

## **Territorialization of Modern Discourses and De-territorialization of Traditions: Glocalized Cultural Homogenization**

**Muhammad Rasheed Arshad**

Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy  
University of the Punjab, Lahore  
Email: *rasheedarshad.phil@pu.edu.pk*

### **Abstract**

This paper will discuss how the discourse of modern education has systematically sidelined traditional value systems because it stands heavily indebted to Enlightenment epistemology. Based on the philosophical hermeneutics by Hans-Georg Gadamer, this paper contends that an insatiable desire for objective knowledge, systematized in the form of global education systems, impairs the interpretive sophistication as well as the epistemic authority of local traditions. With the prism of glocalization, the paper explores the global forces of imposition of homogenized discursive practices which in the name of imposition render nothingness-of-oneself in a way that they present themselves as being uncontested or universal in validity. This twofold process of deterritorialization of local traditions and reterritorialization of global ideologies is being traced especially in the Muslim world where the intellectual responses are divided into modernist, fundamentalist and traditionalist. The paper points to the critical responsibility of the teacher as an agent of change, and a proxy of the global hegemonic paradigms which are gradually governed by the demands of the market economies. It also carefully asks questions on the transformation of education as a space of moral and cultural formation into congruence with technology as a technocratic orientation by transnational bodies. The discussion ends by revealing how this worldwide transformation has brought about ontological and epistemological crisis demanding re-existence to the teacher and maintenance of local intellectual tradition against homogenization of cultures.

**Keywords:** Enlightenment Epistemology, Glocalization, Hermeneutics, Tradition.

### **Introduction**

Living in an underdeveloped, third world, and poor country and at the same time witnessing the growth and prosperity of western world has transformed our dream of progress into a recurring nightmare. This obsession of progress is being underway for the last seventy years or so, the identification and the explications of the causes of underdeveloped and regressive lifeworld have been provided by the intelligentsia of both home and abroad but the relative underdevelopment between third world and first world is constantly increasing. The dominant discourse regarding the stagnancy of the third world countries in general and Muslim world in particular reveals that the nature of problem is structural rather than a grand conspiracy against Muslims in general and Pakistanis in particular.

Although there are millions of reasons one can provide regarding the determination of the cause of being left behind in global process of progress and prosperity. However, one of the most dominant causes identified by most of the intellectuals is our pre-modern and traditional mind set. It is generally claimed that our cultural specificities, traditional collectivities, and medieval religious historicity are not only regressive but provide a hermeneutical circle which is embryonically anti-modern.

The History of ideas reveals an organic relationship between modernity and progress. Therefore, it is claimed that modernization and scientization of life-world cannot be possible without developing a modern-self. Thus, for the last hundred years or so we are actually in the process of making *modern-self-identity*.

In this context the idealization of modern-ways of life is not a recent phenomenon but the contemporary process of globalization and institutionalization of the mechanism of digital communication has expedited our belated consciousness (Suri 2010, 194). Visual representations of high-tech ways of life practice in affluent societies are accessible for every Pakistani who is living in under- modern life form. The process of globalization has highlighted the cultural contradictions of our social order and questions the historically determined parameters of permissible, prohibited, and preferable ideas and their corresponding axiological hierarchies.

Thus, the pre-modern encumbrances are presented as the major cause of our regressive existence. This claim is rested upon certain assumptions:

- i. Our pre-givenness, encumbrances, pre-enlightenment traditions, and particularities are major obstacles in the pursuit of objective knowledge.
- ii. Our collective consciousness is adversely colored by our regressive cultural specificities and religious particularities.
- iii. The formal institutionalization of modern discursive reason is presumed to be the only instrument to transcend from these particularities.
- iv. Modern educational mechanism is inevitable for the realization of objective knowledge.
- v. The dream of progress, development and affluence is realizable only through modern means.

### **Tradition, Modernity, and the Crisis of Progress**

Hans-Georg Gadamer, a major 20th-century Continental philosopher, developed philosophical hermeneutics—the theory of interpretation—as a response to the Enlightenment ideal of objective knowledge. Influenced by Heidegger, he expanded hermeneutics beyond texts to encompass all human understanding, rooted in ‘Being’, the background that qualifies human knowing. Gadamer emphasized on historical and linguistic situatedness by affirming that our understanding of the world is shaped by tradition and language, and to him these are not barriers but these are conditions of thought. Gadamer strongly opposed the scientific notion of truth as reducible to method and he presented truth as an event that transforms the knower. A great emphasis on dialogue as a path to understanding and a great stress on the significance of practical dialogical engagement rather than detached theory is central to Gadamerian thought (Dostal 2002, 3).

