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Abstract:
The paper is an attempt to provide a mode of interpreting the modern world, operating as a system/singularity based on functional distribution of world space in core, semi, periphery, and periphery. The account is based on Foucault concept of “Archaeology”, i.e. the history of Present. Although Foucault believes that the history written using Archaeology as method will be different from traditional, total, linear, and deterministic treatises of mega history, yet his “General History”, is also rooted in Structuralism. Hence Foucault develops an ambivalent relation with Marx. On the other hand the project of histoire totale of Annales, materialized by Immanuel Wallerstein in form of World-Systems theory is Marxist in origin, but deviate from Marxism/Structuralism on conception of longue dure’e or “plural times”, a history unfolding in linear dimension but with difference in pace at multitude of spaces.
The present analysis will combine the two mutually coherent paradigms of critical theory and resistance to capitalist world orders, i.e. the Annales and Postmodernism and provide a spatio-temporal account of history of Present (the World System). Taking Foucauldian notion of discourse as building brick of history and “violence we do to things”, the paper aims to construct a theoretical frame to evaluate transformations,
taking place in different time spans of history at various places leading to modern world system as a singularity, i.e. Globalization
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**Introduction**

Capitalism is the force that moved the history of Europe and non-European world in a particular manner and is responsible for unfolding present the way that is, since Sixteenth century. The world operating as a functioning whole and system with clear distribution of labor amongst different spaces of globe has become a reality with incorporation of different places, civilizations, and autonomous subsistence economies in a grand system, i.e. Eurocentrism. Modern narratives of History with Europe as center and spearhead, are linear and deterministic, incurred legitimacy to present hierarchized world order in suzerainty of Europe. Resistance accounts to hegemonic narratives of modern history, had to develop a different conceptions of history, not only to challenge the unequal distribution of power and wealth but to add the history of places, and civilizations, other than Europe. The Critical tradition emerged in political thought with Marx who offered a new narrative of history, linear and deterministic in nature but differing in end with the valor and final victory of humanity over unequal world order working for the advantage of few. World-System theory, the base component of Annales School of French historians and Foucault idea of history as “Archaeology” are Structuralist and Marxist at root; and provides an alternative explanation of grand narrative of Eurocentric historicism.

The paper is divided in three parts.

The first part enlisted the prominent features of Foucauldian Archaeology, and established its relation with the other resistance accounts, i.e. *histoire totale*.

The second provides an overview of World System theory.

The third combined the coherent parts of Foucault Archaeology and *histoire totale* and cast a gaze on the image of world-
system in mirror of Postmodernism and outline an Archaeological approach to World-System.

**Archaeology as History of Present**

Postmodernism is not a “unified discourse”. The four unique thinkers, i.e. Jacques Derrida, Richard Rorty, Jean-Francois Lyotard and Michel Foucault, “different in voice, style, content and concern” are the four cornerstones of Postmodernism. The Postmodernism as critical paradigm owe much to contribution of Michel Foucault, primarily concerned about “truth, power, legitimation and ‘subject’”. (Flax 1990) Signified as “historian of present” and “philosopher of change”, (Merquior 1985, 11) Foucauldian notions, like, Governmentality, Power/Knowledge, Discourse, Genealogy, and Archaeology provided an array of conceptual tool kits for better understanding of working of world conceived, designed and constructed according to hegemonic needs. Foucault in a subtle manner describes the mechanisms of subjugation; games and politics of truth that make the working of power normal and world as intelligible and given. Foucault real contribution lies in providing two alternative modes of crafting history, i.e. Archaeology and Genealogy.

