3 CTS and indigeneity

Can CTS approaches be indigenous?

Shirley Achieng' and Samwel Oando

> When indigenous peoples become the researchers and not merely the researched, the activity of research is transformed. Questions are framed differently, priorities are ranked differently, problems are defined differently, people participate on different terms.
>
> (Smith, 1999, p. 193)

Introduction

The scholarship on terrorism and counterterrorism has increased tremendously since the 9/11 attacks (Ilyas, 2021a; Prestholdt, 2019). Surprisingly, despite diversity in conceptualizations about terrorism, most of the academic literature has maintained a Eurocentric focus (Ilyas, 2021b) and remained silent on indigenous approaches to terrorism. As Prestholdt (2019, p. 6) posits, "many of the available country case studies on terrorism are conducted through a specific Western lens". Critical terrorism studies (CTS) suffers the same fate of Eurocentric bias. Eurocentrism in this chapter can be understood as "a mode of thinking that privileges the European (or Euro-North American/Western) experience above all others" (Kassimeris & Jackson, 2011, p. 19), which is deeply connected to colonialist ideas. We, therefore, raise an important question about the place of diversity and indigeneity in CTS, which has been marginalized over time.

Over the past few years, CTS has gained traction, by engendering numerous debates, and attracted a great deal of criticisms (Gunning, 2007; Jackson et al., 2010; Stump & Dixit, 2013). Seen by critical scholars as an alternative to the Western-centric, problem-solving approach of much of the terrorism discourse, CTS focuses on emancipation as one of its major commitments (Jackson, 2007; Jackson et al., 2010). Even though the concept of emancipation has been recognized as problematic by scholars such as Jeroen Gunning, among others, we view emancipation as "a continuous process of struggle and critique, rather than providing any particular endpoint" (Jackson et al., 2011, p. 41). The struggle referred to herein is epistemic also seeking to emancipate terrorism studies from temporal stagnation.

With calls for the emancipation of subjugated knowledges increasing, CTS has advocated for engagement with multiple perspectives even though this has not quite reflected in the field, given that key scholars of CTS are predominantly of Western heritage (Ilyas, 2021a). Hence, we raise the quest for a place of indigenous voices

DOI: 10.4324/9781003266709-5

within the field. While there is a burgeoning body of literature within CTS devoted to emancipation in various ways, including, among others, promotion of human rights and explorations of non-violent responses to terrorism (Jackson et al., 2011), much of CTS literature is still predominantly Western-centric. As Stump and Dixit (2011, p. 37) emphasize, "much of CTS has involved research on the global North or on preoccupations of the global North in the South". Consequently, very little has been written about CTS and indigeneity.

Cognizant, therefore, that scholarship about indigeneity is underrepresented in terrorism research (Leonard & Mercier, 2016), this chapter seeks to interrogate the prevailing epistemic gap by making an argument for engagement with indigenous approaches, capturing the obscured voices of the global South within CTS scholarship as a means of diversifying ways of understanding terrorism. By introducing the concept of indigeneity, we aim towards the possibility of methodological plurality, seeking to broaden the scope of conceptual analysis by disrupting the marginality and peripheralization of indigenous perspectives and approaches in CTS. While acknowledging that indigeneity can be defined in different ways, this chapter equates indigenous knowledge to local knowledge that is contextual and specific to different cultures as opposed to Western knowledge that is universal. However, this does not make indigenous knowledge the opposite of Western knowledge.

In order to engage effectively with the nuances of epistemic gaps within CTS, it thus becomes increasingly difficult to ignore the complexity of the subject of positionality of knowledge production and how it is deeply embedded in the multiple layers of colonial practices (Smith, 1999). Analysing the positionality of knowledge production, therefore, involves questioning "the ways in which knowledge about indigenous peoples are collected, classified and then represented in various ways back to the West, and then, through the eyes of the West, back to those who have been colonized" (Smith, 1999, p. 1).

Ultimately, we ask this question: what does it mean for CTS approaches to become indigenous? In our struggle to answer this question, we interrogate the geopolitical exclusion of voices from the global South in terrorism research and the subsequent issues of power relations behind knowledge production and its resulting epistemic inequalities. The subject of knowledge production explores the inclusion of, and engagement with, indigenous voices in terrorism research. This engagement seeks to encourage collaborative research processes and reconciliation of concepts and practices aimed at determining the epistemological process of knowledge production (Kiprop, 2016; Tuso, 2016). For indigenous knowledge to be recognized in terrorism research, this chapter argues for an epistemic shift in the way indigenous approaches are conceptualized by and in CTS. The chapter, thus, contributes to the knowledge base that promotes research practices that emanate from epistemologies that are embedded in survival struggles.

Methods, approach and theory

Imperatively, therefore, the methods alluded to in this study are informed significantly by reflections on the researchers' positionality that builds on their personal preconceptions about the dilemma in the philosophy behind CTS methods.

A constructivist ontology has, thus, been adopted to learn from the rich and in-depth information from indigenous actors. The constructivist approach brings out some underlying assumptions that individuals develop subjective meanings about their experiences, which are basically varied and multiple and which expose the complexity of views rather than narrowing meanings into new categories or ideas (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Constructivism is notably used to explain aspects of indigeneity – to provide a broader structure for developing a substantive model that incorporates agency and structural pillars as constitutive of each other. Constructivism, hence, brings the diversity of actors into the picture and articulates how they express their interests and identities in the realm of unique social constructions.