Hermeneutics, initially concerned with interpretation in biblical and legal contexts, gradually evolved to encompass the interpretation of all kinds of texts. Martin Heidegger, who mentored Gadamer, expanded its scope further by applying it not just to texts but to every dimension of human understanding. As a result, philosophical hermeneutics came to focus on exploring the nature and importance of understanding as it relates to human existence more broadly (Barthold 2020).

Gadamer challenged the Enlightenment’s “prejudice against prejudice,” and argued that all of our understanding is conditioned in historical terms and tradition is an undeniable factor that shapes our understanding of the world (Gadamer 2004, 273). He opposed the idea of eradicating tradition in favor of abstract reason endorsed by the Enlightenment

epistemology. Rather than relying on some sort of fixed methods, he introduced a notion of “fusion of horizon” that suggests that dialogical process between past and present.

### **Muslim Intellectual Responses to Western Epistemologies**

The cultural anthropological studies of Muslim societies reveals that the traditional and the religious practices, prescriptions are harmonized in such a manner that it is difficult to differentiate their paradigmatic differences and it is generally presumed that the denial of one will eventually negate the significance of the other. There is no doubt that the notion of *progress and development* we are pursuing for the last hundred years or so is intrinsically Eurocentric. It is important to note that this notion of the progress and its corresponding socio-economic institutions are introduced in sub-continent by the British Imperialist under the mechanism of colonization and exploitation.

Therefore, despite this fact that Progress and development is presumed to be the only apodictic socio-political agenda which has been presented as conscientious by all quarters of society i.e. from left to right, center, center to left and center to right, but even then, lot of “ifs and or buts” are associated with the notion of progress and development by our intelligentsia. In this context we find text which actually an attempt to reconcile modern progress with our traditional particularities and religious specificities therefore issue of progress and its genealogical roots with the Western axiological foundations reveals that the nature of conflict is more deepen then that of its general representation in poplar text.

On the other hand the literature produced in Western discourse reveals that major cause of underdeveloped Muslim world or development at least not up to the mark is due to their pre-modern specificities and particularities, Ayers categorically claims that time to say goodbye to all our per-modern life forms “since the technological revolution is itself irresistible, the arbitrary authority and irrational values of pre-scientific, pre-industrial cultures are doomed” (Ayres 1962, xxiv–xxv). He has identified three alternatives for all those who are associated with their pre-modern value structures.

Three alternatives confront the partisans of tribal values and beliefs. Resistance, if sufficiently effective, though it cannot save the tribal values, can bring on total revaluation. Or ineffective resistance may lead to sequestration like that of American Indians. The only remaining

alternative is that of intelligent, voluntary acceptance of the industrial way of life and values that go with it (Ayres 1962, xxiv–xxv).

Interestingly all the three alternatives have been tested and practiced simultaneously in our part of the world, the first alternative was opted by the traditionalist, the second alternative was adopted by the fundamentalist, and the third option was chosen by the Islamic modernists.

The contemporary form of Islamic fundamentalism is one of the tendencies that have emerged in the Muslim world and it is in fact not a recent phenomenon, it has its roots in Muslim resistance movements against colonial-imperialist order and there is no doubt that it is genealogically an ant-imperialist tendency. Since the colonial domination was all in compassing therefore the nature of resistance against this unique mechanism of domination of (religion, politics and culture), plundering, exploitation, and discrimination was also all in compassing but interestingly decentralized particularly in the context of Sub-continent. However, one can trace at least above mentioned three different tendencies in Muslim world, out of which only Islamic fundamentalism has been single out, presented, identified, and discussed particularly in the contemporary discourse as threat to the progressive ideologies and their corresponding institutional settings in general and the Pakistani society in particular.