Foucault incepted the mode of “Archaeology” at time of writing “Birth of Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception”. (Foucault, The Birth of Clinic An Archaeology of Medical Perception [1963] 2006) Foucault extended the domain of concept to study life, labor and language in his book “Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences”. (Foucault 1966, 1989) (Merquior 1985, 36) Archaeology was defined by Foucault in “Order of Things” as an inquiry with an aim to rediscover, the base that made “knowledge and theory possible;….knowledge was constituted. Ideas could appear; sciences be established; experiences be reflected in philosophies; rationalities be framed”. (Foucault 1966, 1989, xxiii) Archaeology as philosophy of history matured in Foucault book “Archaeology of Knowledge”. (Foucault [1969], 2004) The creator of “Archaeology” abandoned the concept and
replaced it with a broader category i.e. Genealogy\(^1\). The reason was the clear Structuralist\(^2\) leanings of the concept that Foucault was in denial. “Archaeology was Structuralist at base and Foucault was a “reluctant Structuralist”. Although Foucault acknowledged the worth of Structuralism, he considered it an inappropriate method for “History of knowledge”; “my aim is not to transfer to the field of history and more particularly to the history of knowledge (connaissances\(^3\)), a structuralist method that has proved valuable in other fields of analysis”. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 7) Hence in “Archaeology of Knowledge”, Foucault intends to develop a novel mode of history writing beyond the traditional (modern) and Marxist accounts of “totale historie”.

Traditional, totale and General History

History as form of knowledge is an element within the overall holistic fields of Modernity and Enlightenment. “During Medieval period, historical knowledge was either subject to rational philosophy or subordinate to theology”…with emergence of modernity and rationalism of enlightenment in nineteenth century, historical knowledge became a “major

\(^1\) Foucault is indebted to Nietzsche for the concept “Genealogy”. Archaeology as concept was power neutral with no clear hint about working of power in construction of knowledge, focusing on perceived, Genealogy cleay indicates that knowledge is not an independent category free from the working of power and power relations. Concept of Genealogy has implications for the phenomenon of resistance. To Foucault, power is exercised on free subject capable of resisting effects of power as well as undergoing changes leading to subject formation. (Nawaz 2012)

\(^2\) Deryfus and Rabinow (Rabinow 1983) believes that Archaeology like structuralism is a holistic interpretation. The elements of archaeology are products of a field of relations, having much complex relation with the whole than a structuralist could conceive. Structuralism identifies and individuates elements in isolation and constructs a whole that is sum of its parts. While on the other hand archaeological holism produces the elements within the bounds of structure and structure determines what can/ cannot be a possible element. Foucault’s pragmatic holism is more radical than structural holism. To them Archaeology is a kind of more subtle and refined form of Structuralism. (Rabinow 1983, 64-65)

\(^3\) French word Connaissances literally means cognition, has broader connotations. The word means the base of organized human knowledge
claimant of authority””. Hence the school of Historians associated with the trend constructed historical treatises on the claim that ‘historical knowledge’ is ‘objective in nature’; is ‘reliable like science and scientific fact’. (Shafique 2016, 3-4) The historical claims of universality were subjected to severe critique posed by resistance paradigms like Postmodernism and Annales rooted in Marxist and Nietzschean philosophies. Foucault is of the view that his Archaeological and Genealogical approaches to History are the “General History”, and built on traces of Marxist and Nietzschean thoughts. He denotes modern history as traditional and believes that it was decentered by anthropology and humanism of Marx and Nietzsche. Hence the structuralist concept of “histoire totale” emerged as response to this decentering. Foucault adds that the project reduced all the differences invoked by Marx like, “materialistic determinism”, relations of production”, “class struggle” by constituting a “world view”, “system of values “ and constructing an overarching concept of civilization. History during the same period also opposed the Nietzschean ideals for “search of an original foundation”, and made “rationality the telos of mankind”. Main objective of such historical knowledge is the preservation of this “rational telos”. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 15) The project of histoire totale by Annales4, is search of continuity over long spans employing the concept of longue dure’e, introduced by Fernand Braudel. (Lee 2012) Foucault is of the view that idea of discontinuity plays a pivotal role in construction of history. Discontinuity to Foucault is the process that can play a pivotal role in historical understandings. But for the protagonists of continuity thesis, discontinuity was perceived as “stigma of temporal dislocation” and historian task is to exclude the phenomenon and produce continuous coherent accounts based on conception of structural time like epochs.