While exploring multiple dynamics about contextual implications for CTS, this chapter outlines the significance of ideational, normative and discursive factors in shaping realities (Jackson, 2009) for purposes of enhancing space for indigenous knowledge in terrorism research. Accordingly, appropriate CTS methods demand for suitable considerations to be made on "social, regional and international contexts" given the increasing globalization of both conflict and subsequent interventions (Miall, 2004, p. 69). The analyses also consider that conflicts emerge from cyclic realms where different parties are more likely to generate some sense of grievances by developing multiple and shared identities and form goals for deposing the party blamed for being responsible for the grievance (Weinberg & Richardson, 2004). Indigeneity, thus, ensures that CTS methods are grounded on geopolitical disparities in knowledge production (Mwambari, 2019a). This explains a glaring gap between global and local conceptualizations in CTS; hence, much discussion is still desirable to effectively revitalize CTS, with increasing interest in discourses around indigeneity.

Against this background, this chapter is developed from studies by African scholars to understand how CTS can fit within indigenous African systems of knowledge. The work is guided by theories of Afrocentrism, as introduced by Mafeje (2011), to enrich the analysis and understanding in dynamics of terrorism, especially, within the contexts of different African countries. Afrocentrism nuanced in CTS can help to explore how Africans hope to freely choose the roles in which to cast themselves "as active agents of history" by putting their significant social issues on the global agenda (Mafeje, 2011, p. 31). Asante confirms that this theory can be understood in the same perspectives of other cultural realities, such as Asiacentrism, Eurocentrism or Oriental ideological standpoints (Asante, 1983). In this respect, Afrocentricity creates "the subject and object" relationship in which CTS can bridge the global gap that emerges between the universal and the specific knowledge systems, which can be analysed based on African culture, experience and subjective realities of the world (Asante, 1983, 2017).

The personal space and agency of actors in the paradigm of Afrocentrism designates a global subject of understanding African issues in CTS (Akinola & Uzodike, 2018). Owusu-Ansah and Mji (2013) acknowledge the 'suitability' of "Afrocentric paradigms in African research" by noting the significant position of Afrocentrism in both participatory and emancipatory studies, which embrace the contextual values, interests, identities and agency of indigenous people and knowledge.

As Suleiman (2019, p. 24) postulates, the process of incorporating indigenous approaches in CTS cannot be accomplished without "looking back" at how issues

were represented during the colonial and pre-colonial eras. According to Appiah (2016, p. 1), the act of looking back has its roots in the Ghanian indigenous symbolism of the Sankofa bird. A combination of two words – *San* means "go back", and *Kofa* means "get it". In this symbolic expression, the Sankofa bird's "head is looking back while holding an egg in her beak, which is her future. Her feet facing forward also symbolize moving into the future". The Sankofa bird symbolism, thus, teaches that in order to move forward, indigenous people must go back into the past and get whatever was stolen, lost and forgotten, realizing that whatever was lost can be revived and preserved (Appiah, 2016). This indigenous worldview, hence, emphasizes the significance of the past in the quest for solutions in the present to ensure a better harmonious future (Suleiman, 2019; Yeboah, 2021).

As a way of looking back, this chapter submits counter-narratives that seek to challenge dominant Eurocentric terrorism discourses. Consequently, we aim to start a discussion among critical terrorism scholars about the need to extend terrorism research beyond the Western prism by actively and equally engaging with indigenous approaches in order to conceptualize divergent and alternative viewpoints about terrorism and, hence, encourage pluri-versality of knowledges. This move to indigenize CTS, therefore, contemplates potential transformation of CTS approaches to reflect the diversity of contexts in which terrorism research is conducted. The arguments here raise prospects for understanding local problems through the lens of local practices by seeking to increase the chances for enhancing indigenous solutions to the problems of terrorism (Kwanya & Kiplang, 2016).

Indigeneity and CTS

Unless CTS approaches include indigenous perspectives, global agendas in terrorism research risk being perceived solely in a universal paradigm. This implies that lest CTS is indigenized, it risks being enshrined in the universality of knowledge and, hence, ignore the local context reality within terrorism studies. Therefore, by asking the question whether CTS can be indigenous, it is important that we highlight the understanding of indigeneity in this work. For example, indigenous knowledge can be exercised by local institutions, such as clan elders who convey the perspectives of subaltern voices in counterterrorism. In many cases, such voices are often ignored, omitted and dismissed as primitive or illiterate. This marginalization traces its roots in the colonial legacy that holds monopoly of what counts as knowledge and what does not count.

Oando and Achieng' (2021, p. 365) also acknowledge the varied meanings of indigeneity, suggesting that methods used in CTS can be described as indigenous "based on whether they are embedded in the lived priorities" of indigenous communities. Indigeneity, therefore, connects to the extent to which knowledge shared is produced within the unique cultural, social and environmental hierarchies of local people. Kenyan scholar Ali Mazrui introduced a radical task towards indigeneity in his seminal work, *Toward a Pax Africana*, in 1967. Mazrui sought to challenge "the old colonial order" in search of indigenous systems (of knowledge), paving way for a fresh ideological shift by African states as a new mode of engagement with the global

community (Ero et al., 2001). We therefore explore how contemporary CTS scholarship engages with informal knowledge structures that are seamlessly intertwined with the lives of some indigenous communities.

As noted by Grosfoguel (2011, p. 5), "knowledge is always situated", and hence, researchers in any field of study often "speak from a particular location in the power structures". This shows that different forms of knowledge seldom escape the lures of "class, sexual, gender, spiritual, linguistic, geographical, and racial hierarchies of colonial and capitalist or patriarchal world-system" (Grosfoguel, 2011, p. 5). This analysis of knowledge structures becomes crucial in CTS to highlight how, as a field of study, it has engaged with diverse aspects of indigenous knowledge systems. Indigeneity in this respect is understood from the extent to which CTS has managed to observe, engage and analyse diverse "cultural practices, oral tradition, digressive thinking and even spiritual belief systems" (Knopf, 2015, p. 181).