Muslim intellectuals have been introduced by the modern technologically driven life pattern under the imperialist order of exploitation and colonial plundering. Although this capital-intensive technological domination over natural and traditional form of life practiced by the English in Sub-continent was fascinating for Indians but due to specific historical conditions of Muslims, the modernity was intertwined with imperial tool of Western domination. Thus, their response against the colonial/imperialist domination is not one dimensional i.e. just of political nature rather every dimension of Muslim intelligentsia (including orthodox religious scholars, Sufis, Lawyers, historians, poets, philanthropists, journalist, teachers and intellectuals etc.) all have participated in that anti-imperialist struggle. However, the process of decolonization has unfortunately begun before the natural synthesis of different tendencies regarding the futuristic dynamics of the Muslims of this region.

Three important tendencies were emerged during colonial period, which are the modernist, fundamentalist and the traditionalist. Apart from the

political activism if we look at the theoretical dynamics of resistance movement these tendencies can be presented as representative theoretical response to the given challenge. The lopsided acceptance and rejection of western Enlightenment intellectual tradition has manifested itself in internal antagonist dialectics between puritanical reformist (Islamic Fundamentalist) and modernist in Muslim world. “Modernist such as Sayyed Ahmed Khan and Chiragh Ali of India have rejected every facet of theology and philosophy which does not accord with an Enlightenment and Positivist notion of reasons” (Lumbard 2005, 41).

On the other hand, according to Lumbard puritanical literalists in Muslim world have denied the “efficacy of our speculative, intuitive and imaginable faculties” (Lumbard 2005, 41), and ignore the significance of tradition and historicity of the Muslim Ummah. However, Lumbard believes that both these extremist positions do not represent the real Islamic tradition. The solution Islam provided for humanity is not properly elucidated by these apologetic and rejectionist manifestations of Islam particularly in the post-colonial intellectual context. He believes that neither the secularists nor the puritanical literalist (i.e. Islamic fundamentalist) represents the true Islamic tradition which is rested upon “Islam, Iman and Ihsan” (Lumbard 2005, 41).

It means that these three different tendencies are very prominent in Islamic postcolonial discourse according to Lumbard i.e. modernist who are the remnants of Muslim secular intelligentsia emerged under the control conditions of colonization of Muslim world. Second are the puritanical literalist reformist, who are generally been identified as Islamic fundamentalist. They are reactionary to the Western hegemony in the world order particularly in post-colonial Muslim world, they have generally been identified as regressive, anti-modern and intolerant.

The Islamic Traditionalist represents the third tendency. They do not consider Islam as a political ideology- rather they focus on the revival of genuine Islamic tradition which according to Lumbard has been compromised by the “widespread rejection of Islamic intellectual tradition, usually in the name of progress” (Lumbard 2005, 66). It is important to note that modernist dream of progress under the condition of Enlightenment discourse has been questioned by both the puritanical literal Islamists and the traditionalist. But both have different reasons to delegitimize the modern urge of power and progress to overcome one’s belated consciousness (Suri 2011).

The traditionalists believe that modernization process has disentangled the organic relation between Islam, Iman and Ihsan. According to them from the organic totality of these three aspects the genuine Islamic tradition has emerged. Secondly modern reliance on discursive reason regarding the determination of legitimate public sphere also delegitimizes the fundamental cultural dynamics of Islamic tradition i.e. Sufism. It is important to note that Sufism which is, according to traditionalist, ultimate breeding ground for the continuation of genuine Islamic tradition is questioned and delegitimized by both the puritanical literalist fundamentalist as well as the apologetic modernist.

The tradition of Junayed Baghdadi, Al-Ghazali, Ibn al-Arabi, Maulana Rumi, etc. has been presented as: “The scapegoat through which Islam’s backwardness” could be explained. In this view Sufism is the religion of the common people and embodies superstition and un-Islamic elements adopted from local cultures” (Chittick cited in Lumbard 2005, 67). The contemporary form of Sufism is resisted by the fundamentalist because the puritanical Islamists were not satisfied with the amalgamation of un-Islamic practices and doctrines in Islamic mysticism, and consider it as a source of secularization through the passive culturalization and naturalization of the multiplicity of faith.

