

GLOBALIZATION AND THE FUTURE OF POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES

Dilip Barad,

Prof & Head, Department of English,
Maharaja Krishnakumarsinhji
Bhavnagar University, Gujarat, India.

Abstract

This research article explores the complex relationship between globalization and postcolonial studies, with a particular focus on the 9/11 phenomenon, the emergence of the New American Empire, and the Global War on Terror. It investigates how the concept of "Global War" intertwines with globalization, giving rise to discussions on violence within this context. The article also delves into the perspectives of scholars like Thomas Friedman, Hardt and Negri, Joseph E. Stiglitz, and P. Sainath to shed light on the multifaceted nature of globalization. Additionally, it examines Klaus Schwab's concept of Globalization 4.0 and its connection to the Fourth Industrial Revolution, as well as the challenges associated with this new era of globalization. To provide a balanced view, the article includes counterarguments presented by Noam Chomsky in his work, "Globalization and Its Discontents."

Keywords: Globalization, Postcolonial Studies, New American Empire, Global War on Terror, Orientalism, Fourth Industrial Revolution, Future of Postcolonial Studies.

GLOBALIZATION AND THE FUTURE OF POSTCOLONIAL STUDIES

- Dilip Barad,

1. Introduction:

The 21st century has witnessed the profound impact of globalization on the world stage. However, this process is far from being a one-dimensional phenomenon. It intertwines with various aspects of international relations, economics, and culture, presenting both opportunities and challenges. This article explores the intricate relationship between globalization and postcolonial studies, unraveling the complexities through a series of interconnected themes and perspectives.

2. The 9/11 Phenomenon:

The events of September 11, 2001, marked a significant turning point in contemporary history. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center not only had immediate and devastating consequences but also set in motion a series of events that reshaped global politics. This tragedy served as a catalyst for the emergence of the New American Empire and the subsequent Global War on Terror. Ania Loomba has rightly observed:

“Since the events of 11 September 2001, the so-called global war on terror, and the US invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, it is harder than ever to see our world as simply ‘postcolonial. As the New American Empire develops, openly and shrilly advocated by policy-makers, politicians, and academics within the US and elsewhere, it is more urgent than ever to think about the questions of dominations and resistance that have been raised by anti-colonial movements and postcolonial studies worldwide.”
(Loomba)

The events of September 11, 2001, and the subsequent Global War on Terror, coupled with the rise of the New American Empire, have significantly reshaped our global landscape. In this era of heightened geopolitical tensions and rapidly evolving power dynamics, the traditional boundaries of postcolonial studies have become increasingly porous. The violence and dominance inherent in these developments cannot be separated from the broader canvas of globalization. As such, it becomes essential to explore the interplay between these phenomena and to reconsider the analytical frameworks that have long underpinned postcolonial studies. This interconnection between the New American Empire, the Global War on Terror, and

globalization presents an urgent need for scholars and thinkers to grapple with the enduring questions of domination and resistance, echoing the concerns that have driven anti-colonial movements and postcolonial studies across the globe.

“At the same time, these violent events are also part of the phenomenon we think of as globalization, which has provided fresh grounds for examining the relevance of postcolonial perspectives to the world which we now inhabit. Globalization, they argue, cannot be analyzed using concepts like margins and centers so central to postcolonial studies. Today’s economies, politics, cultures, and identities are all better described in terms of transnational networks, regional and international flows, and the dissolution of geographic and cultural borders, paradigms which are familiar to postcolonial critics but which are now invoked to suggest a radical break with the narratives of colonization and anti-colonialism.” (Loomba)

In a world where the forces of the New American Empire, the Global War on Terror, and globalization converge and intertwine, the traditional paradigms of postcolonial studies are undergoing a profound transformation. The complexities of this contemporary landscape demand a nuanced and dynamic approach that goes beyond the notions of margins and centers. Postcolonial scholars must now grapple with the realities of transnational networks, the fluidity of regional and international flows, and the erosion of geographic and cultural borders. While this may seem like a departure from the narratives of colonization and anti-colonialism, it is, in fact, an evolution and expansion of the field. It is within this context that the future of postcolonial studies must be forged—an era where the legacies of colonialism, the intricacies of global politics, and the transformative power of globalization intersect. As scholars and activists continue to navigate this complex terrain, they are tasked with the vital mission of critically examining the multifaceted intersections of power, resistance, and identity in a world marked by both promise and peril.

