are lauded, while states who are seen to not comply with them are frequently labelled as “weak states”, “fragile states” or even “failed states”. I would argue that the “weakness” or “failure” of these states relates to their (imagined) failed or weak masculinity, which serves to imply inferiority and indeed feminise these states as in need of protection or invasion by more capable, stable states.

However, a closer look at which states frequently get feminised as “weak” or “failed” reveals the racial identity that is accrued to feminised states. The “failed states” discourse is hardly ever connected to Western states but most frequently relates to African, Middle Eastern and other Global South states. Indeed, as postcolonial scholar [Gruffydd Jones \(2015, pp. 64–65\)](#) points out, “the discourse of good governance/state failure is irredeemably rooted in an imperial and racialised imagination”. I argue that this colonial and racialised imagination of non-Western “weak” or “failed” states is upheld linguistically and conceptually through the Western gender code. This gender code feminises racialised states as irrational, weak, dependent and incompetent. This feminisation then has real life consequences in providing the justification or rationalisation of invasions or “interventions” into so-called “failed states”. It further displays a resemblance to colonial logic and discourse, which justified the invasion and colonisation of non-European states based on the racist idea of its peoples as less developed, “dependent” and therefore also feminised.

This is also where the discourse on terrorism becomes relevant again. While on the one hand there is a notable resistance to the idea of “state terrorism” in dominant terrorism discourse, ([Jackson, 2008b](#)), when it is discussed, it is usually discussed as something that “weak” or “failed” or “fragile” states are prone to. Both the usual resistance of discussing “state terrorism” and its predominant attachment to non-Western (“weak”) states is a gendered, and I argue colonial, discourse. The resistance to the idea of state terrorism becomes apparent in dominant terrorism discourse’s association with and imagination of terrorism as perpetrated mainly by non-state actors. This in itself can also be understood as a gendered and racialised phenomenon. As [Gentry and Sjoberg \(2015, p. 41\)](#) have noted, states in the Westphalian system are constructed as masculinised entities and non-state terrorist organisations are therefore “written into the masculine-feminine binary as the actors without the legitimate authority to use violence”. As [Gentry \(2016, p. 146\)](#) further observes, there is a so-called epistemic bias against non-state actors in IR scholarship more generally, which she argues to be the direct result of the gendered “Westphalian narrative”. This narrative is the foundational idea of the primacy and legitimacy of sovereign states in IR scholarship which leads to the

“hermeneutical injustice of denying power, credibility and ultimately legitimacy to non-state actors” (Gentry, 2014, p. 21). This automatically delegitimises violence perpetrated by non-state (or non-state approved) actors and makes them prone to be labelled as “terrorist”.

What Gentry referred to as simply the “Westphalian system” and “narrative” on this occasion, cannot simply be abstracted from coloniality. The Westphalian system being the very symbol of the constitution of modernity in Europe, is inherently colonial. The modern state-system as we know it today emerged at the same time as European colonial expansion. In fact, as Ahmad (2000, p. 10) notes, “the colonial project was not *external* to the constitution of the modernity of European nations: rather the identity of these nations became predicated on their relationship to the colonised others”. Thus, the (gendered) primacy of states within IR scholarship, pointed out by feminist scholars like Gentry and Sjöberg, is not only the primacy of states, it is the primacy of the *Western*, white ideal state. Thus, while non-state actors might be written into the masculine-feminine binary as the feminised counterpart to the masculine, modern nation-state, the non-Western state, too, is imagined in opposition to the ideal, masculine, modern nation-state. This means it is also feminised (and can be to a higher or lower degree depending on its perceived proximity to the West). This, then, explains why state terrorism, on the rare occasions where it is attributed to a state, is attributed to those feminised/racialised states imagined as non-White, non-Western and therefore prone to being a “weak” or “failed” state.