On the other hand, the modernist considers Sufism and traditionalism as one of the major sources of underdevelopment, backwardness and culturally passive Muslim societies. They believe that this culture of superstition should be replaced by modern institutional order which is consistent and naturally compatible with Islamic worldview. Therefore “in order for Islam to retain its birth right which includes modern science and technology, Sufism must be eradicated” (Lumbard 2005, 67).

The initial exposition of the internal intellectual dynamics in Muslim world reveals that Islamic fundamentalism is intrinsically an indigenous issue of Muslim societies. This intellectual antagonism between rationalist, puritans and Sufi’s is not a novel phenomenon in Muslim Intellectualism. The intellectual disagreements among Mutazilites, Khawarij and Asharites were the part of Muslim intellectual tradition. But what is novel in contemporary post-colonial dynamics is that the different solutions brought by both modernist and reformist, were not successful “The modernist fail to offer solution because they begin with intellectual capitulation [whereas] the reformists fail because they only

provide immediate solutions which are fideistic and voluntaristic at best” (Lumbard 2005, 69).

### **Education, Globalization, and the Role of the Teacher**

This initial exposition of internal theoretical dynamics reveals that Muslim world is actually in the process of temporal synthesis (Suri 2011, 108). This transitory period in which different intellectual dynamics are being under way in Muslim world is intrinsically local. The internal process of temporal synthesis is being underway in response to the emergence of nation states, international bureaucratic institutions, national, regional, and international dynamics which are constantly affecting post-colonial life form. On other hand the external process of synthesis is responding the global capitalist order and international power players who are encroaching Muslim states and societies all around the world. Muslim states like Sudan, Algeria, Chechnya, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Indonesia, Libya etc. are all directly being affected by the political and military intervention of Western powers as a result of this many non-state actors have developed an ideology which has the potential to be presented as a global threat.

The localization of global ideas cannot be possible without redesigning the local educational apparatus “local system from globally oriented education policies, which continue to influence to the way that local system redesign education” (Vongalis-Macrow 2007, 425). The realization of global socio-political and economic objectives presumes a comprehensive structural transformation. The structural reform presumes three-dimensional transformation i.e. a) methodological, b) institutional, and c) axiological. Methodological reforms include critical re-evaluation of curricula and in cooperation of inclusive reading material and pedagogical innovation as per the requirement of transnational working conditions.

Institutional transformation is an attempt to rationalize the conventional structures of family, religion, culture, and tradition so that the pre-modern socio-cultural particularities are gradually deterritorialized and with the help of modern discursive practices reterritorialize the given order as per the requirement of predominantly modern global life-world. Institutional transformation is a time taking process it cannot be possible without using all the contemporary modern tools of control, infiltration, proliferation of ideas and propaganda. Thus, comprehensive educational apparatus cannot be institutionalized without deconstructing pre-modern

life-world so it is necessary to explore and equate pre-modern cultural particularities as discriminatory, patriarchal and anti-egalitarian (in terms of gender share in given socio-economic order). The axiological transformation is actually the consequence of methodological and institutional transformation it actually neutralizes the concerns, fears and adverse implications made by the people regarding the gradual transformation of methodological and institutional apparatus. This transformation will be decisive in the sense that on the one hand it axiologically values the modern and global ways of life and its corresponding practices and institutions. On the other hand, it deconstructs local particularities by disvaluing their pre-modern form of life and their corresponding institutions. Thus, the revaluation of localized hierarchies, religious prohibitions/preferences, traditional particularities, and specificities will be the intended corollary of this process of transformation which were presumed to be absolute, certain, and universal.

Central and global process of deterritorialization of local systems of value and of reterritorialization of values on a global scale is not only a structural and ideological process; it completely depends on the existence of human agents who cause these changes. Of these, one of the most crucial ones is the teacher. Being an institutional actor who is a part of the education system, a teacher is a carrier of dominant epistemology as well as a filter of them. Unless there is active cooperation and assistance of the teacher or even mere passive obedience, the imposition of globalized norms, pedagogies, and worldviews would be largely ineffective. In their classroom discussion, curriculum teachings and pedagogical orientation, teachers ease the internalization of the values. They do not have a neutral role; their role is profoundly embedded in the process of reconfiguration of student consciousness, which sometimes subtly makes local sensibilities fit in the global framework.

