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Reflections on “Critical Thinking” in Global Studies

Manfred B. Steger

Abstract
Much of what passes today as “global(ization) theory” falls within the new transdisciplinary framework of “global studies” (GS). GS constitutes an academic space of tension that generates critical investigations into our age as one shaped by the intensifying forces of globalization. Indeed, the young field both embraces and exudes the “global imaginary” – a sense of the social whole that frames our age as one shaped by the forces of globalization. Moreover, few GS scholars would object to the proposition that their field is significantly framed by “critical thinking.” But they need to be prepared to respond to a number of questions regarding the nature of their critical enterprise. What, exactly, does critical thinking signify in this context and how is it linked to GS? Do globalization scholars favor specific forms of critical thinking? If so, which types have been adopted and for what purposes? Finally, what forms of internal and external criticism have been leveled against GS itself and how have these objections been dealt with? These four questions provide the guiding framework for these reflections on the significance of critical thinking in GS.

Introduction

Much of what passes today as “global(ization) theory” falls within the transdisciplinary framework of “global studies” (GS). Emerging as a new field of academic inquiry in the late 1990s, GS explores globalization’s central dynamics of interconnectivity, reconfiguration of space and time, and enhanced mobility of people, goods, and ideas (Steger 2013). Although globalization has been extensively studied in the social sciences and humanities, it falls outside the established disciplinary framework. It is only of secondary concern in traditional fields organized around different master concepts: “society” in sociology; “resources” and “scarcity” in economics; “culture” in anthropology; “space” in geography; “the past” in history; “power” and “governance” in political science, and so on. By contrast, GS has placed the contested keyword “globalization” at the core of its intellectual enterprise. The rise of GS represents, therefore, a clear sign of the proper academic recognition of the new global interdependencies that cut across all disciplines and geographical scales. Moreover, as the work of leading GS scholars suggests, interconnectivity does not merely
manifest in objective processes in the world “out there” but also operates on a subjective level through people’s consciousness “in here.” Hence, GS both embraces and exudes a certain mentalité I call the “global imaginary” – those largely pre-reflexive convocations of the social whole colored by globalization (Steger 2008).

Increasingly institutionalized in today’s global higher education environments, the evolving field has attracted scores of single-discipline based faculty and students. They are committed to studying transnational processes, interactions, and flows from a broader perspective. Such inter- and transdisciplinary framings constitute but one of four central conceptual and methodological “pillars” of GS: globalization, transdisciplinarity, space and time, and critical thinking (Steger and Wahlrab 2017). Notwithstanding sensible attempts to gauge the conceptual coherence of GS by delineating its main contours and central features, we should remember that it still constitutes a fluid and porous intellectual terrain rather than a novel, well-defined item on the dominant disciplinary menu. To use Fredric Jameson’s apt characterization, GS operates as an academic “space of tension” framed by multiple disagreements and agreements in which the very problematic of globalization itself is being continuously produced and contested (Jameson 1998, xvi).

One of these agreements relates to the field’s affinity for “critical thinking” – what I consider to be the “fourth pillar” of GS. Indeed, few globalization theorists – to whom this article loosely refers to as “GS scholars” – would object to the proposition that critical perspectives significantly frame their field. But if GS scholars claim to analyze globalization processes through a critical prism, then they need to be prepared to respond to a number of important questions regarding the nature of their critical enterprise. How, exactly, is critical thinking linked to global studies? Do globalization scholars favor specific forms of critical thinking? If so, which types have been adopted and for what purposes? Finally, what forms of internal and external criticism have been leveled against the field itself and how have these objections been dealt with?

These four fundamental questions provide the guiding framework of this article. Its ultimate purpose is to provide both a conceptual orientation and a thematic overview indispensable for a full appreciation of the significance of critical thinking in GS. But let us pave the way for our ensuing discussion by first reflecting on the various understandings of critical thinking.
Two Stages of Critical Thinking: Analytical and Ethico-Political

The term “critical” derives from the ancient Greek verb krinein, which translates in various ways as “to judge,” “to discern,” “to separate” and “to decide.” The compound “critical thinking,” then, signifies a discerning mode of thought capable of judging the quality of a thing or a person by separating its essence from mere attributes. While modern social thinkers have pointed to a strong philosophical affinity between “critical” and “thinking,” the conceptual connection between these terms goes back for millennia. Both Western and Eastern cultural traditions have celebrated the ethical virtues of critical thinking as epitomized in such heroic tomes as Plato's Republic or the Bhagavad Gita. Indeed, most global philosophical traditions do not understand critical thinking solely in analytic terms as “value-free” operations of the discerning mind, but insist that it also entails a normative commitment to justice.

However, these vital ethical dimensions and political implications of rational thought were given short shrift in the contemporary critical thinking framework created by leading Anglo-American educators during the second half of the twentieth century. Turning a philosophical ideal into a popular educational catch phrase, these influential pedagogues elevated the program of “enabling students to think critically” to the universal goal of schooling. A teachable method of self-directed reasoning, such critical thinking expressed itself in cognitive operations like “seeing both sides of an issue, being open to new evidence that disconfirms your ideas, reasoning dispassionately, demanding that claims be backed by evidence, deducing and inferring conclusions from available facts, solving problems, and so forth” (Willingham 2007, 8).