Indeed, gendered binary constructions are central to theorising about global politics more generally. Distinctions between domestic and foreign, inside and outside, order and anarchy, civilised and uncivilised, developed and underdeveloped as well as centre and periphery continue to inform significant assumptions in theory construction, and order how actors view and theorise about the world, and how they divide it linguistically (Peterson and Runyan, 1991, p. 70; Tickner 1992, p. 19; Tickner & Sjöberg, 2007, 2011). These gendered dichotomous constructions not only signify inferiority, as well as danger regarding those associated with the outside (or “periphery”), but they also always have explicitly racial implications. An example for this is also found in the Orientalist distinction between “East” and “West” which, as Edward Said (1979, p. 40) points out, is tied to the distinction made between “inferior” and “superior” races, “uncivilised” and “civilised” ones. These binary distinctions, then, have justified the colonisation of “Oriental” countries which were constructed as “passive”, “supine” and “feminine” (Said, 1979, p. 138).

Zooming Out: Gender on the System Level

As I have already implied with the introduction of a “gendered coloniality”, looking at gender in the way I have outlined above, means zooming out from gender on the individual level (issues relating to “women” and “men”) and onto gender on the system-level (gender as inscribed into international concepts and institutions). This, I argue, reveals gender as an essential structural mechanism upholding the colonial and global structures of white supremacy. Understanding and applying gender lenses in this way is a commitment to adopting gender lenses as a “meta-lens” (Peterson & Runyan, 2010, p. 3). Such a focus on gender as a structuring principle means acknowledging how the interpersonal binary between masculinity and femininity has been abstracted or transferred to bigger concepts, such as “states” or “non-state actors” within the international arena (Gentry, 2016, pp. 147–148).

Thus, by focusing on the gendered coloniality (rather than just coloniality or just women/gender), I am “zooming out” from merely focusing on women’s issues or gender relations between women and men in order to look at the bigger picture and account for gender on the system level, as well as analyse gender constructions in language and discourse (gender on the “macro”- or system-level). However, through a decolonial lens, this system, language and discourse into which I argue gender is inscribed, is the modern-colonial system, language and discourse and therefore adds a complication to the picture which post-structural feminists have neglected so far.

Such a system-level understanding of gender is also heavily discourse-centred. As Peterson (2015, p. 174) explains, gender operates discursively “as a governing code that conceptualizes gender as differentiating hierarchically between masculinized and feminized identities, qualities or characteristics”. Thus, it pervades language and meaning systems and orders “how we think (and hence shaping how we act) by privileging that which is associated with masculinity” (Peterson, 2015, p. 174). Gender order and hierarchy therefore need to be seen as part and parcel of the international system (Sjoberg, 2014, p. 100). However, I argue that this gender order is a specifically Western structuring principle and functions as yet another tool for the imposition of Western (masculine) superiority. It is, as I have argued above, an element of coloniality, but also defines colonial-modernity.

As pointed out by Wilcox (2010 as cited in Sjoberg, 2010, p. 3), “[g]ender symbolism describes the way in which masculine/feminine are assigned to various dichotomies that organise Western thought” where higher value is always placed at the trait or value identified as masculine. The dominant (Western):

“understanding of gender is based on a set of culturally determined and fixed binary oppositions attached to masculinity and femininity, such as public versus private, autonomy versus relatedness or reason versus emotion, where the latter is usually associated with femininity”.

(Scott, cited in Tickner, 1992, p. 8)

Other binary constructions that are linked to the masculinity/femininity dichotomy are rational/emotional, strong/weak, dominant/submissive, active/passive, independent/dependent, order/anarchy and objective/subjective (Hooper, 2001, p. 43).

In these dichotomies, while the former term is always associated with masculinity, the latter usually signifies femininity. These gendered dichotomies serve to sustain the perception of men/masculinity as political (public), active, assertive, autonomous, strong and rational and women/femininity as personal (private), passive, dependent, weak and irrational (Peterson & Runyan, 2010, pp. 52–68). In Western modernity, they have further justified female subordination to male power and authority, as well as provided the justification for females to be excluded from political and public life (Elshtain, 1981; Pateman, 1988; Steans, 2013, p. 9) by associating women with feminised – hence devalorised – concepts of irrationality, passivity and dependency.