3. The New American Empire and the Global War on Terror:

In the wake of 9/11, the United States assumed a dominant global role, often referred to as the New American Empire. This shift in power dynamics led to the Global War on Terror, a military campaign with far-reaching implications for global politics and security. It is within this context that the concept of "Global War" intertwines with globalization, raising questions about the role of violence in the process of globalization. Significantly, the book, according to Ania Loomba, that has most famously made this case has done so by describing our contemporary global formation in imperial terms. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s *Empire* argues that the contemporary global order has produced a new form of sovereignty which should be called ‘Empire’ but which is best understood in *contrast* to European empires:

“In contrast to imperialism, Empire establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers. It is a decentered and deterritorializing

apparatus of rule that progressively incorporate the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers. Empire manages hybrid identities flexible hierarchies, and plural exchanges, through modulating networks of command." (Hardt and Negri)

Hardt and Negri suggest that the new Empire is better compared to the Roman Empire rather than to European colonialism, since imperial Rome also loosely incorporated its subject states rather than controlling them directly.

4. Globalization and the concept of Center and Margin:

The analogy with imperial Rome, Vilashini Cooppan argues, makes it difficult to accurately analyze contemporary US imperialism and its place in the contemporary world (Cooppan). Globalization, traditionally associated with economic integration and cultural exchange, also reveals a darker side when examined through the lens of dominance and submission. The violent events of 9/11 and the subsequent Global War on Terror are integral to the broader phenomenon of globalization. This challenges traditional postcolonial studies that primarily focus on concepts like margins and centers, urging scholars to adopt a more nuanced perspective. In this context it is important to notice what Susie O'Brien and Imre Szeman observed. They believe that 'characterizing US political and cultural power as a global dominant detracts from a more thorough examination of sites and modalities of power in the global era'; accordingly, they celebrate *Empire* as 'exceptionally helpful in advancing our capacity to think past the inscription of globalization as a centre / periphery dynamic that produces resistant margins and hegemonic cores'. In their view, it is this model of margin and cores which has prevented postcolonial studies from being able to analyze the operations of contemporary power (O'Brien and Szeman)

5. The "Flat World" of Thomas Friedman:

Thomas Friedman's concept of the "Flat World" represents a paradigm shift in our understanding of globalization. It highlights the transformative power of technology and connectivity, blurring traditional boundaries and redefining the dynamics of global relationships (Friedman).

Advocating for globalization, Friedman introduced the Dell Theory of Conflict Prevention, also referred to as the Dell Theory. This theory, rooted in capitalist peace principles, represents an updated iteration of Friedman's earlier "Golden Arches Theory of Conflict Prevention." Friedman succinctly articulates this theory as follows:

"The Dell Theory stipulates that no two countries integrated into a major global supply chain, akin to Dell's operations, will engage in armed conflict with each other while remaining part of the same supply chain" (Friedman, 2005).

In essence, the theory posits that when large corporations, like Dell, establish supply chain operations across multiple nations, it fosters economic interdependence among these countries. As a result, these interconnected nations, particularly developing ones where supply chain activities often thrive, are less inclined to jeopardize the prosperity they have gained by resorting to armed conflicts.

However, several critics have raised concerns regarding the book's distinctly American perspective, noting that Friedman's extensive professional background with The New York Times may have influenced its narrative tone. Some critics argue for a more "inclusive voice" in the book's content, underscoring the need for a broader global perspective. (Begley)

Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz, in particular, has offered critical insights into Friedman's work. While acknowledging the profound changes occurring in the global economy and increased interconnectivity, Stiglitz emphasizes that the world is far from "flat." In his book "Making Globalization Work," Stiglitz contends that globalization has, in some respects, been making the world less flat rather than flatter.