The dominant work in CTS can be attributed more to Western (white) scholars (Oando, 2021), which prompts the question about the impending space for local knowledge that is unique to specific cultures in non-Western communities. Whenever such considerations are missed, CTS risks falling into the unfortunate paradigms of white "enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries" which conform to the orthodoxy of "intellectual bias of the modern world" (Andrews, 2021, p. 28). By asking whether CTS can be indigenous, we navigate through a candid appraisal of CTS methodology to chart an expanded space for local knowledge that is transmitted through experience and which aims at recognizing local expertise that transcends several generations (Hudson, 2009). In so doing, we comprehend "Enlightenment as a racist intellectual project" (Andrews, 2021, p. 29) to which CTS methods of analysis and apportioning may be culpable, based on the ideas it produces, to challenge an already unjust world.

It is inevitable that CTS becomes indigenized on the basis of social transformation that captures the sacred values in diverse contexts in order to demonstrate indigenous paradigms that may be subtle but manifested in the informal "ways of knowing, seeing, and thinking" (Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019, p. 7). The transformation would ensure that knowledge generated in CTS accounts for both formal and informal knowledge settings that are transmitted "orally from generation to generation" as it happens in many African contexts through oral tradition (Kwanya & Kiplang, 2016, p. 2). The varied contexts of indigenous knowledge share much similarity in reasoning and logic but present a tactical departure from the Western knowledge system which is mostly recorded "based on Western science and empirical proof" (Knopf, 2015, pp. 181–182). As such, the modes of sharing informal forms of knowledge about terrorism and counterterrorism have not only remained complex when subjected to formal scales, where records of reference are non-existent, but they also pose the greatest gaps in terrorism research as they do in CTS. Andrews (2021) observes that such debates about indigeneity and CTS cannot simply be academic but point towards an unequal engagement upon which knowledge systems of the world can be built.

Scholars of CTS must, therefore, seek to challenge orthodox theories of "great thinkers who placed themselves on top of the world, resulting in their apparent

supremacy, and providing the justification for the genocide, slavery and colonialism that were utterly indispensable to Western progress" (Andrews, 2021, p. 28). It is upon this premise of knowledge superiority and its consequent political tragedies that Grosfoguel (2011) also challenges the hegemonic paradigms of Western philosophies, most of which dominated the world for over five centuries by assuming an objective and universalistic worldview.

Since terrorism can be linked to the tragedies of global politics of superiority, it is proper for terrorism research in different geopolitical contexts to account for the geopolitics of "social values in knowledge production" (Grosfoguel, 2011, p. 5). Consequently, CTS must be fully aware that global knowledge is always partial, and so is terrorism research. Incorporating indigeneity in CTS is, therefore, one of the necessary steps needed to contest Enlightenment that delivers the kernels for universalistic paradigms, purportedly as the only "rational and scientific framework of knowledge" (Andrews, 2021, p. 29).

Even though it might sound reproving to interrogate ancient white knowledge which is embedded as the substance of unjustified social order currently witnessed in many fields of study, inescapably, terrorism research and CTS must seek to recognize how racism of the past, infused through colonial logic, continues to govern the world to date. Commencing from the hope of having a dualistic approach that combines both Western and African knowledge frameworks, the realization is made that terrorism must be tackled based on the multiplicity in conceptualization and diversity of experiences in different settings. The diversity attempted in CTS methods helps to appreciate how universal meanings relate to or obscure local understanding, especially on what constitutes similarities or differences in terrorism research.

The hegemony of Western knowledge over indigenous knowledge

As the chapter explores whether CTS approaches can be indigenized, our discussion builds on the critical schools of thought, which espouse the space for local positionality in knowledge production (Mwambari, 2019b). This analysis contests the mendacious discourse of the hegemony of Western knowledge by postulating that "there is no such thing as 'global knowledge' – that is supposedly wrapped as a gift, under the spell of another deceptive term – the universal" (Sithole et al., 2017, p. 226). Regardless, this crucial question remains: how and when did Western epistemology seemingly trump other forms of knowledges? According to Tucker (1999), this begun with the European agenda of modernization which quickly transformed into Westernization. Fabian (1983), for example, contributes the classic work that examines, critically, the idea of time. The perception of modernization portends that the West had progressed into modernity, while other cultures remained in a state of stagnation (Breidlid, 2013; Kassimeris & Jackson, 2011). Modernity was, therefore, perceived as an exclusive European construct which culminated into the manipulation of both the realities and histories of the rest of the world, despite their sophistication, development and contribution to the rise of the West (Hobson, 2004).

The discussion, therefore, subjects CTS approaches to the debate about universality and specificity of knowledge. Hence, we argue that indigenous knowledge facilitates the foundation for unique and context-specific knowledge in CTS, without which it remains incomplete in terms of scope. In essence, it can be argued that while Western knowledge steers research methods in terrorism towards conformity to some specific tenets, its approaches might deny or ignore geopolitical diversity and ability to think autonomously about terrorism – leading to the emergence of subjugated voices (Sithole et al., 2017). As such, what is considered knowledge by one group of people can be seen as irrelevant to another group in a different setting given their different positionalities in terms of culture, language and even environmental factors (Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019).

However, despite the existence of different knowledges – that is, including indigenous knowledge – the European experience has found a general applicability to other cultures (Kassimeris & Jackson, 2011). Nevertheless, there is no denial whatsoever of the ethnocentric and universalist thinking that underpins liberal thought when it comes to counterterrorism, for example. That is, "its tendency to regard western social, political and economic mores as fit for purpose in non-western contexts" (Mac Ginty, 2011, p. 30). Even though proponents of the liberal school of thought may see this as part of a liberating and emancipatory agenda, Mac Ginty (2011) cautions that this tendency is problematic and is capable of presenting serious contradictions, especially when liberal approaches clash with indigenous norms and practices. Against this backdrop, critical perspectives have championed against liberal practices that are at odds with the needs of indigenous communities (Randazzo, 2021).