Feminisation as Racialisation

This narrative stemming from classical white feminists like Pateman and Elshtain, and later further refined by, among others, post-structural feminists, demonstrates a disregard for how these gendered dichotomies extend beyond the Western focus and onto the rest of the world. This ideal type of masculinity with all the traits outlined above relates to the white, colonial man and not any universal man. They have further justified the privatisation of native and indigenous cultures and religions (see Khan, 2021a) which were feminised and put in opposition to the rational coloniser’s religion and culture. The above list of masculinity/femininity dichotomy further includes dichotomies which are very clearly stemming from a colonial and imperial imagination where dominant/submissive, active/passive, independent/dependent, order/anarchy, self/other have very obvious foundations in the colonial imagination of the non-white, feminised other.

As Peterson (2007) argues, feminisation is always also devalorisation. And as I argue this feminisation as devalorisation is a mechanism upholding coloniality, colonial logic, and —

connected to this — racialised and racist assumptions. As Sara Ahmed (2004, p. 3) states, “becoming feminine” also implies becoming “less white”. Becoming less white always implies a “moving backwards in time” to a lesser stage of development of human and social life (Ahmed, 2004, p.3). Being feminised as irrational and emotional implies being less developed, which in turn implies a distance to the ideal type of whiteness, which in turn is premised on the ideal type of white masculinity. An obvious example is how British colonial administrators in India feminised the darker-skinned Bengali men as weaker and more effeminate than the superior light-skinned Punjabis (Hooper, 2001, p.71). Other very pertinent examples include the feminisation of the Orient and the “Oriental” man more specifically, as illustrated by Said (1978, p.40). Oriental, i.e. usually Arab Muslim, men have been constructed as childlike and feminine putting them in opposition to the Western, white and rational man (see Said, 1978, p.40).

While there are very obvious examples showcasing how feminisation implies “less white”, there are also cases where this is not so obviously tied to visibly darker or lighter-skinned people and the geographic regions they inhabit. Instead, given that race is a construct and the idea of a “white” race does not have any actual biological foundation, whiteness can be implied and attached to practices or concepts. “Terrorism” is feminised too, which also implies a distancing from whiteness. I argue that ascribing terrorism or the terrorist label to a person — even if that person is “white” — not only feminises but also racialises them and distances them from whiteness.⁶ This means that the discourse of “terrorism” aids the project of Western modernity. It helps the West define itself by negation, that is by being the counter-terrorist. Thus, while discourses of the so-called “savage” prevailed during the colonial era and served to define the West and whiteness by negation (i.e. with the white man as “civilised” in opposition to the “savage”), the term “terrorism” now serves a similar purpose functioning through the same gendered-racialised and ultimately *colonial*, binary (see Schotten’s work in Chapter Three for a detailed analysis of how queer methods resist “regimes of the normal”, including white supremacy, colonialism and Euro/Western-centrism).

What the example above shows, is that gendered-racialised binaries are always relational. As Hooper (2001, p.43) notes, within the masculinity/femininity binary, femininity merely constitutes a “residual category, a foil or Other for masculinity to define itself against”. This

⁶ An example that is well-known here is how the Irish, today seen as “white”, were racialised as non-White not too long ago (Bonilla-Silva, 1997, p.472; Delgado & Stefancic 2017, pp.88–89). The association of Irish people with “terrorism”, too, showcases this inherent racialisation that goes hand in hand with the assigning of the “terrorist” label whether that person is “white” or not.

means the concept of gender functions to create an oppositional category against which masculinity can define itself against and gain meaning from in the first place. In other words, masculinity, as a relational category, has meaning because it constitutes everything femininity is not (see also Tickner, 2014, p.260). This becomes even clearer from race as a concept which functions to give “white” meaning. The category race therefore only functions to establish “White” as not just another race, but rather “that to which race relates as its norm” (Lynch, 2017, p.289). This is similar to how masculinity relates to femininity as the norm as well as the superior attribute. The idea of race was developed not just to distinguish “other” races from the white race but to imply their inferiority. Similarly then, “the West” only has meaning because it defines itself against the so-called “rest”. Edward Said (1978, p.7) argued the same for the construction of the “Orient” in opposition to the West/Occident: The West needs the Orient to prop up its own identity by constructing the Orient as everything that the West is not.