4 The Journal Annales d’histoire économique et Sociale was established by Lucian Febvre and Marc Bloch in 1929. Its name was changed to indicate the broadening of its scope as Annales :Economies, Societe’s, civilisations in 1946. Prime aim of Annales was to provide a historical narrative, identifying recurrence of patterns, the change and continuity in polity, society and economy over long terms.
periods, and ages having a single origin. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 10) Foucault believes that instead of vast unities like ‘periods’, centuries or *longue durée*\(^5\), history must be associated with the phenomenon of rupture and discontinuity. Hence Foucault takes discontinuity and rupture as a “working concept”, a “positive element that determines objectives and validates the analysis”. Hence Foucauldian narration of history will invert all those signs that consider breaks and rupture as flaws of historical accounts. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 11) For Foucault the “Dialectical” and similar models of history are problematic due to their consideration and construction of “history”, according to a grand totalizing image. That is, because they suggest that historian can establish relations between various events taking place over a long period and discover patterns because events unfolds, following certain laws of “historical development”. (Clifford 2001, 97)

Foucault’s second objection on traditional (modern) historical accounts is its attempts to legitimize the European colonial rule, justifying the clash of an advanced civilized West with a backward and barbaric rest of the world (both Hegel and Marx supported colonial rule and considered it a transforming agent for change).

Foucault’s third concern with traditional (modern) history is its portrayal of forces of history as beliefs and ideology. Foucault criticizes the ideologies that matured in incubator of Enlightenment, i.e. Liberalism, Capitalism, Socialism, Communism. (Geoff Damaher, Tony Schirato and John Webb 2000, 100)

But Foucault’s prime objection on “Total history” remains its conception and phenomenon of rupture and discontinuity and its effort to remove rupture from history by imposing false continuities. Hence Foucault builds his Archaeological edifice on the concept of discontinuity/rupture. To him the task of General historian, i.e. the Archaeologist is not to remove

---

\(^5\)The concept of *longue durée* (Lee 2012), i.e. the structural time was coined by Braudel and employed by Immanuel Wallerstein and other theorists working on World System approach like Andre Gunder Frank and Samir Amin.
“rupture”, and “discontinuity”, from history but to focus on new formation brought to life through phenomenon of rupture.

Archaeology

Foucault proposed Archaeology as alternative to totalizing versions of history. Foucault purposefully titles his approach as Archaeology, as he wants to “transform documents into monuments”, where meanings can be (re)discovered by (re)situating historical discourses and history aspires to the conditions of “Archaeology”, as intrinsic description of monument. The Archaeology “speaks of series, divisions, limits, and differences of level, shifts, chronological specificities, and particular forms of re handling, possible types of relation”. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 10-11) Foucault is of the view that concern of traditional history was “to define relation series being known, it was simply a question of defining the position of each element in relation to the other elements in the series”, while Archaeologist treating history as an architectural construct will not only establish a relation series; distinguish elements and relations peculiar to this series; demarcate the boundary; discover laws that govern the series” but will go beyond the objective and build an historical artifice more grand and multi layered than total history. So beyond the method described earlier, Archaeology has to further “describe the relations between different series, thus constituting series of series or ‘tables’”. Hence the Archaeologist can employ different stratifications and make time specific distinctions between them instead of imposing false unities over longer periods. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 8-9)

Thus Archaeology as history has the capacity to establish multiple layers of levels between micro and macroscopic levels of analysis and establish a vertical nonlinear system of analysis penetrating deep down the horizontal linear deterministic surface changes and transformation.(Nawaz 2012) Foucault believes that such analyses will reveal different effects and consequences of same events on different spaces and levels of analysis. The output of Archaeological appraisal is that, “recurrent redistributions reveal several pasts, several form of connections, several hierarchies of importance, several networks of determination, several teleologies, as present
undergoes change” (Foucault [1969], 2004, 6) Hence an Archaeologist will employ a mass of elements, establish their inter relation as well as their relation with the totalities. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 9)