"Friedman is right that there have been dramatic changes in the global economy, in the global landscape; in some directions, the world is much flatter than it has ever been, with those in various parts of the world being more connected than they have ever been, but the world is not flat ... Not only is the world not flat: in many ways, it has been getting less flat". (Stiglitz, Making Globalization Work)

Richard Florida echoes similar sentiments in his 2005 Atlantic article titled "The World Is Spiky," emphasizing the dynamic, uneven nature of globalization. (Florida)

Another critical perspective comes from John Gray, who, in his review titled "The World Is Round," concurs with Friedman regarding increased global interconnectedness and wealth in certain regions. However, Gray vehemently challenges the idea that globalization necessarily leads to a more peaceful or freer world, asserting that it most certainly does not make the world flat in any sense. (Gray)

6. Market Fundamentalism and the Critics Globalization:

Joseph E. Stiglitz's, Nobel laureate and once Chief Economist at the World Bank, critique of globalization, particularly his use of the term "Market Fundamentalism," sheds light on the role of global institutions like the World Bank and the IMF in shaping the global economic landscape. (Stiglitz, Globalism's Discontents)

"The international financial institutions have pushed a particular ideology – market fundamentalism – that is both bad economics and bad politics; it is based on premise concerning how markets work that do not hold even for developed countries, much less for developing countries. The IMF has pushed these economic policies without a broader vision of society or the role of economics within society. And it has pushed

these policies in ways that have undermined emerging democracies. More generally, globalization itself has been disadvantageous to developing countries, especially the poor within those countries." (Stiglitz, *Globalism's Discontents*)

P. Sainath further explores the destructive impact of Market Fundamentalism, emphasizing its global reach and its contribution to various forms of fundamentalism. In seminar paper 'And Then There Was the Market,' he makes this observation:

"Market Fundamentalism destroys more human lives than any other simply because it cuts across all national, cultural, geographic, religious, and other boundaries. It's as much at home in Moscow as in Mumbai or Minnesota. A South Africa —whose advances in the early 1990s thrilled the world —moved swiftly from apartheid to neoliberalism. It sits as easily in Hindu, Islamic or Christian societies. And it contributes angry, despairing recruits to the armies of all religious fundamentalisms. Based on the premise that the market is the solution to all the problems of the human race, it is, too, a very religious fundamentalism. It has its own Gospel: The Gospel of St. Growth, of St. Choice." (Sainath)

Thus, the critiques offered by scholars like Joseph E. Stiglitz and P. Sainath shed a piercing light on the multifaceted implications of globalization and the pervasive influence of Market Fundamentalism on the global economic landscape. Stiglitz, drawing on his extensive experience as Chief Economist at the World Bank, underscores the inherent flaws in market fundamentalism and its adverse consequences, both economically and politically. His assertion that international financial institutions have promoted policies devoid of a comprehensive societal vision highlights the need for a more holistic approach to economic development.

Furthermore, P. Sainath's exploration of Market Fundamentalism goes beyond borders and boundaries, revealing its destructive impact on diverse societies across the globe. His observation that this ideology transcends national, cultural, and religious distinctions, contributing to the rise of various forms of fundamentalism, underscores the urgency of critically examining the relentless pursuit of market-driven growth as a quasi-religious doctrine.

In essence, these critiques call for a reevaluation of the prevailing economic paradigms and emphasize the imperative of considering the broader societal implications of globalization. They serve as a reminder that while globalization has brought undeniable benefits, it has also raised significant ethical and political questions that demand careful consideration and responsible governance to ensure that its advantages are equitably distributed, and its pitfalls are mitigated.

7. Globalization 4.0 and the Fourth Industrial Revolution:

Klaus Schwab's concept of Globalization 4.0 draws parallels between industrial revolutions and globalization waves, highlighting the exponential evolution of technology in the Fourth Industrial Revolution. This era challenges existing mindsets and requires a new approach to the global economy. (Schwab)

Table 1: Klaus Shwab: The Fourth Industrial Revoltion

4 th Industrial Revolution	Globalization 4.0
1 st IR – used water and steam power Mechanical Production	Globalization 1.0 – About countries and muscle power – 1492-1800 Countries Globalizing
2 nd IR – used electric power Mass Production	Globalization 2.0 – Great Depression + WWI-II – 1800 – 2000 Companies Globalizing
3 rd IR – synergized electric and IT (electronic) Automated Mass Production	Globalization 3.0 – MNCs – 2000 onwards New found power for individuals for collaboration and to compete globally The Flat World (Thomas Friedman)
4 th IR – digital – fusion of technology with everything; blurring lines between physical, digital and biological spheres No parallel with previous revolutions in 'Speed'; evolves exponentially rather than linear pace; 'disrupts' all industries; herald transformation of entire system of production, management & governance; 3D printing, A.I., iot, robotics, auto-vehicles etc	Globalization 4.0 – the advancement of 4 th IR shall be incorporated – for which our mindsets are not yet ready – a new approach to the new economy - this is not a matter of 'free trade' or 'protectionism', 'technology' or 'jobs', 'immigration' or 'protecting citizens', and 'growth' or 'equality'. Those are all false dichotomies, which we can avoid by developing policies that favor "and" over "or," allowing all sets of interests to be pursued in parallel.