The dominant discourse on terrorism, as I have noted above, functions to substantiate the fragile identity of the West which is forever dependent on a non-Western other to define itself against. The discourse on terrorism functions as one way to uphold and aid this project of defining the West in opposition to an inferior other. In other words, it upholds the project of Western modernity.

Dominant Discourse

Western modernity cannot be fully understood without its darker side, coloniality. As mentioned above, I further contend that the gendered aspect of this coloniality can be foregrounded in a constructive way to better illustrate how one consequence of the modern-colonial world order is also that Western thought and discourse is gender-coded, privileging a Western idea of masculinity. I therefore refer to a gendered coloniality to draw attention to how much this gender code is infused in Western thinking and discourse. Paying attention to this gender code is particularly useful in making sense of the colonial constructions of power which are also encoded in everyday language. I argue that these colonial constructions are naturalised because they have taken on the form of “truths”. What counts as “true” in a society is produced through and in discourse (Edkins, 1999, p.15; see also Said, 1979, p. 3). Language is therefore never a neutral medium of communication but carries within it the systems of power which produce and sustain what counts as “true” and therefore establish that which is normalised and goes unquestioned in society (Edkins, 1999, p. 15). Thus, what we “know” about concepts, such as “terrorism” or “religion” for example, is produced

through discourse, reflecting the structures of power in a society. More specifically it is produced in what [Terdiman \(1985, p. 57\)](#) refers to as “dominant discourse”.

As [Third \(2014, p. 17\)](#) explains, there are always multiple discourses competing for dominance at any point in time. However, the discourse which prevails in gaining supremacy is what [Terdiman \(1985\)](#) refers to as the “dominant discourse” which is sanctioned by the general culture and “granted the legitimacy of institutional knowledge and support” (as cited in [Third, 2014, p.17](#)). I argue that this discourse, by default, is the colonial discourse. The lack and oversight of referring to it as such by post-structural theorists demonstrates the limits of its theory and the need for decolonial approaches instead. There is much reference to and awareness of how the structures of power and knowledge are stemming from Western ideals and values. However, more direct reference to how this “Western” ideal is also *colonial* is missing and aids the erasure of coloniality from modernity. It further demonstrates how these approaches, while critical, are still embedded within the Western, hence colonial, intellectual heritage and tradition.

However, while acknowledging these limitations, as I stated above, I am also guilty in still engaging with and partly relying on a lot of the methods and insights post-structural thinkers have been credited with. Nevertheless, and as I have argued before, I approach CTS with a decolonial mission and not the goal of a “decolonisation”. A substantial contribution to decoloniality would have to involve the discarding of post-structural, post-modern tools to begin with. Something I consider to be not only difficult but also non-desirable for CTS, given that I do not seek to build a better “Terrorism Studies” that *is* decolonial but rather, to challenge the same with a decolonial ethos and postcolonial methods.

Thus, the dominant, i.e. colonial, discourse I seek to dismantle within the dominant discourse on terrorism, is the discourse that is naturalised, seems as “common sense” and upholds the coloniality of power. Third (2014, p. 18) refers to the dominant discourse as always elusive because it is naturalised, that means it “appears as self-evident and commonsensical and therefore evades perception” (see also [Terdiman, 1985, p. 61](#)). As [Terdiman \(1985, p. 61\)](#) further notes, “[b]ecause of that implicit potential toward automatism, the dominant is the discourse which, being everywhere, comes from nowhere: to it is granted the structural privilege of appearing to be unaware of the very question of its own legitimacy”. This, as I have argued before, is the colonial discourse — the discourse upholding coloniality/modernity. Not all discourse is power. The dominant discourse that is, is the colonial discourse privileging masculinity and whiteness without appearing to do so. This discourse also upholds the coloniality of “terrorism”.