The phenomenon of rupture and discontinuity form the basis of Archaeology, so instead of finding coherence and imposing unities, Archaeologist disentangles the web of complex relations to uncover incoherence. Philip Barker believes that “Archaeology” “attempts to untie all those knots that historians have patiently tied; it increases differences, blurs the line of communication and tries to make it more difficult to pass from one thing to another”. The effect of archaeology is to refuse to reduce difference to continuous form but rather elaborate them, analyze them and propose how they function in the production of knowledge in the differentiated space which knowledge allows to be deployed. (Barker 1998, 96)

Merquior quotes Michel Seres who defines Foucault archaeology a “heterology”, “ethnology of European knowledge”. The historical knowledge constituted in the manner is exact opposite to ideals of modernity and enlightenment; cultural specific instead of universal, time relevant instead of cumulative, and erodes as a result of factor broader than conscious human efforts. (Merquior 1985, 55)

While Foucault denounces the phenomenon of cohesion according to a principle core and continuous progress towards a determined end, Foucault Archaeological appraisal does not denounce the results obtained by previous historical appraisals. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 18)

**Discourse as Component of Archaeology**

Foucault is of the view that individual with his identity and characteristics, is the product of the holistic field, a structure of rationality and product of relations of power exercised over bodies. Since Sixteenth century, the Structure of rationality relies on “individualizing techniques”, and “totalizing procedure”. These techniques and procedures played a pivotal role in subjugating individuals and spaces and resulted in mastery of Europe. (Foucault, Security Territory Population, Lectures at the College De France 1977-78 2004) The Archaeologist Historian of Foucault has to understand the
(possible) field of relations; that determines and conditions the subject. It is different from Structuralist explanation as “Structuralist” studies ‘Condition of Possibilities’; the “Archaeologist” studies ‘conditions of Existence’. (Hubert L. Deryfus and Paul Rabinow 1983, 52-53)

A system of existence is the product of discourse, because the discourse establishes a ‘system of relations’ producing and sustaining the conditions of existence at any given time. Discourse can be made intelligible on its own terms. Discourse is the underlying core thread that unifies the practices going on in various dimensions of society. Discursive unity brings together economic, political, technological, and pedagogical factors and them come together to function in cohesive manner at any given moment in history. The archaeological analysis is for Mills is a “description of regular patterns within a discourse”. (Mills 2003, 24)

Foucault supposes that “everything that is formulated in discourse was already articulated in semi silence that precedes it, which continues to run obstinately beneath it, but which it covers and silences. The manifest discourse, therefore, is really no more than the repressive presence of what it does not say; and this 'not-said' is a hollow that undermines from within all that is said”. (Foucault, Archaeology of Knowledge [1969], 2004, 28-29)

So discourse is a ‘violence we do to things’. For Foucault “discourse is the path from one contradiction to another: if it gives rise to those that can be seen, it is because it obeys that which it hides”. (Foucault [1969], 2004, 169). Further discourses has a transformative effects, and bring to life a transformation and a formation that though articulated on already said bring to life that was not present prior to it. Discourse has both a negative and positive impacts at the same time silencing, repressing and producing something new. Discourse, power and subjectivities are intrinsically in relation because economic, political, and social institutions cannot work effectively without truth effects and notions of truth. These institutions draw their legitimacy and authority from their capacity to produce true discourses acceptable as normal for the society.
Foucault believe that will to truth remained most dominant and pervasive throughout the history of Western Civilization but true discourses does not seek truth but mask it. (Sheridan 1980, 124) Structure of rationality is knowledge based because Foucault cannot make distinction between will to knowledge from will to power and its implicit urge to mastery over subjects. Games of Truth played by state institutions heavily rely on science of state, “Statistics” (Foucault 2002) (Wallerstein 1997) Archaeology is sustained by relationship of interaction between individuals or groups and mechanism of subjugation and true discourses. Foucault believe that Archaeologist have to record events starting from the “empirical observability” of an ensemble to the point when it becomes historically acceptable and observable. The “Archaeologist” historian wants to capture reality hidden by truth masks and “route goes by analysis of knowledge-power nexus, supporting it, recouping it at the point where it is accepted, moving towards what make it acceptable, of course not in general, but only where it is accepted archaeological analysis bring a whole group of derived phenomena back to cause, not only in general but only where it is accepted.”. (Foucault 2002, 201)