Globalization 4.0, as articulated by Klaus Schwab in his book "The Fourth Industrial Revolution," represents a transformative phase in the evolution of globalization. This concept delves into the profound changes brought about by the fusion of digital technologies with various aspects of human life, spanning the physical, digital, and biological spheres. Unlike the previous industrial revolutions, Globalization 4.0 is characterized by exponential growth in technological advancement, challenging traditional linear progressions. It serves as a catalyst for disrupting industries, redefining the production system, altering management practices, and even transforming governance structures.

One of the most distinctive features of Globalization 4.0 is the blurring of boundaries between the physical, digital, and biological realms. This convergence has far-reaching implications for various sectors, including 3D printing, artificial intelligence (A.I.), the Internet of Things (IoT), robotics, and autonomous vehicles. These innovations not only redefine industries but also reshape the way individuals and societies interact with technology.

In contrast to previous industrial revolutions, where transformations were relatively gradual, Globalization 4.0 evolves at an unprecedented speed. The exponential growth of technology means that changes occur at an accelerating pace, challenging our ability to adapt and our established mindsets. This rapid evolution requires us to adopt a new approach to the global economy, one that acknowledges the complexities of this digital era.

Schwab's comparison of the industrial revolutions with different phases of globalization provides valuable insight into the evolution of the global landscape:

1) - Globalization 1.0 (First Industrial Revolution): This era, spanning from 1492 to 1800, primarily hinged on the use of water and steam power for mechanical production. It marked the initial phase of countries beginning to globalize, as nations sought to expand their influence and economies.

2) - Globalization 2.0 (Second Industrial Revolution): Taking place from 1800 to 2000, this phase was characterized by the utilization of electric power for mass production. Companies played a central role in this period, with globalization influenced by the great economic challenges of the Great Depression and the world wars.

3) - Globalization 3.0 (Third Industrial Revolution): Emerging from the year 2000 onward, this phase saw the synergy of electric power with information technology (IT), leading to automated mass production. Multinational corporations (MNCs) became key players, and this period introduced a newfound power for individuals to collaborate and compete globally, as famously noted by Thomas Friedman in his concept of "The Flat World."

4) - Globalization 4.0 (Fourth Industrial Revolution): The current phase, Globalization 4.0, is characterized by the digital revolution, where technology becomes intricately woven into all aspects of life. The unprecedented speed of evolution, disruptive innovations, and the transformation of production, management, and governance systems define this era. It challenges traditional dichotomies and calls for a more inclusive approach to economic policies that embrace "and" over "or," enabling diverse sets of interests to be pursued concurrently.

In essence, Globalization 4.0 represents a paradigm shift in the way we perceive and engage with the world, driven by the rapid advancement of digital technologies and their profound impact on societies, economies, and governance structures. As we navigate this new era, it is imperative to adapt our mindsets and policies to harness its potential while addressing its challenges.

8. Challenges of Globalization 4.0:

The Fourth Industrial Revolution coincides with ecological constraints, a multipolar international order, and rising inequality. These integrated developments usher in a new era of globalization, presenting challenges that demand adaptation in corporate, local, national,

and international governance. Klaus Schwab's assessment of the challenges to globalization in the context of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) offers a sobering reflection on the complexities of our evolving global landscape. (Schwab) Several key challenges come to the forefront:

i. Convergence of 4IR and Ecological Constraints: The Fourth Industrial Revolution, with its rapid technological advancements, is occurring concurrently with pressing ecological constraints. This juxtaposition presents a critical challenge as the potential environmental impacts of these innovations require careful consideration. Balancing technological progress with sustainability is essential for the long-term well-being of the planet.

ii. Multipolar International Order: The world is transitioning into an increasingly multipolar international order, with various nations and regions asserting their influence. This shift in global power dynamics introduces complexities in governance, diplomacy, and economic relations. Effective global governance mechanisms must adapt to accommodate this changing landscape.

iii. Rising Inequality: Despite the potential for innovation and economic growth brought by the Fourth Industrial Revolution, there is a growing concern about rising inequality. The benefits of technological advancements are not distributed equally, potentially exacerbating disparities between affluent and marginalized populations. Addressing this inequality is a moral imperative and crucial for social stability.

iv. Adaptation of Governance: Schwab's assessment underscores the vital role of governance at multiple levels, from corporate and local to national and international. Effective governance mechanisms must adapt promptly to the challenges posed by 4IR and globalization. This requires proactive policies that promote inclusivity, sustainability, and equitable distribution of benefits.