Stickiness

One concept that is also useful in understanding how this discourse operates, is Sara Ahmed's (2004) concept of "metaphorical stickiness". Ahmed explains how some words "stick" to certain bodies or objects. As she explains, if a word is used in a certain way and attached to a certain body or object repeatedly then it becomes "sticky" with that body/object, and it becomes difficult to associate something else with that word (Ahmed, 2004, p. 90). Ahmed gives the example of the derogatory word "P*ki" and how this word has come to be associated with (i.e. sticky with) various other unspoken words such as "immigrant", "dirty" or "outsider". Thus, as she explains with regards to bodies, words (or signs) such as "P*ki" evoke other words which "have become intrinsic to the sign through past forms of association" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 92). They also stick to these bodies and restrict their freedom of movement, behaviour and action (Ahmed, 2004, p. 79). This further confirms that words *do* things. As Ahmed (2004, p. 79) further notes, emotions such as fear stick to certain bodies and objects more than they do to others. This is because of the metaphorical stickiness of signs which cannot be separated from their histories. "Arabs", "Islam", "Asian" and "East" are all bodies which are associated with "terrorism", and where fear has stuck on them. This in turn has real-life consequences, such as these bodies' restriction in freedom of movement for example (Ahmed 2004, p. 79). This not only refers to individuals but also states (for example "rogue states"), which are seen as or associated with the above terms, which in turn have become sticky with "terrorism" and therefore also fear (Ahmed, 2004, p. 79).

As a result of (colonial) historical processes, some bodies, then, have become so sticky with certain words that I argue it constitutes an element of the dominant discourse on this body. As Terdiman (1985, p. 61) states: "The inherent tendency of a dominant discourse is to 'go without saying'". It goes without saying, for example, that terrorism constitutes an absolute evil, although it is unlikely that we have experienced it (Third, 2014, p. 17). However, it has become something which has acquired "truth" in our societies through constant repetition in dominant discourse. It is further a concept which has become sticky with many gendered and racialised terms, such as "irrationality" and "illegitimacy". It has become further sticky with "religion". Religion similarly has become sticky with many other gendered terms which uphold its coloniality (see Khan, 2022). This has consequences for how these terms can be used and what its use in discourse does and affects.

However, discourse always contains within itself the possibility for resistance (Edkins 1999, p. 59). As Third (2014, p. 26) points out, dominant discourse is not stable: "on the one hand it

appears as timeless and authoritative; on the other hand, this appearance must be continually and closely regulated – its assertions must be ceaselessly reaffirmed”. The well-known obsession of terrorist scholars to define “terrorism” or constrain the term within some boundaries constitutes an example for this (Third, 2014, p. 25). A critical analysis of these dominant discourses then constitutes a site for the resistance of hegemonic, dominant discourse as it seeks to uncover that which would otherwise evade perception. This would further serve to make the dominant discourse visible in the first place, which in itself is a form of resistance. A commitment to this form of resistance is what I argue to be a realisable, anti-colonial, counterhegemonic mission that CTS can claim as decolonial.

Conclusion

Asking what upholds the colonial discourse on “terrorism” through a decolonial approach also means asking what *precedes* and underpins the discourse on terrorism. I argue that the structures of white supremacy as an element of coloniality do. It is this coloniality which has preceded the discourses that have eventually come to produce the dominant discourse on terrorism and guarantee its continued popularity. These discourses can be summarised as the dominant discourse, which I argue is the colonial discourse privileging masculinity and whiteness. Challenging the colonial discourse that has produced “terrorism” and challenging the colonial constructs surrounding it is the decolonial mission I envision for CTS.

While it is “terrorism” (and especially “religious terrorism” as I have argued elsewhere) today which has been conceptualised through a colonial gender code and in order to fulfil the function of upholding and aiding the project of Western modernity, it has been other constructions before and it will be other constructions still when or if “terrorism” ever gets replaced by another concept whose dominant discourse will fulfil the same function. It would be CTS’s task to recognise when this happens, what colonial language and mechanism hold the current one in place and how these can be challenged and deconstructed in present time.