World -System as Global Archaeological Structure
Concept of world operating as a coherent, interdependent whole operating as system is the core theme of debates concerned with Globalization. The concept of Globalization as “time-space compression” (Harvey 2005) and “intensification of worldwide social relations” (Mittleman) and “consciousness of the world as a whole” (Held) tacitly support the idea that this whole existed prior to theorizing about the buzz word Globalization. (Steger 2003, 10) As we intend a Foucauldian “history of present”, Foucault believe that such an account is not concerned with a debate on structure, a structure opposed to genesis, history, development but problem of structure arises6, because we have to specify

---

6 Foucault takes present as mid-point, facilitating to oscillate between past and future and calls Archaeology as history of present. He believes that an
the field where the questions of the subjectivity, consciousness, origin, truth and the subject materialize, traverse, overlap, mingle, and separate off. World as a structure and singularity is concern of World-System theory, hence it can provide Archaeologist a space and not only free him from the problem of domain that produce elements in relation with each other and with the “holistic field”, Archaeologist can use its interpretation and analysis as well, due to coherence of prioris, as both approaches are rooted in Structuralism. Analysis of World-System history reveals that it demarcates the field where subjectivities are constituted and reconstituted. The field continuously is in process of expansion and Globalization is the process of completion of World-System in form of singularity, i.e. globality. Where, entire surface of globe will be incorporated in the field, leaving no area as external to system. As modernity is the culture of core of World-System, associated with European enlightenment project, in global epoch the whole planet has embraced modernity and now ready to take off to enter in postmodern age of ‘globality’. (Nawaz 2012) In our study of globalization as present, the world system will be considered as an architectural structure, “comprising of architectonic unities of systems which cannot count as continuities but an internal coherence, axiom, deductive connections and compatibilities” (Foucault [1969], 2004, 6) a field where a cobweb, relation of power; totalizing procedures; individualizing techniques; discursive formations; concepts and strategies appear to form both subject and resistance. Foucault believes that whole determines what can be counted as possible element but “the relationship we are attempting to establish to account for a singularity as an effect are in perpetual slippage from one another”. (Foucault, What is Critique 2002, 203)

World System VS World-System
World System approaches facilitate the Archaeological history as the debates of origin and visibility of phenomenon World as a functional whole are central to system debates. System theorists are divided on continuity/discontinuity dictum.

ensemble of causes, not only sets the horizon of present but also provide an insight about future network and assemblage as well.

23

Contrary to Braudel/Wallerstein explanation, theorists of this group like Modelski and McNeil are of the view that “world system” has so far passed through three phases. The first stage of world system originated around 3000 B.C. with development of Muddle East as core. During the second phase there were parallel developments and no region can be signified as core, and a situation was that of a cultural balance and economic parity between different civilizations and regions. (Modelski 2000, 20-21) During the third stage the phenomenon of dominance reemerged, but this time center of dominance was not “Middle East”, but “Europe”. The system can be categorized as one of “Western dominance”. (Nawaz 2012)

Contrary to historical world system approach (without hyphen), the World-System approach proposed by Wallerstein and other theorists of Braudel (Annales) School like Samir Amin believe that system developed round European core is the only system that developed a three tier economic structure, global in scale with assigned function for the trio of spaces and developing the multiple variants of “core culture i.e. the modernity”, at various levels.