Schwab's analysis acknowledges that pessimists may argue that political conditions are hindering productive global dialogue about Globalization 4.0 and the evolving global economy. However, it also recognizes the role of realists and optimists in shaping the future:

- Realists: In the face of challenges, realists seize the current moment to identify gaps in the existing systems and explore the prerequisites for a more effective and responsive approach. They seek pragmatic solutions that address the complexities of the global landscape.

- Optimists: Optimists hold the hope that future-oriented stakeholders—individuals, organizations, governments, and international institutions—can come together to create a community of shared interests and, ultimately, shared purpose. They believe in the potential for collective action to navigate the challenges and opportunities presented by Globalization 4.0.

In conclusion, Klaus Schwab's assessment underscores the urgency of addressing the challenges posed by the Fourth Industrial Revolution and the evolving global landscape. It emphasizes the critical role of adaptable governance, environmental stewardship, and efforts to mitigate inequality in shaping a more equitable and sustainable future in the era of Globalization 4.0. Whether this new era improves the human condition will depend on the collective actions and shared purpose of stakeholders across the globe.

9. Counterarguments by Noam Chomsky:

Noam Chomsky's critique of globalization in "Globalization and Its Discontents" offers a counterpoint to the optimistic view of globalization. (Chomsky) He emphasizes the role of corporations in perpetuating inequality and questions the benefits of trade deals between nations.

Noam Chomsky's incisive commentary in 'Globalization and its Discontents' offers a critical perspective on the dynamics of corporate power, international trade, and their impact on societies. (Globalization and its Discontents: Noam Chomsky debates with Washington Post readers) Chomsky's observations can be summarized as follows:

i. Corporations as Private Tyrannies: Chomsky characterizes corporations as a form of "private tyranny." He underscores that the primary responsibility of corporate directors is to maximize profits and expand market share, rather than to engage in philanthropic or socially responsible activities. This assertion challenges the prevailing notion that corporations inherently prioritize the greater good or societal well-being.

ii. Wealth Redistribution in Trade Deals: Chomsky's assessment of trade deals, particularly with a major economic player like China, challenges the conventional understanding of how wealth is distributed. Rather than seeing these agreements as mechanisms to transfer wealth from one country to another, he posits that they often contribute to redistributing wealth within both nations. In this process, privileged sectors tend to benefit, while the general population may experience marginal gains, if any. This nuanced perspective highlights the complex and often unequal outcomes of international trade.

iii. Misleading Notions of National Gain or Loss: Chomsky cautions against framing discussions of international trade in terms of what a particular nation, such as the United States or China, "gains" or "loses." Instead, he contends that the gains and losses are distributed within societies themselves. This perspective challenges the simplistic narrative that a nation as a whole benefits or suffers from trade agreements. Chomsky's critique underscores the importance of considering the distributional effects of globalization within countries.

iv. Extreme Protectionism for Corporate Interests: Chomsky's reference to "extreme forms of protectionism" within the context of "normal trade relations" highlights how trade policies

can be shaped to favor the interests of powerful corporations. This protectionism, he argues, is often designed to benefit U.S. corporations, emphasizing the need for a critical examination of trade agreements and their implications for both national and global economic landscapes.

In essence, Noam Chomsky's perspective on globalization and trade agreements challenges mainstream narratives and calls for a more nuanced understanding of the role of corporations, wealth distribution, and the impact of trade policies on societies. His critique serves as a reminder of the complexities involved in the global economic system and the importance of considering the broader societal implications of economic decisions.

10. Globalization, Postcolonial Studies, and its Implications on Higher Educational Institution:

The notion of the new imperialism extends its influence into the realm of educational institutions, where it raises critical questions about the preparation of the best and brightest students for imperial missions. Niall Ferguson, in drawing parallels with the British imperial experience, suggests that the United States should consider sending its most talented students, often hailing from its leading universities, to fulfill this mission. (Ferguson) However, this proposal prompts us to ask how these top-tier students will be adequately prepared for such responsibilities.