Studies questioning and challenging Eurocentrism and institutionalization of Western hegemony in the research space have been flourishing, especially in the last couple of decades (Ryder et al., 2020). This questioning came about because, more often than not, indigenous knowledge has been seen as representative of a social and cultural group of people rather than as a valid alternative to the mainstream liberal thoughts and Western modes of knowing (Chandler & Reid, 2018). This epistemological imbalance says more about the endemic crisis in liberal thinking more than it does about the demands and debates of indigeneity. The endemic crisis that is in modernist thinking is one which is dismissive of indigenous knowledge and approaches, even though these approaches are "region specific and transmitted through experience and long-time intentional practice aimed at expertise and excellence" (Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019, p. 7).

Historically, indigenous approaches have often been described in derogatory terms that insinuate backwardness, such as 'savage', 'primitive', 'rudimentary', 'underdeveloped' and 'inferior' (Akena, 2012; Breidlid, 2013; Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019). In fact, as Masolo (2017, p. 62) postulates, indigenous ways of knowing are considered "ineffective in advancing any understanding of the world in every sense of the term – physically, historically, and morally". Even in academia, indigenous knowledge has been consigned to the periphery as naïve and simplistic (Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019). Liberal thoughts and approaches, on the contrary, are seen as rational, civilized, dynamic and scientific. According to Breidlid (2013), this invalidation of other knowledge systems is nothing short of epistemic genocide.

Even though this comparison can be considered needless by some scholars, speaking about indigeneity in the exclusion of liberal thought is tantamount to escapism and only perpetuates the same marginalization that indigeneity so bitterly contests (Randazzo, 2021). Accordingly, challenging liberal thought is, in fact, inevitable, given "liberalism's self-image of righteousness and superiority in the face of alternatives" and the beguiling narrative that "scientifically proven 'solutions' from the global North will 'solve' the problems of conflict" (Mac Ginty, 2011, p. 60).

As a result of this thinking, liberal thought has had profound influence and consequences in the global South landscape. According to McDonnel (2014), the positivist reductionism within liberal thought engenders intellectual control by dismissing as invalid approaches that are considered immeasurable and non-objective within the liberal epistemological framework. Yet ironically, no single discourse or knowledge can claim objectivity because what is often presented as objective knowledge is in fact a singular story which conflates words and images to favour a particular culture (Rosenau, 1992). This, therefore, calls the objectivist yardstick into question.

Despite the existing dialectical relationship between liberal thought and indigenous approaches, the two are often discussed as discrete entities competing against each other, or worse still, one is relegated to the position of merely supplementing the other (Randazzo, 2019) because of the fallacious belief that liberal thought is already successful and is to be imitated (Mac Ginty, 2011). As such, these knowledges are not often discussed on equal terms.

However, it is important to note that the dichotomy that exists between Western knowledge and indigenous knowledge does not in any way insinuate that the West is devoid of indigenous knowledge. Likewise, it does not connote that all Western scholars subscribe to Eurocentric dispositions. On the contrary, there are voices in the West that have begun listening to discourses of alternative knowledges (Breidlid, 2013). Accordingly, this dichotomy only seeks to highlight the differences in each approach and their unique identities (Ezeanya-Esiobu, 2019), without appropriating any knowledge as better than the other. Conversely, it seeks to cultivate humility in the way researchers approach each knowledge system (Dove, 2010).

Entrenchment of colonial perspectives on indigenous knowledge

Humility in research demands that CTS scholars acknowledge the impact of disenfranchisement of indigenous people, which is poorly understood within terrorism studies, particularly because of the absence of a decolonial framework within the field. It, thus, becomes apparent for terrorism scholars to deconstruct colonial perspectives towards indigenous knowledge and strive to delink from idealistic Eurocentric conceptualizations and narratives about terrorism. These narratives are structured around identities that depict the West as the representation of freedom, democracy and progress, and anybody who challenges that notion is classified as evil (Kassimeris & Jackson, 2011).

Moreover, the Eurocentric narrative that 9/11 was the defining moment of terrorism for the rest of the world has been challenged since acts of terrorism were already happening in continents such as Africa prior to 9/11 (Smith, 2010). Also,

narratives that equate terrorism to weak and failed states, citing certain conflicts that arise due to political and socio-economic problems with terrorism, have been contested (Ewi & Aning, 2006). Admittedly, such contestations arise because the West has seemingly awarded itself monopoly in shaping how terrorism is understood and managed (Smith, 2010). As a result, indigenous peoples have found themselves silenced by hegemonic discourses that deny them the opportunity to tell their stories based on their own realities (Smith, 2005, 2010).

The subjugation of indigenous knowledge mirrors what Alatas refers to as 'intellectual imperialism'. Here, he states that the dominated people are taken through a tutelage system in which they are taught certain things and steered in a certain direction intellectually. The tutelage is justified by the assumption that the dominated people "know less about practically all subjects than people in the West" (Alatas, 2000, p. 25). One would wonder whether such connotations provide justification for the fact that other indigenous peoples, such as Africans, are not seen as equal partners and seemingly ignored in the war on terror discourse (Aderemi, 2010). It appears that in matters of counterterrorism, coloniality is manifested in the way in which African countries, for example, are instructed on what to do rather than given space to act on their own terms. Admittedly, the Western dominant ways of knowing have been emphasized, especially in counterterrorism. For example, the emphasis on building armies, border controls, drone technology, among others. Yet paradoxically, these Western counterterrorism efforts generally appear to be struggling to grasp the terrorism problem in the global South.