But both versions consider World as structure, a field where questions of power, dominance and subjectivity arise. Both believe that our present is characterized and specified by the culture of modernity and enlightenment and we live in the epoch of Europe whose relation with the “rest of the world is that of economic domination or colonization, and commercial utilization” (Foucault 2004, 298) Both groups “humanocentric” and continuity approach to World System (Modelski, Frank and Gills) as well as “Eurocentric” (Amin, Wallerstein and Taylor), consider the 15th century as point of origin of European hegemony in world (World System). (Nawaz 2012)
Continuity approach consider 15th century as a shift and rupture in human history of 4500 years when Europe hegemonised, the inter-regional system of cultural, political and economic exchange. Europe that according to Dussel, “had never been the center, and during its best times, became only periphery” (Dussel 1998) became the center of the World. On the other hand (World-System) discontinuity approach consider the 15th century as point of origin of World-System. Continuity thesis consider European exceptionality and its rise to dominance as only a recent, and perhaps a passing event (Andre Gunder Frank and Barry K Gills 2000, 2), while believers in discontinuity consider fifteenth and sixteenth century as origin. Wallerstein believe that “these centuries not only marked the discovery of faraway lands by the Portuguese, but by the discovery of a new social construct, of which these voyages, ocean routes, commercial networks were part”. (Wallerstein 1974 a) Wallerstein referred Italian author, Godinho, writing on transformation of 15th and 16th century that “map of the World was drawn and humankind learned to situate itself in space, the production of merchandise was growing. A world scale market became the dominant vector of economic development. A mercantilist, bureaucratic and centralized state was coming into existence”. (Wallerstein 2005) Samir Amin takes the Renaissance as the moment of break with the tributary ideology; a rupture that crystalized Eurocentrism with discovery of New World in 1492. “If the period of the Renaissance marks a qualitative break in the history of humanity, it is precisely because, from this time on, Europe becomes conscious of the idea that conquest of the world by its civilization is henceforth a possible objective…..from this moment on Eurocentrism crystallizes”. (Amin 1989, 72-73) Henceforth the system became global and like a concert between European powers shaping and moving the historical forces as “active agents” while “other” people and places were the passive acceptors of the Western dominance. With no outside contender for hegemony, history became a purely European affair. Peter Taylor describes phenomena of European hegemony like this “during the sixteen century, Portugal and Spain operated in a global system arranged by Pope Alexander VI and non European World was divided
between them along the 47th parallel. In Seventeenth century Netherland were challenging Spain on both sides of the globe, in the East and West Indies. In Eighteenth century Britain and France were fighting on the battlefield as far apart as Canada and India, and in the nineteenth century several European powers were involved in the famous “Scramble of Africa”. (Taylor 1989, 3)

Archaeological Approach to World System
Wallerstein is the key figure of Annales School working on the “mentalities” of an era with the object to arrange history in long periods and construct a face of that period by adopting a combination approach using tools of geography, ecology, economics, demography with cultural factors to paint a total picture of Past. Annales schools of French historians, perceives history as being driven by forces far more powerful than those of any individual. Main inspiration of this school of Historian is Fernand Braudel. Annales can be counted as resistance to discourses of modernity as it contends that humanist tradition of Enlightenment that assigns conscious human mind, and free will is false premise. Both Foucault and Annales historian share the anti-humanist presupposition and belief. Foucault coined the phrase “Death of Man” (Foucault 1966, 1989), and heralded the end of humanist concept of man as a creature ruled by reason and history as a phenomenon governed by powerful man (Merquior 1985, 51-53).

Foucault and Annales theorists both consider a combination of history and structure important for historical analysis. Many parallels can be drawn between Foucauldian Archaeological historiography and Wallerstein World-System approach as both thinkers have almost a consensus on reasons of European dominance.