The report titled 'Defending Civilization: How Our Universities are Failing America and What Can be Done About it,' published by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) (Martin and Neal), posits that American universities are ill-equipped to address this challenge. The report argues that a significant portion of American academics and students harbor critical views of U.S. policies, diverging from the perspectives prevalent in the rest of the country. This divergence is particularly pronounced on U.S. campuses, where it has become increasingly common to assert that Western civilization bears a primary responsibility for the world's problems, despite its historical contributions to ideals such as democracy, human rights, individual liberty, and mutual tolerance.

In the wake of the 9/11 attacks, the report laments that, instead of prioritizing the cultivation of an understanding of the unique contributions of America and Western civilization, which were under attack, universities have rushed to introduce courses focusing on Islamic and Asian cultures. This shift in academic focus reflects broader debates surrounding the need for a more inclusive and diverse curriculum. However, it also highlights a tension between celebrating cultural diversity and preserving a sense of national identity and values.

The ACTA report underscores the complex interplay between education, national identity, and global responsibilities in an era of evolving imperialism. It poses a fundamental question: How can educational institutions strike a balance between fostering critical thinking and appreciation for diverse perspectives while also instilling a sense of pride and responsibility in their students, particularly when it comes to global affairs? This challenge resonates with

broader discussions about the role of education in shaping future leaders and their understanding of their nation's role in an increasingly interconnected world.

However, the report was not seen by one and all as a welcome suggestion. Many like Emily Eakin had questioned the use of patriotism to stop people from making critical inquiries. (Eakin) She observed in this article –

“But the council is facing mounting criticism from scholars who say that singling out individuals -- for remarks taken out of context -- is misleading and offensive. . . Other scholars went further, comparing the report's list of names to McCarthy-era blacklisting. "It has a little of the whiff of McCarthyism," said Hugh Gusterson, a professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who is on the list for a comment he made at a campus peace rally. "Imagine the real suffering and grief of people in other countries," the report quotes him as saying. "The best way to begin a war on terrorism might be to look in the mirror... Scholars protest that the council is taking advantage of a national crisis to further its academic agenda. "Their aim is to enforce a particular party line on American colleges and universities," said Eric Foner, a professor of American history at Columbia University whose name appears in the report. "Now they're seizing upon this particular moment and the feeling that they're in the driver's seat to suppress the expression of alternative points of view." (Eakin)

It seems that the critique of globalizations is not accepted and hence, using the crisis of 9/11 and global war on terror, the postcolonial studies is also attacked. Ania Loomba observes that disciplines of history and literature are also not exempt from this politics of patriotism and hyper-nationalism.

“Those who do teach Western history and literature are not exempt from critique, in an earlier report, ACTA had complained not only that Shakespeare was being dropped from required courses but that Shakespeare and Renaissance classes were being polluted by a focus on social issues such as poverty and sexuality”. (Loomba)

It is not surprising that postcolonial studies should be attacked in such a situation. Stanley Kurtz, a fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution, has urged the US House of Representatives to ensure that federal funding to 'area studies' are not used to spread 'anti-American sentiments under the influence of postcolonial scholarship and especially Edward Said's 'Orientalism': 'Said equated professors who support American foreign policy with the 19th century European intellectuals who propped up racist colonial empires. (Loomba) Finally, these observations from Ania Loomba are worth taking note of:

“One of Edward Said's most valuable achievements in 'Orientalism' was not simply to establish the connections between scholarship and state power in the colonial period, but to indicate its afterlife in a post-colonial global formation with the US at its epicenter.”

There is growing intolerance among the right-wing political environment against the critical insights of postcolonial studies as one of its core premises is that it is not fair for a scholar to put his knowledge of foreign languages and cultures at the service of the political power. In the globalized world order, the nexus between ruling political parties and the multinational companies is under the scanner of postcolonial studies and thus it is becoming increasingly necessary to silence the scholars in the higher education. It is in this context that Loomba observes:

“If universities are to remain sites of dissent and free intellectual inquiry, if scholarship is not to be at the service of American or any other power, critiques of past and ongoing empires are going to be more necessary than ever.” (Loomba)

11. Conclusion:

In the ever-evolving landscape of globalization, the role and relevance of postcolonial studies have come under scrutiny and, at times, attack. The emergence of a new global order, epitomized by the 9/11 phenomenon, the rise of the New American Empire, and the Global War on Terror, has injected elements of violence and power dynamics into the discourse of globalization. This shift in the global paradigm prompts critical reflections on how scholars and institutions engage with these transformations.