When discussing colonial perspectives, therefore, it would be impossible not to mention Edward Said's seminal work *Orientalism*, which disputes the so-called indisputable epistemology of the West and exposes the hegemony and imperialism that underlies colonial discourse, all designed to dominate the other (Burney, 2012). Othering, as a process of constructing the other, is defined by Staszak (2008) as the stereotypical and stigmatizing classification of individuals into two hierarchical groups based on asymmetrical power relationships. Acknowledging that "orientalism" has multiple meanings, we look at the concept from Said's outlook; that is, as a "corporate institution for dealing with the Orient: dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, teaching it, settling it and ruling it" (Said, 1978, p. 11). We, therefore, use the concept of the Orient to mirror the epistemological concept of the other, which, in this context, represents the indigenous. The phenomenon of the other seeks to shed light on the colonial power structures that continually present indigenous knowledge as the other (Burney, 2012).

As Staszak (2008) points out, the ethnocentric bias that creates otherness is arguably a product of Western thought, whose logic is embedded on the principle of binaries, such as self/other, black/white, theory/praxis, subject/object and so on. He emphasizes that such dichotomies of identity were exported throughout the world via colonization. Consequently, indigenous knowledge was rendered as the opposing half to Western knowledge, yet it is not the case. Even so, the subjugation of indigenous knowledge because of colonialism has not been adequately voiced, represented or even understood (Maloba, 2017). Despite the advanced scholarship

on colonialism, the absurdity is that "the history of the native (indigenous peoples), the story of the other, is forgotten in modern-day imperialism. History and literature, media and politics still do not represent the native point of view" (Burney, 2012, p. 31). As a result of colonialism, therefore, the indigenous person is disempowered of their voice (Burney, 2012). As Alatas (2000) puts it, the irony of it all is that most of the history of indigenous people was written by foreigners and the finished product exported back to them.

It, therefore, becomes evident that colonialism interfered with indigenous people's way of knowing. However, for colonialism to take place, certain power structures had to be constructed and maintained. Michael Foucault in *The Order of Things* explains why some languages, perceptions and practices are presented as invalid. He sheds light on the ontology of this power structure by explaining, "there exists, below the level of its spontaneous orders, things that are in themselves capable of being ordered, that belong to a certain unspoken order; the fact in short, that order exists" (Foucault, 1970, pp. xx–xxi). However, Said's work questions where this authority to create such order is derived from and challenges the Western establishment's imposition as the regime of truth above other knowledges.

As such, the tragedy of imposing Western knowledge within indigenous cultures is that it impacts negatively on the target society's indigenous knowledge because of the disconnect that exists between Western knowledge and indigenous knowledge (Tuso, 2016), making it ultimately biased, disempowering and colonizing (Akena, 2012). Eventually, indigenous knowledges in colonized societies experience considerable erosion owing to the universalization of education, which is skewed towards Eurocentric paradigms such that whoever questions the mainstream knowledge system is perceived as primitive (Wane, 2006).

To effectively analyse the significance of indigenous knowledge, therefore, researchers have to appreciate the dynamism and monumental complexities that surround the structures of colonialism. Besides, they have to recognize what Mazrui refers to as "the unholy alliance between Enlightenment and colonialism" (Mazrui, 2005, p. 69) and the destructive aspects of the struggle for freedom that marginalized the culture and knowledges of the colonized (Akena, 2012). Undoubtedly, colonization involves the rewriting of history to control, disparage and deprive the colonized of their very existence (Wane, 2006).

With colonization came Westernization, whereby "westernization became equated with civilization and those who practiced different belief systems were labelled pagan/heathen. Similarly, those who possessed different ethnic/cultural identities in the conquered territories were referred to as tribes (the uncivilized)" (Tuso & Flaherty, 2016, p. 4). Despite gaining independence, the newly formed states adopted the Western system of governance as a sign of modernization (Tuso & Flaherty, 2016). Hence, "the affairs of the global South was more concerned with development, modernization and state integration, meanwhile tolerating or ignoring the local communities' practice of indigenous methods" (Tuso & Flaherty, 2016, p. 5). Consequently, one would ask whether modernization signifies the end of indigenous knowledge. Bhola argues for the contrary, stating that despite the gradual erosion of indigenous knowledge as a result of modernization, it has also "brought

about its dialectical opposite; the desire for localization, the search for community, indigenous values, mother tongues; and the wish to preserve cultural heritage and indigenous knowledge" (Bhola, 2002, p. 6).

Enhancing the space for indigenous knowledge in CTS

Incorporating indigenous knowledge while researching non-Western contexts is an avenue towards pluralistic perspectives which accommodate new (foreign) thoughts. Pluralism in approaches coupled with multiculturalism, therefore, brings out a paradigm shift in CTS to enrich Western knowledge systems that manifest dominance in global knowledge production by positioning its discourses as "the ultimate non-negotiable so-called truth" (Sithole et al., 2017). Consequently, enhancing the space for indigenous knowledge in CTS helps to challenge some tenets of Western knowledge that are likely to be "imposed without the due consent of the recipient populace, and tends to favor the producers at the expense of its recipients" (Akena, 2012, p. 603).

In other words, incorporating indigenous perspectives expands the knowledge space to avoid being "caught up in a cul-de-sac", where coloniality hardly allows freedom of knowledge production systems (Sithole et al., 2017, p. 232). As such, challenging the hierarchies of knowledge in CTS approaches becomes increasingly important. Kiprop (2016) and Tuso (2016), therefore, propose that suitable models aimed at reconciling the concepts and practices of the two systems must be developed through a collaborative research process aimed at determining the epistemological process of knowledge production.