Thus, the decolonial mission I envision for CTS is one that makes it the main goal to detect where and how “terrorism” (or its past and future placeholders) functions to uphold, aid and facilitate the project of Western colonial-modernity. The dominant discourse on terrorism, as I have shown in this chapter, works for Western society and not against it. It helps the West define itself by negation and through a gendered-colonial binary. There have been and will be other concepts which will replace the current one imagined as “terrorism” which function to fulfil the same purpose of upholding colonial-modernity. Making the dismantling of it the

prime mission of a decolonial CTS can ensure a future for CTS that stays true to the emancipatory ethos underpinning its inception in response to the Global War on Terrorism.

References

- Ahmad, A. (1995). The politics of literary post-coloniality. *Race and Class*, 36(3), 1–20.
- Ahmed, S. (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. Routledge.
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Routledge.
- Anievas, A., Manchanda, N. & Shilliam, R. (2015). Confronting the Global Colour Line: an Introduction. In A. Anievas, N. Manchanda & R. Shilliam (Eds), *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line* (pp. 1–16). Routledge.
- Bhambra, G. (2014). Postcolonial and decolonial dialogues. *Postcolonial Studies*, 17(2), 115–121.
- Bhambra, G., Gebrial, D. & Nisancioglu, K. (2018). “Introduction: Decolonising the University?” In G. Bhambra, D. Gebrial & K. Nisancioglu (Eds), *Decolonising the University*, (pp. 1–18). Pluto Books.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble*. Routledge.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press.
- Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities*. Polity Press.
- Edkins, J. (1999). *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Elshtain, B. J. (1981). *Public Man, Private Woman: women in social and political thought*. Robertson.
- Fanon, F. (1961). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Penguin Books.
- Gani, J. K. (2017). The erasure of race: Cosmopolitanism and the illusion of Kantian hospitality. *Millennium*, 45(3), 425–446.
- Gentry, C. (2014). Epistemic Bias: Legitimate Authority and Politically Violent Nonstate Actors. In C. Gentry and A. Eckert. *The future of just war: new critical essays*, (pp. 17-29). Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Gentry, C. (2016). Gender and Terrorism. In S. Sharoni, L. Steiner, J. Pedersen & J. Welland (Eds), *Handbook on Gender and War*, (pp. 146–169). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Gentry, C. & Sjoberg, L. (2015). *Beyond Mothers, Monsters and Whores*. Zed Books.
- Glissant, E. (1989). *Caribbean discourse: Selected essays*. M. Dash (Trans.). University of Virginia Press.

Gruffydd J. B. (2015). 'Good Governance' and 'state failure': The pseudo-science of statesmen in our times. In A. Anievas, N. Manchanda & R. Shilliam (Eds), *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line*, (pp. 62–80). Routledge.

Hooper, C. (2001). *Manly States: Masculinities, International Relations, and Gender Politics*. Columbia University Press.

Jackson, R. (2008a). An Argument for Terrorism. *Perspectives on Terrorism*, 2(2), 25–32.

Jackson, R. (2008b). The ghosts of state terror: knowledge, politics and terrorism studies. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 1(3), 377–392.

Jarvis, L. (2009). *Times of Terror: discourse, temporality and the War on Terror*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Khan, R. M. (2021a). Race, coloniality and the post 9/11 counter-discourse: Critical Terrorism Studies and the reproduction of the Islam-Terrorism discourse. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 14(4), 498–501.

Khan, R. M. (2021b). The gendered coloniality of the religious terrorism thesis: a critical discourse analysis of religious labels and their selective use in terrorism studies (Doctoral dissertation, University of St Andrews). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17630/sta/124>

Khan, R. M. (2022). Speaking "religion" through a gender code: The discursive power and gendered-racial implications of the religious label. *Critical Research on Religion*, 10(2), 153–169.