Re-conceptualization of the agency of transformation, especially in education and production of knowledge, has become the hallmark of transnational development since the last decade of the twentieth century. This transformation is an indicator of the increasing impact of world market forces on the ways societies envision change and the future. The agents of change like teachers, scholars, intellectuals, etc. are no longer considered as fully formed moral or intelligent individuals but as increasingly subject to re-configuration to satisfy the demands of a competitive efficiency-seeking and market-based world. This change

comes with a redefinition of their functions- as custodians of cultural and ethical heritage to custodians of economic utility and employability. Professional expectations, educational policies and institutional models across countries have slowly been moving closer towards the making and supporting this model and perceptually a larger global collaboration is planned in the future. In that way, this tendency not only reflects the commercialization of knowledge, but it also results in the commercialization of people with whom knowledge is shared (Mason 1999).

Michael Young has paid special attention to the occurrence of a new era of working in the field of teaching and the changing of the outlines of the significance of working in the teaching field in the twenty-first century (Young 1988, 53). Within the framework of the high speed of globalization, knowledge economies, and changes in the priorities associated with education, the essential role of the teacher as the one who simply provides knowledge has changed. Young points out the fact that teachers at present are now in larger nexus of curriculum renewal, knowledge legitimation, and socio-economic reconciliation. External requirements in their work are gaining growing importance to define their professional identity as a profession, whether in policies-based accountability requirements or provision of globally competitive human capital. As opposed to being facilitators, teachers will be supposed to be critical agents in the reconstruction of knowledge to meet the demands of the present. This realization once again reinforces the fact that the teacher should be reconsidered as a source of knowledge, a teacher, but also as one of the key actors in providing balance between tradition, state policies, and global requirements.

The globalization of market demands a new breed of teachers who are not only aware about the ever changing transnational and trans-cultural dynamics of modern educational apparatus but more importantly they must also be committed with rising tendencies of global values. In this sense appropriate human resources are needed to cope with the demand of global market. The education system is intrinsically teleological. The emerging trends in market mechanism demand that locally grounded conventional education model is needed to be replaced as per the requirement of global financial order. "Macro-education policy figures, such as the OECD and the world bank, at the forefront of systemizing global responses to knowledge economy, produced strategies implicating changes to education systems" (Vongalis-Macrow 2007, 431).

In line with this, Shacklock (Smyth and Shacklock 1998), Srrain (Srrain 2000) and Zajda (Zajda 1998), have recognized that realizing systematic change in the education transformation is a very complicated and, in many cases, a problematic task. The complexity of this situation resides in fundamental duality between agency and structure, between an actor-teacher that has the potential to transform a situation and apparatus (institution) in which an actor deals. Although teacher may have the abilities to reflect, resist, or create innovations, their behaviors are often controlled by prior structures like standardized curriculum, measurement systems, bureaucratic accountability systems, and mandates based on policy. Such structural conditioning reduces the scope at which individual agency can be affected as true change. Paradox, then, is deep-rooted in the system itself: the teachers are supposed to be change-makers, but they operate within the system that does not allow much possibilities of a profound change at all. Becoming familiar with this contradiction is an important step in any discussion of educational change because this exposed the uneven, conflictual and negotiated character of pedagogical reform in the modern age.

The duality between the need to enable and empower teacher agency and the need to achieve a more structured educational system is more convoluted yet when a certain incompatibility of existing forms of human resources created by current educational systems and the needs and demands of the new changes within the global economic order turns out to be fundamental namely, contracting of the public sector and concurrent growth of the privatized global economy. This mismatch puts the institutions of learning under a pressure of adapting not out of ideological convenience nor local imperatives but of structural realities of the global era.

The restructuring of the apparatus of education in accordance with the requirements of the market then turns into a necessity, a compulsion requirement, instead of a reform at free choice. Not that far however such transformation is not uniform or monolithic (Deleuze and Guattari 1988, quoted in Vongalis-Macrow 2007, 426). Again, taking most of the critical theorists the way we see it is not a paradigm of the dominant paradigm but a process of how multiplicity is changing. Coupled here in all likelihood with processes of reterritorialization, the displacement or dissolution of all localized values and structures now carries with it the re-inscription of new forms of coherence and legitimacy into the fabric of the global order. To maintain itself it is necessary that a system re-

anchors its control, meaning, and reproduction mechanisms even in situations of complexity.