Unless due flexibility is observed in CTS approaches, the outcomes of terrorism research, especially those focusing on the global South, risks subjecting indigenous knowledge into a compromising position that narrows the scope of researchers understanding, thus forcing indigenous groups to catch up with Western knowledge (Sithole et al., 2017). This implicit pressure on the need to catch up is described by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) as the dragon of coloniality in global knowledge production systems. The domination of Western scholars in CTS research demonstrates a dire need for decolonization of historical and postcolonial knowledge systems used in the global South. For example, while looking at the African context, coloniality of knowledge only reproduces Africa's subjectivity and, hence, relegates indigenous knowledge to the periphery. Owing to this relegation, CTS research outputs in the continent become dependent on Western knowledge – exposing the huge knowledge gap that plagues the entire CTS architecture.

Fundamentally, an acknowledgement in CTS about the existence of indigenous knowledge systems contributes to accepting hybridity, as opposed to supremacy of knowledge. Hybridity produces the dialectical interface between indigenous knowledge and Western knowledge, which would make CTS approaches be in sync with the reality of diversity. In this regard, introducing indigenous knowledge in CTS research should not be seen as a quest to supplement Western knowledge (Randazzo, 2019) but as a complete set, upon which critical analysis can and should be made. Such considerations suggest embracing "hybridity that points to the protean

nature of human collective existence in social, cultural and political arenas as shaped and reshaped through millennia of invasion, migration, marriage, trade and similar global and dynamic interactions" (Brown, 2017, p. 446). Instead of seeking to transform how communities think or how they conceptualize issues, CTS research stands a better chance at accommodating hybridity in knowledge production, beyond the limits of its current analysis (Boege et al., 2009, p. 599).

In a nutshell, we argue that CTS can be indigenized by seeking to confront hierarchical [mis]conceptions of subjectivity that place primacy of knowledge production with the liberal European self. In so doing, we submit that indigeneity holds wide-ranging definitions encompassing issues of identity, positionality, subjectivity and marginalization all embedded in power differentials. Conceptually, therefore, CTS should incorporate an examination of these nuances from the perspective of transformation and resistance by challenging the prevailing social and political order in knowledge production.

Conclusion

While recognizing the great contribution of CTS in challenging epistemic inequalities within terrorism research, it is the missing voices of local perspectives that expose CTS approaches to a series of criticism. Acknowledging that Eurocentric bias in terrorism research has not only contributed to the relegation of indigenous voices as inferior, it also led to the marginalization of indigeneity of methods. CTS scholars must, thus, attempt to bridge this knowledge gap that ignores indigenous knowledge production while fully endorsing foreign ideology. This chapter, thus, contributes to the knowledge base that calls for the emancipation of subjugated knowledges within terrorism research by challenging the prevailing power relations behind knowledge production. As argued in the chapter, challenging the intellectual foundation of knowledge production in terrorism research cannot be accomplished without addressing the question of colonialism and coloniality, which inform the geopolitical exclusion of voices from the global South in terrorism research. Besides, having interrogated the general applicability of some tenets of Western knowledge within indigenous cultures, we argue for the need to deconstruct colonial perspectives towards indigenous knowledge and delink from Eurocentric misconceptions about terrorism, particularly in the global South. The move to challenge knowledge production in CTS approaches is essential, if not urgent, to avoid facing the dilemma that arises from the quest for emancipation and the hidden aspects of marginalization of indigenous knowledge. As such, this chapter provides justification for pluralistic perspectives in terrorism research and contends that terrorism research must extend beyond the Western prism and actively and equally engage with indigenous approaches.

References

Aderemi, A. (2010). The Post-Bipolarity, Terrorism and Implications for Africa. In M. S. Smith (Ed.), *Securing Africa-Post 9/11 Discourses on Terrorism* (pp. 129–141). London: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Akena, F. (2012). Critical Analysis of the Production of Western Knowledge and Its Implications for Indigenous Knowledge and Decolonization. *Journal of Black Studies*, *43*(6), 599–619.

Akinola, A. O., & Uzodike, U. O. (2018). Ubuntu and the Quest for Conflict Resolution in Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, *49*(2), 91–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934717736186

Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual Imperialism: Definition, Traits, and Problems. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, *28*(1), 23–45. doi:10.1163/030382400X00154

Andrews, K. (2021). *The New Age of Empire: How Racism and Colonialism Sill Rules the World*. Bold Type Books. Originally published in February 2021 by Allen Lane/Penguin in Great Britain. www.penguin.co.uk/books/316/316672/the-new-age-of-empire/9780241437445.html

Appiah, K. K. (2016). The Sankofa Bird and Reflection. *The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership*, *10*(1), 60–69.

Asante, M. K. (1983). The Ideological Significance of Afrocentricity in Intercultural Communication. *Journal of Black Studies*, *14*(1), 3–19. www.jstor.org/stable/2784027

Asante, M. K. (2017). The Philosophy of Afrocentricity. In A. Afolayan & T. Falola (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of African Philosophy* (pp. 231–244). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bhola, H. S. (2002). Reclaiming Old Heritage for Proclaiming Future History: The Knowledge-for-Development Debate in African Contexts. *Africa today*, *49*(3), 2–21.doi: 10.2979/AFT.2002.49.3.2

Boege, V., Brown, A., Clements, K., Nolan, A., Boege, V., Brown, A., & Nolan, A. (2009). Building Peace and Political Community in Hybrid Political Orders. *International Peacekeeping*, *16*(5), 599–615. https://doi.org/10.1080/13533310903303248

Breidlid, A. (2013). *Education, Indigenous Knowledges, and Development in the Global South Contesting Knowledges for a Sustainable Future*. New York: Routledge.