Foucault as well as the anti humanists of Annals aims at a history without the individual subject. Rather they emphasize that the stage on which we enact our history is much like script and is established independent of our thoughts and action. However Foucault does not exclude subject centered accounts that treat history as a plot unified by the concerns of human beings and leading to humanly meaningful conclusions, derived out by the experiences and projects of the consciousness that live it. Archaeology introduces factors beyond human consciousness and control that may negate continuity that we read into our lives. (Nawaz 2012)
Both identifies the European reason as coercive; European historiography as colonizing (Foucault is critical of Marx due to his belief in Enlightenment ideal of utility), imposition of theory of progress on non-European world. Foucault criticizes Aufklauung (Enlightenment) for three reasons, i.e. Positivist Science; Development of State or State system with its instrumental reason and processes that rationalize society, economy and polity; Stitching together of scientific positivism and development of State and a science of state, statism (statistics)and exercise of power through refined techniques (Foucault 2002, 196) At the same time Wallerstein (Wallerstein 1997) describes the reason of rise of Europe in knowledge (positivism) based on the conception of dichotomy between science and philosophy. He believes that claims of value neutrality and assumption about universals were indeed parochial in character as the only acceptable universals were Eurocentric. So Wallerstein while writing the history of European dominance criticizes and condemns its historiography; parochialism of its universalism; assumptions about Western Civilization; and Its attempts to impose theory of progress. (Wallerstein 1997) Foucault considers historiography originating from Hegel, responsible for colonization. To him modern forms of history writing have origins in early 19th Century and It was not coincidental that the period also witnessed a dramatic rise in Western Colonization activities. It is the Prime objection that Foucault raises on traditional narratives of history. To him the dialectical view of history played an instrumental role in the colonizing process itself. As it was an integral component of colonization, therefore history till today is unable to provide a critical perspective on colonization. Further, for Foucault, the traditional mode of historical narrations “regards history in terms of a single and steady progress unfolding over time”, legitimized the process leading to European “hegemony”, because this progressive conception of history (sometimes referred as the teleological view), with its determinism “tends to see the world gradually evolving into some ideal state, or a utopian society. From this perspective, rather than being considered as an act of violent aggression by the colonizing force, colonialism is regarded as a necessary phase in the
evolutionary development of history into higher forms of society”. (Geoff Damaher, Tony Schirato and John Webb 2000, 99-100)

As Foucault provides “Archaeology” as method of historiography to a “structured” ordered space that constitutes a “singular whole”. The objective of Wallerstein research is also similar that is to implant a structure on world space on basis of functionally specificity of different spatial zones i.e. the core, periphery, and semi-periphery making world appear as a “singularity”. After Foucauldian structure treatment, the structure of World-System will appear as a whole but based on “architectonic compatibility” and deductive connection between its three tiers.

Foucauldian history of World-System will also help us to make composite relationship, a ‘series of series’ among the trio of spaces (core, semi-periphery and periphery) because this trio has variant political, economic and social traits as well as different versions and multiple shades of modernity that have become the culture of semi-periphery and periphery as well in process of making world as “singularity”.

One expression of “European Modernity” is its mode of political organization i.e. State and State system, which originated in Europe but that is now global in nature. The system reached its present stage by incorporating places, the places other to Europe. As these territories have to become the integral part of this Europe dominated system, norms, values, structures of European modernity were planted in colonial space. Colonial hegemons\(^8\) devised different strategies of rule to govern different colonial spaces. Unlike Europe the modern ethos was not a result of political trial and error and responsive transformations but the areas received modern ethos from colonial masters. Moreover different spaces entered in European system at different times, for different reasons\(^9\) to

---

\(^8\)Two pillars of Hegemony are coercion and consent. European rule was not a simple imposition through coercion but it also secured the consent of its non-European subjects by creating an element of trust for master’s superiority but also about the inferiority of indigenous civilizations.

\(^9\)Reasons of incorporation were varied. Some areas were incorporated in system as sources of raw material, a market for excessive goods, as sources
meet different hegemonic needs, the resultant effect is a heterogeneous periphery at various levels of development of modernity.