Stanley Kurtz's call for vigilance in ensuring that federal funding for "area studies" does not propagate perceived anti-American sentiments, often associated with postcolonial scholarship, highlights the tension between academic freedom and national interests. Edward Said's seminal work, 'Orientalism,' is emblematic of the challenges posed by postcolonial scholarship, as it questions the intersection of knowledge production, state power, and foreign policy.

Ania Loomba's observations resonate in this context, emphasizing that Said's enduring legacy lies in exposing the connections between scholarship and state power during the colonial era and their persistence in the postcolonial world, with the United States at its core. The scrutiny and sometimes intolerance faced by postcolonial scholars, rooted in the premise that knowledge of foreign languages and cultures should not serve political power, reflects the growing tension between critical inquiry and the globalized nexus between political entities and multinational corporations.

As globalization continues to shape the contours of the world order, it becomes increasingly essential to engage with critiques and dissenting voices from scholars like Loomba. In an era characterized by Globalization 4.0 and the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the challenges, and opportunities of this transformative phase demand thoughtful consideration. Critics like Noam Chomsky offer insights into the nature of corporate power, international trade, and their societal implications, challenging conventional narratives.

In this dynamic and complex landscape, the future of postcolonial studies remains intertwined with the evolving discourse of globalization. To navigate this evolving terrain, it is imperative to engage with the multifaceted challenges posed by the globalized world order and to uphold the principles of dissent and free intellectual inquiry. As Ania Loomba aptly notes, universities must continue to serve as sites of critical engagement, ensuring that scholarship remains independent of any political power and that critiques of past and present empires persist as a necessary part of our intellectual discourse.

Works Cited

- Begley, Peter. "Book Review: The World is Flat." Credo Advisors, 2006. 1 Feb 2022. <http://web.archive.org/web/20061106211147/www.credoadvisors.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/The_World_is_Flat_begley.pdf>.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Globalization and its Discontents: Noam Chomsky debates with Washington Post readers*. Washington Post. 16 May 2000. 2022 Feb 1. <<https://chomsky.info/20000516/>>.
- Cooppan, Vilashini. "The Ruins of Empire: The National and Global Politics of America's Return to Rome." Loomba, Ania, et al. *Postcolonial Studies an Beyond*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005. 80-100.
- Eakin, Emily. "On the Lookout For Patriotic Incorrectness." *The New York Times* Nov 2001. 1 Feb 2022. <<https://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/24/arts/on-the-lookout-for-patriotic-incorrectness.html>>.
- Ferguson, Niall. "The Empire Slinks Back." *The New York Times Magazine* 27 April 2003. 2022 Feb 1. <<https://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/27/magazine/the-empire-slinks-back.html>>.
- Florida, Richard. "The World is Spiky." *The Atlantic Monthly* Oct 2005: 48-51. <<https://www.creativeclass.com/rfcgdb/articles/other-2005-The%20World%20is%20Spiky.pdf>>.
- Friedman, Thomas. *The World is Flat*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2005.
- Gray, John. "The World is Round." *The York Review of Books* 2005: 1-9.
- Hardt, M and A Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism / Postcolonialism: New Critical Idiom*. 2nd. Special Indian Edition: Routledge, 2009.
- Martin, Jerry L. and Anne D. Neal. *Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can be Done About It*. Washington, DC: American Council of Trustees

and Alumni (ACTA), 2001. 1 Feb 2022.

<<https://www.mafhoum.com/press2/71P5.pdf>>.

O'Brien, Susie and Imre Szeman. "The Globalization of Fiction / the Fiction of Globalization." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 100.3 (2001): 603-26.

Sainath, P. "And Then There Was the Market." *India-Seminar* no 497. India, 2001. 2022 Feb 1. <<https://www.india-seminar.com/2001/497.htm>>.

Schwab, Klaus. *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Switzerland: World Economic Forum, 2016. <<https://www.weforum.org/about/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-by-klaus-schwab>>.

Stiglitz, Joseph E. *Globalism's Discontents*. American Prospects, 2002. 1 Feb 2022. <<https://archive.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/econ/2002/0114stiglitz.htm>>.

—. *Making Globalization Work*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 2007.