Brown, M. A. (2017). Hybridity and Dialogue: Approaches to the Hybrid Turn. *Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal*, *2*(4), 446–463. https://doi.org/10.1080/23802014.2017.1353893

Burney, S. (2012). Orientalism: The Making of the Other. In *Pedagogy of the Other: Edward Said, Postcolonial Theory, and Strategies for Critique* (Vol. 417, pp. 23–39). Shehla Burney New York; Bern; Berlin; Bruxelles; Frankfurt am Main; Oxford; Wien: Peter Lang.

Chandler, D., & Reid, J. (2018). 'Being in Being': Contesting the Ontopolitics of Indigeneity. *The European Legacy, toward New Paradigms*, *23*(3), 251–268. doi: 10.1080/10848770.2017.1420284

Creswell, J., & Creswell, D. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th Revise). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Dove, N. (2010). A Return to Traditional Health Care Practices: A Ghanaian Study. *Journal of Black Studies*, *40*(5), 823–834. doi: 10.1177/0021934708320001

Ero, C., Sidhu, W. P. S., & Toure, A. (2001). *Toward a Pax West Africana: Building Peace in a Troubled Sub-Region*. New York, NY: International Peace Academy.

Ewi, M., & Aning, K. (2006). Assessing the Role of the African Union in Preventing and Combating Terrorism in Africa. *African Security Review*, *15*(3), 32–46. doi: 10.1080/10246029.2006.9627603

Ezeanya-Esiobu, C. (2019). Indigenous Knowledge and Education in Africa. In A. Heshmati (Ed.), *Frontiers in African Business Research*. Los Angeles, CA: Springer.

Fabian, J. (1983). *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books.

Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking, and Global Coloniality. *Transformordernity:*

Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/t411000004

Gunning, J. (2007). A Case for Critical Terrorism Studies? *Government and Opposition (London)*, *42*(3), 363–393. doi: 10.1111/j.1477-7053.2007.00228.x

Hobson, J. M. (2004). *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilisation*. Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hudson, H. (2009). Peacebuilding through a Gender Lens and the Challenges of Implementation in Rwanda and Côte d'Ivoire. *Security Studies*, *18*(2), 287–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/09636410902899982

Ilyas, M. (2021a). Decolonising Terrorism Journals. *Societies (Basel, Switzerland)*, *11*(1), 6. doi: 10.3390/soc11010006

Ilyas, M. (2021b). Decolonising the Terrorism Industry: Indonesia. *Social Sciences (Basel)*, *10*(2), 53. doi: 10.3390/socsci10020053

Jackson, R. (2007). Language, Policy and the Construction of a Torture Culture in the War on Terrorism. *Review of International Studies*, *33*(3), 353–371. doi: 10.1017/S0260210507007553

Jackson, R. (2009). Constructivism and Conflict Resolution. In J. Bercovitch, V. Kremenyuk, & I. W. Zartman (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook on Conflict Resolution* (pp. 172–189). London: Sage.

Jackson, R., Jarvis, L., Gunning, J., & Breen-Smyth, M. (2011). *Terrorism: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Jackson, R., Murphy, E., & Poynting, S. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and Practice*. London; New York: Sage.

Kassimeris, G., & Jackson, L. (2011). The West, the Rest, and the 'War on Terror': Representation of Muslims in Neoconservative Media Discourse. *Contemporary Politics*, *17*(1), 19–33. doi: 10.1080/13569775.2011.552684

Kiprop, M. (2016). Changing Gender Roles: Challenging Ethno-Historical Depictions of African Women's Roles in Conflict. In H. Tuso & M. P. Flaherty (Eds.), *Creating the Third Force: Indigenous Processes of Peacemaking* (pp. 391–410). Lanham, Md: Lexington Books, an imprint of Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

Knopf, K. (2015). The Turn toward the Indigenous: Knowledge Systems and Practices in the Academy. *American Studies*, *60*(2), 179–200. www.jstor.org/stable/44071904

Kundnani, A., & Hayes, B. (2018). *The Globalisation of Countering Violent Extremism Policies: Undermining Human Rights, Instrumentalising Civil Society*, TNI Report. Washington, DC: Transnational Institute (TNI). www.tni.org/files/publication-downloads/the_globalisation_of_countering_violent_extremism_policies.pdf

Kwanya, T., & Kiplang, J. (2016). Indigenous Knowledge Research in Kenya: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Paper Presented at the the 11th International Knowledge Management in Organizations Conference, Hagen Germany*, 1–7. http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2925995.2926018

Leonard, B. R., & Mercier, O. R. (2016). Indigenous Struggles within the Colonial Project: Reclaiming Indigenous Knowledges in the Western Academy. *Knowledge Cultures*, *4*(3), 99–116.

Mac Ginty, R. (2011). Indigenous Peacebuilding. In M. Ginty (Ed.), *International Peacebuilding and Local Resistance* (pp. 47–67). London: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-230-27376-4. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230307032

Mafeje, A. (2011). Africanity: A Combative Ontology. In R. Devisch & F. B. Nyamnjoh (Eds.), *The Postcolonial Turn: Re-Imagining Anthropology and Africa* (pp. 31–44). Langaa Research and Publishing Common Initiative (RPCIG). www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvk3gm9f.7

Maloba, W. O. (2017). *The Anatomy of Neo-Colonialism in Kenya: British Imperialism and Kenyatta, 1963–1978*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-50965-5_1

Masolo, D. (2017). Africanizing Philosophy: Wiredu, Hountondji, and Mudimbe. In A. Afolayan & T. Falola (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of African Philosophy*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mazrui, A. A. (2005). The Re-Invention of Africa: Edward Said, V. Y. Mudimbe, and beyond. In *Edward Said, Africa, and Cultural Criticism* (Vol. 36, pp. 68–82). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

McDonnel, J. (2014). Challenging the Euro-Western Epistemological Dominance of Development through African Cosmovision. In P. Lang (Ed.), *Emerging Perspectives on 'African Development': Speaking Differently* (Vol. 443, pp. 98–116). New York; Bern; Berlin; Brussels; Frankfurt am Main; Oxford; Wien: Peter Lang AG.