The role of the teacher in this process of reterritorialization has been shown to become one of the primary and hotbeds of change. As transformation with globalization reformulates the face of education today, there is the strong urgency to look beyond the actions of teachers themselves and consider how they have been remade and repositioned themselves in the course of this larger structural transformation. No longer mere dispensers of knowledge or the bearers of culture, the teachers are steadily being made global skills dispensers, market-itis producers, and the tools of performance-standardization.

This rebuilding is a more fundamental ontological transition: the instructor does not belong trained to be a member of a locally specific ethical or intellectual tradition but is formed in the shape of the needs of a transnational knowledge economy. To comprehend this transformation, it is important to interrogate with a critical eye how global discourses, policy arrangements, and institutional expectations reconstitute the professional identity, authority and purpose of the teacher in a manner that usually conceals their initial pedagogical and moral calling. It is necessary to understand “how teachers have been reconstructed and reterritorialized within the current globalization landscape” (Vongalis-Macrow 2007, 427).

### **Technocratic Governance, Capital, and Cultural Homogenization**

It is also very important to note that global educational dynamics apart from its macro-logical aspect cannot be understood without exploring its localized implications. The role of teachers to infer the localized implications of global tendencies is very important for the re-territorialization of a given life-form. And it cannot be possible without re-forming relations among different constituents of given matrix. i.e. Students, teachers, parents and their mutual relationship have been redefined in this new emerging reterritorialized context.

Teachers play a decisive role in this process of reterritorialization, their obligations and limitations are institutionalized and monitored through legal parameters of the educational apparatus. These obligations judge teacher’s performance with respect to student’s achievements and their capacity to ensure the protocols that have been formalized by the institution as per the requirement of global market. “These obligations are increasingly shaped by business-like operational measures,

underpinned by the conception of education as a product and relations based on business-like exchanges where students are customers and clients.” In this sense the education is no more a free pursuit of awareness rather its epistemological predication is remarkably being controlled by this technocratic apparatus. Therefore, modernization is not uncontrolled, autonomously chosen path rather this technocratic modernization is on the one hand a comprehensive mechanism of deterritorialization of pre-modern epistemological foundations, its corresponding educational objectives and axiological structures. On the other hand, reterritorialization as per the requirement of emerging global market dynamics and order of mass production.

The role of transnational institutions like World trade organization (WTO), General agreement on trade (GATS), Organization for economic cooperative development (OECD) and UNESCO is gradually increasing and the political liberalization is actually intertwined with liberalization in trade and commerce. These policies are difficult to implement in culturally non-liberal and traditionally religious societies. The only option left for the architect of global order is gradual transformation of State and society through modern liberal educational apparatus.

People like Martin Shaw believe that the gradual process of globalization is not malignant for third world rather it is an opportunity for under-developed states to participate in this process of transforming both state and society as per the spirit of the age, this process of liberal reterritorialization according to Shaw “is both predicated on and produces such transformation” (Shaw 1997, quoted in Robertson, Bonal, and Dale 2002, 472). It has been acknowledged fact that “GAT is less well known than other supranational organizations that affect national education policies such as world bank, the organization for economic and cooperative development OECD, and UNESCO” (Robertson, Bonal, and Dale 2002, 473).

The role of capital and expanding markets i.e. financial markets in the process of globalization in general and deterritorialization and reterritorialization is decisive (Harvey 1982, quoted in Robertson, Bonal, and Dale 2002, 473). People like Deleuze, Harvey and Brenner have emphasized on the notion of fixity and motion of the capital, because the inherent capacity of capital that it cannot be in rest its constantly in process of accumulation for the sake of accumulation. The problem is that it needs a public order to legitimize and continue this

process of accumulation. But this process of multiplicity disintegrates all those social collectivities which questions or resist this globalizing movement of capital. In Brenner's words:

On the one hand, in its drive to accumulate surplus value, capital strives to annihilate space through time, and therefore to overcome all geographical barriers in its circulation process. Yet, to pursue these continual dynamics of deterritorialization and space-space compression, capital necessarily depends upon relatively fixed and immobile territorial infrastructures such as urban, regional agglomerations and territorial states (Brenner 1998, 461).