Giddens believe that World System theory is flawed and suffers from economic reductionism looking only on economic processes and neglecting the cultural and political aspects of social change. (Giddens 1985, 167-8) Wallerstein also treats World System as ‘single society’ and three tiers core, semi-periphery and periphery as three stratifications of same society having a chance for upward mobility. Peter Taylor describes it as error of developmentalism and result of faith in Rostow theory of growth (Taylor 1989, 8-9)providing a utopia to semi-periphery and periphery that they are capable to be included in core by quoting the precedents set by ex colonies i.e. USA and Canada.

Although Wallerstein paint world map in three homogenous colors demarcating core, semi-peripheral and peripheral regions a Foucauldian Architect will paint world space with diffuse colors. Hardt and Negri believe that while spatial progression of Europe was linear covering entire global surface but in epoch of globalization we can find centers and peripheries within Europe, as well as within each subordinate country. (Hardt and Negri 2009, 70)

We can find surrogates of Eurocenter in peripheral capitals, as well as anti-systematic retrogressive ethnic movements in capitals of core zone. Foucauldian narration of World system of active and reserve labor force, and as buffers to protect the markets and Raw material reservoirs from competitors, contenders and rivals.
architecture and history would help us reveal several points of origins, and multiple networks of domination, multiple hierarchies of power and importance multiple teleologies hence multiple ends, while escalating between micro and mega levels, therefore a plurality of historical narrations within a given time zone. As we have already established, during course of our discussion that like Foucault Wallerstein consider Positivist science responsible for production of Eurocentric universals. Twin doctrines of state and capitalism served as structure of rationality for modern world has their origin in Renaissance European state where they first devised their mechanisms of subjugation. Economic changes that resulted in the accumulation of capital and political changes resulting in accumulation of power were not incongruent. (Hubert L. Deryfus and Paul Rabinow 1983, 135)

With spatial expansion of Europe these techniques and procedures also covered the entire surface of globe. Globalization is the process that makes World System appear as a singular structure that leave on insignificant areas as external to world economy and even lesser people untouched by cultural and technological forces of globalization, but globalization theorists face the challenge to address contradictory themes like

- **Globalization/Localization** Relation of Global with local and establishment of relations of domination
- **Time/Space** People living in different spaces are living in different times (traditional, modern and postmodern world is present within the global space)
- **Homogeneity/Heterogeneity** A Socio-political homogeneity imposed by forces of Eurocentric modernity resulting in heterogeneous hybrid formations

Hence despite heroic efforts of modern (traditional) historian to impose the false coherence and unities the problem of rupture and discontinuity is still there. An Arachaeological appraisal, taking rupture, difference and discontinuity as priori can provide a multi angled narrative of complex processes, phenomenon and effects dispersed across the globality.
Conclusion

“Historiography is work of subjective creativity”. (Shafique 2016) Hence the paper combined the two mutually coherent paradigms of resistance, i.e. the Annales and Postmodernism, looking the same image in one another’s mirrors. Foucault perceives history as “plurality of forces”, resulting in multiple numbers of outcomes. The forces are as much in conflict with each other as they can be held together. (Smart 1985, 2002, 14) At the same time, Wallerstein combined the plurality of spaces in a structured network of functional division of labors. An Archaeological Appraisal of World operating as system, singularity and structural whole taking Europe as center will not only help in defining different stages employing as “series” of World System in form of linear unfolding but also provide a vertical multilayered analyses by measuring the impacts of events on trio of spaces, and building a “series of series”, a table of perpendicular realities of the multilayered artifact “globality”.

Each successive stage is in itself a field where the questions of the human being, consciousness, origin, and the subject emerge, intersect, mingle, and separate off. Identifying power/knowledge compound producing structure of rationality, mechanism of subjugation, true discourses producing regimes of truth as well as relation of power as discursive and non-discursive elements in each successive stage will help us by
uncover laws governing that particular age, discovering continuities at the same time not ignoring the phenomenon of rupture and discontinuity as working concept. Each stage of series can be further divided on vertical lines, measuring the impacts and consequences on core as well as periphery. At the same stage Archaeological analysis can focus on two stratifications, i.e. West and Rest (the spaces other than Europe).
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