Kinsella, H. (2017). Feminism. In J. Baylis, S. Smith & P. Owens (Eds), *The globalization of World Politics*, 189–203. Oxford University Press.

Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. *Hypatia*, 25(4), 742–759.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Thinking through the decolonial turn: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and critique – An introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2), 1–15.

Mignolo, W. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3), 449–514.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.

Newman, E. (2007). Weak States, State Failure, and Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 19(4), 463–488.

Oyěwùmí, O. (1997). *The invention of women: Making an African sense of western gender discourses*. University of Minnesota Press.

Passada, M. N. M. (2019). Discourses Analysis by a Decolonial Perspective. In L. Suciu (Ed.), *Advances in Discourse Analysis*, IntechOpen www.intechopen.com/books/advances-in-discourse-analysis/discourses-analysis-by-a-decolonial-perspective.

Pateman, C. (1988). *The Sexual Contract*. Polity Press, in association with Basil Blackwell.

- Peterson, S. (2007). Thinking Through Intersectionality and War. *Race, Gender & Class*, 14(3/4), 10–27.
- Peterson, S. & Runyan, A. (1991). The Radical Future of Realism: Feminist Subversions of IR Theory. *Alternatives*, 16(1), 67–106.
- Peterson, S. & Runyan, A. (2010). *Global gender issues in the new Millennium*. Westview Press.
- Peterson, V. S. (1992). Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations. *Millennium*, 21(2), 183–206.
- Peterson, V. S. (2015). International/global political economy. In L. Shepherd (Ed.), *Gender Matters in Global politics: A Feminist Introduction to International Relations* (pp. 173–186). Routledge.
- Quijano, A. (1992). Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad. *Perú indígena*, 13(29), 11–20.
- Resende, V.M. (2018). Decolonizing critical discourse studies: for a Latin American perspective, *Critical Discourse Studies*, 18(2), 1–17.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, S. (2012). A Reflection on the Practices and Discourses of Decolonization. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Winter.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. Penguin.
- Sarup, M. (1993). *An introductory guide to Post-structuralism and postmodernism*. Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Schotten, H. C. (2018). *Queer Terror: Life, Death, and Desire in the Settler Colony*. Columbia University Press.
- Schuurman, Bart (2019). Topics in terrorism research: reviewing trends and gaps, 2007–2016, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 12 (3), 463–480.
- Shilliam, R. (2021). *Decolonizing Politics: And Introduction*. Polity Press.
- Sjoberg, L. (2013). *Gendering Global Conflict: Toward a Feminist Theory of War*. Columbia University Press.
- Sjoberg, L. (2014). *Gender, War and Conflict*. Polity Press.
- Sjoberg, L. (2010). Introduction In L. Sjoberg (Ed.), *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 1–14). Routledge.
- Steans, J. (2013). *Gender and International Relations*. Polity Press.
- Terdiman, R. (1985). *Discourse/Counter-Discourse: The theory and practice of symbolic resistance in nineteenth-century France*. Cornell University Press.
- Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. Columbia University Press.

Methodologies in Critical Terrorism Studies

Tickner, J. A. & Sjoberg, L. (2013). *Feminism*. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith (Eds) *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (pp. 205–233). Oxford University Press.

Tickner, J. A. (2014). Gender in World Politics. In J. Baylis, S. Smith & P. Owens (Eds), *The Globalization of World Politics* (pp. 258–271). Oxford University Press.

Tlostanova, M. (2010). *Gender Epistemologies and Eurasian Borderlands*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Third, A. (2010). *Imprisonment and excessive femininity: reading Ulrike Meinhof's Brain Parallax* 16(4), 83–100.

Third, A. (2014). *Gender and the political: deconstructing the female terrorist*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Tuck, E. & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40.

Vitalis, R. (2015). *White world order, black power politics: The birth of American international relations*. Cornell University Press.

Wadley, J. (2010). Gendering the state: performativity and protection in international security. In L. Sjoberg (Ed.), *Gender and International Security: Feminist perspectives* (pp. 56–76). Routledge.