The capital driven deterritorialization of all forms of fixity which resist the mobility of global capital reveals itself in modern education governance this analysis has comprehensively been presented by Jessop (Jessop 1999, 19–38). He has characterized the nature of capitalist order emerged in post-world war as closed national economy, demand-side management, economic and social rights, which are ensured by national territorial State. In this framework the regimes work “within the matrix of national state, national economy, a society of national citizens, a national system of education” (Robertson, Bonal, and Dale 2002, 477).

### **Conclusion**

Territorialization of contemporary discursive practice and corresponding deterritorialization of all systems of the classic reality is not just a change in the epistemological pattern, but a complete cultural, ideological and institutional change. Reading the example of Muslim societies, it becomes clear that discourse of progress, when based on the concept of Enlightenment project, diminishes the validity of the tradition, and, at the same time, promotes itself as the only possible way towards the development. This world discourse is supported by the education system which is increasingly run on the reasoning of the market policies and control by technocracy; whereby teachers are simply reduced to global standardizers instead of being instruments of morality and culture.

The conflict between domestic cultures and world demands cannot be handled easily in both instances of resistance and assimilation but is worked out in multifaceted and usually ambivalent intellectual discourses. Such a division of the Muslim thinkers into the modernist, fundamentalist, and traditionalist groups is merely a higher expression of anxiousness of the postcolonial world full of broken meanings and identities. None of these responses, though, get the crisis of cultural

continuity and epistemic legitimacy sufficiently resolved, strictly speaking.

There is a need to remember that education is a place where one gets to engage in a dialogical and hermeneutical process, not an area where the economy rationality reigns. Correctly positioned and enabled teachers can negotiate between the heritage and the modern needs, as they would fill in the breach formed by the global (super) homogenization. At stake in all this is no less than the continued existence of tradition, as well as the very diversity of modes of knowing and being in the world.

## References

- Ayres, Clarence E. 1962. *The Theory of Economic Progress: A Study of the Fundamentals of Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 2nd ed. New York: Schocken Books.
- Barthold, Lauren Swayne. 2020. "Hans-Georg Gadamer." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Last modified 2020. <https://iep.utm.edu/gadamer/>
- Brenner, Neil. 1998. "Between Fixity and Motion: Accumulation, Territorial Organization and the Historical Geography of Spatial Scales." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 16: 459–481.
- Chittick, William C. 2005. Quoted in J. E. Lumbard, "The Decline of Knowledge and the Rise of Ideology in the Modern Islamic World." In *Islam, Fundamentalism, and the Betrayal of Tradition*, edited by Joseph E. B. Lumbard, foreword by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, 41–69. New Delhi: Third Eye.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1988. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dostal, Robert J. 2002. "Introduction." In *The Cambridge Companion to Gadamer*, edited by Robert J. Dostal, 1–21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*. 2nd rev. ed. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London and New York: Continuum.
- Harvey, David. 1982. *The Limits to Capital*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Jessop, Bob. 1999. "Reflections on Globalization and Its Logic." In *Globalization and the Asia Pacific: Contested Territories*, edited by Kris Olds, Peter Dicken, Paul E. Kelly, and Henry Wai-Chung Yeung, 19–38. London: Routledge.
- Lumbard, J. E. 2005. "The Decline of Knowledge and the Rise of Ideology in the Modern Islamic World." In *Islam, Fundamentalism, and the Betrayal of Tradition*, edited by Joseph E. B. Lumbard, foreword by Seyyed Hossein Nasr, 41–69. New Delhi: Third Eye.
- Mason, Robin. 1999. *Globalizing Education: Trends and Applications*. London: Routledge.
- Robertson, Susan L., Xavier Bonal, and Roger Dale. 2002. "GATS and the Education Service Industry: The Politics of Scale and Global Reterritorialization." *Comparative Education Review* 46 (4): 472–495.

- Shaw, Martin. 1997. "The State of Globalization: Towards a Theory of State Transformation." *Review of International Political Economy* 4 (3): 497–513.
- Smyth, John, and Geoff Shacklock. 1998. *Remaking Teaching: Ideology, Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- Srrain, Mick. 2000. "Changing Teachers' Work: The Reform in Secondary Schooling." *School Leadership & Management* 20 (2).