Miall, H. (2004). Conflict Transformation: A Multi-Dimensional Task. In A. Austin, M. Fischer, & N. Ropers (Eds.), *Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict: The Berghof Handbook* (pp. 67–90). Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management. http://kar.kent.ac.uk

Mwambari, D. (2019a). *Africa's Next Decolonisation Battle Should Be about Knowledge*. Opinion: Al Jazeera. https://apc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%253A%252F%252Fwww.aljazeera.com%252Fauthor%252Fdavid_mwambari_190906074937540&data=04%257C01%257Cshirley.achieng%2540postgrad.otago.ac.nz%257Cb375449bcc0c4fb0aa2308d8ff158b5a%257C0225efc578fe4928b1579ef24809e9ba%257C1%257

Mwambari, D. (2019b). Local Positionality in the Production of Knowledge in Northern Uganda. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *18*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406919864845

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Empire, Global Coloniality and African Subjectivity*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books. https://doi.org/10.25159/0256-6060/623

Oando, S. O. (2021). Book Review of "Radicalization in Pakistan: A Critical Perspective." *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *14*(3), 378–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2021.1919352

Oando, S. O., & Achieng', S. (2021). An Indigenous African Framework for Counterterrorism: Decolonising Kenya's Approach to Countering "Al-Shabaab-Ism." *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *14*(3), 354–377. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2021.1958182

Owusu-Ansah, F. E., & Mji, G. (2013). African Indigenous Knowledge and Research. *African Journal of Disability*, *2*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v2i1.30

Prestholdt, J. (2019). Counterterrorism in Kenya: Security Aid, Impunity and Muslim Alienation. In M. J. Boyle (Ed.), *Non-Western Responses to Terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Randazzo, E. (2019). Post-Conflict Reconstruction, the Local, and the Indigenous. In N. Lemay-Hébert (Ed.), *Handbook on Intervention and Statebuilding* (pp. 30–40). Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788116237

Randazzo, E. (2021). The Local, the 'Indigenous' and the Limits of Rethinking Peacebuilding. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, *15*(2), 141–160.

Rosenau, P. V. (1992). *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads, and Intrusions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ryder, C., Mackean, T., Coombs, J., Williams, H., Hunter, K., Holland, A. J. A., & Ivers, R. Q. (2020). Indigenous Research Methodology: Weaving a Research Interface. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *23*(3), 255–267. doi: 10.1080/13645579.2019.1669923

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Sithole, T., Oloruntoba, S., & Nkenkana, A. (2017). Global Politics of Knowledge Production and the African Development Trajectory: The Imperative of Epistemic Disobedience. In S. Oloruntoba, M. Muchie, V. Gumede, & N. A. Check (Eds.), *Regenerating Africa: Bringing African Solutions to African Problems*. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.

Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London, New York, Dunedin, NZ and New York: Zed Books University of Otago Press Distributed in the USA exclusively by St. Martin's Press.

Smith, M. (2005). The Constitution of Africa as a Security Threat. *Review of Constitutional Studies*, *10*(1 2), 163.

Smith, M. (2010). *Securing Africa: Post-9/11 Discourses on Terrorism* (M. Smith Ed. 1st ed.). New York, USA: Routledge.

Staszak, J.-F. (2008). Other/Otherness. In A. Kobayashi (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Coventry: Elsevier Ltd.

Stump, J. L., & Dixit, P. (2011). Toward a Completely Constructivist Critical Terrorism Studies. *International Relations (London)*, *26*(2), 199–217. doi: 10.1177/0047117811404720

Stump, J. L., & Dixit, P. (2013). *Critical Terrorism Studies: An Introduction to Research Methods*. Milton Park, Abingdon: Routledge.

Suleiman, M. Dan. (2019). *(Re) Framing 'the jihad' in Western Africa: An Epistemic Disobedience* (Doctor of Philosophy). The University of Western Australia. https://doi.org/10.26182/5df83bb5b613e

Tucker, V. (1999). The Myth of Development: A Critique of Eurocentric Discourse. In R. Munck & D. O'Hearn (Eds.), *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm*. London: Zed Books.

Tuso, H. (2016). Arrara: Oromo Indigenous Processes of Peacemaking. In H. Tuso & M. P. Flaherty (Eds.), *Creating the Third Force: Indigenous Processes of Peacemaking* (pp. 77–104). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, an Imprint of the Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

Tuso, H., & Flaherty, M. P. (2016). *Creating the Third Force: Indigenous Processes of Peacemaking*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, an Imprint of the Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

Wane, N. (2006). Is Decolonization Possible? In G. Dei & A. Kempf (Eds.), *Anti-Colonialism and Education: The Politics of Resistance* (pp. 87–106). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Weinberg, L., & Richardson, L. (2004). Conflict Theory and the Trajectory of Terrorist Campaigns in Western Europe. In A. Silke (Ed.), *Research on Terrorism: Trends, Achievements and Failures* (1st ed., pp. 138–160). London: Frank Cass.

Yeboah, N. (2021). All the Nation's a Stage: The Ghana National Theatre as Sankofa Praxis. *Theatre Journal (Washington, D.C.)*, *73*(2), 147–168. doi: 10.1353/tj.2021.0039