Undoubtedly, these analytical capabilities of objectivity, balance, and problem solving should be the foundation of any form of critical thinking. Still, the well-meaning efforts of pedagogues to enhance the educational effectiveness of their vocation should not remain unconcerned with political and ethical reflexivity, lest they reduce the activity of critical thinking to a mere analytical “skill.” The presentation of critical activity as a form of cognitive dexterity betrays a rather impoverished social and ethical imagination. After all, confined to such a value-free analytic framework, critical thinking connects to the life-world only in rather instrumental ways. For example, it resonates with the exhortations of many business leaders who demand from schools to improve their students’ “critical thinking skills” in the hope of taking material advantage of a “well-educated workforce.” Other than making more profitable work-related judgments, however, the notion of “well-educated” in this neoliberal context has no explicit ethico-political connection to the social world. Rather, it refers
to economic efficiency, productivity, flexibility, and other instrumental skills highly valued in advanced capitalist societies.

Conversely, an ethico-political understanding of critical thinking emphasizes the crucial link between thinking and its social practices. Thought processes should not be isolated from the entire spectrum of the human experience. It is not enough to engage things merely in terms of how they are but also how they might be and should be. And to be mindful of this socially engaged dimension of thinking also means to be aware of the connection between contemplation and action, and between interrelated analytical and ethico-political forms, which we could conceptualize as Stage 1 and Stage 2 of critical thinking.

Critical Theory: Old and New

This emphasis on the crucial link between theory and practice has served as common ground for various socially engaged currents of critical thinking that have openly associated themselves with “critical theory.” Originally used in the singular and upper case, Critical Theory was closely associated with mid-twentieth-century articulations of Western Marxism as developed by thinkers of three generations of the “Frankfurt School” of social research. While rejecting the Marxist orthodoxy of economic determinism, these critical theorists nonetheless retained a social democratic understanding of the emancipatory role of “critique” in the class struggle for social justice and against new forms of alienation, commodification, and conformity generated in advanced capitalist societies (Bronner 2011, 7).

In recent decades, the Critical Theory tradition of the Frankfurt School has been subsumed under the pluralized framework of “critical theories” – in the plural and in lower case. Thus, critical theories have multiplied and now stretch across an extremely wide intellectual terrain. Covering conventional class-based perspectives, they also include more current identity-centered enunciations of social critique ranging from feminist theory and queer theory to psychoanalytic theory; from poststructuralism and postcolonialism to indigenous thought; and from literary criticism and critical legal studies to critical race theory. In spite of their tremendous methodological diversity and philosophical eclecticism, today’s critical theorists take as their common point of departure the historical specificity of existing social arrangements. They also share a vital concern with analyzing the causes of current forms of domination, exploitation, and injustice.
How, then, are these new forms of critical theory linked to GS? It is obvious that dominant neoliberal modes of globalization have produced growing disparities in wealth and wellbeing within and among societies. They have also led to an acceleration of ecological degradation, new forms of militarism and digitalized surveillance, previously unthinkable levels of inequality, and the chilling advance of consumerism and cultural commodification. The negative consequences of such a corporate-led “globalization-from-above” became subject to global democratic contestation in the 1990s and impacted the evolution of critical thinking in at least two major ways. First, they created fertile conditions for the emergence of powerful social movements advocating a people-led “globalization-from-below.” These transnational activist networks, in turn, served as catalysts for the proliferation of “new” critical theories – and thus critical thinking – that developed within the novel framework of globalization.

Many of these new critical thinkers were inspired by local forms of social resistance to neoliberalism such as the 1994 Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, the 1995 strikes in France and other parts of Europe, and the powerful series of protests in major cities around the world following in the wake of the iconic 1999 anti-WTO demonstration in Seattle. Critical intellectuals interacted with the participants of these alter-globalization movements at these large-scale protest events or at the massive meetings of the newly founded World Social Forum in the 2000s. They developed and advanced their critiques of market globalism in tandem with constructive visions for alternative global futures. As a Zapatista manifesto puts it, “If this world does not have a place for us, then another world must be made …What is missing is yet to come” (Cited in Lindblom and Zúquete 2010, 2).

The second impact of the corporate-led wave of “globalization-from-above” on the evolution of critical theory is closely related to the first. Since the struggles over the meanings and manifestations of globalization occurred in interconnected local settings around the world, they signified a significant alteration in the geography of critical thinking. As French sociologist Razmig Keucheyan (2013, 3) has emphasized, the academic center of gravity of these new forms of critical thinking shifted from the traditional centers of learning located in “old Europe” to the top universities of the New World. The United States, in particular, served as a powerful economic magnet for job-seeking academics from around the globe while also posing as the obvious hegemonic target of their criticisms. Indeed, during the last quarter century, American academia has managed to attract a large number of talented postcolonial critical theorists to its highly reputed and well-paying universities and colleges. A significant number of these politically progressive recruits, in turn, promptly put their newly
acquired positions of academic privilege into the service of their social engagement, which resulted in a vastly more effective production and worldwide dissemination of their critical publications. Moreover, the global struggle against neoliberalism heating up in the 1990s and 2000s also contributed significantly to the heightened international exposure of cutting-edge critical theorists located in the vast postcolonial terrains of Asia, Latin America, and Africa. In particular, the permanent digital communication revolution centered on the Web and the emergent new social media made it easier for these voices of the Global South to be heard in the dominant North. As Keucheyan (2013, 20–1) points out, the “globalization of critical thinking” culminated in the formation of a “world republic of critical theories.” Although this worldwide community of critical thinkers is far from homogenous in their perspectives and continues to be subjected to considerable geographic and social inequalities, it has had a profound influence on the evolution of GS.

Still, we need to be careful not to exaggerate the extent to which such critical theories pervade global theory today. Our discussion of the developing links between the post–1989 new wave of critical theories and GS should not seduce us into assuming that all GS scholars support radical or even moderate socially engaged perspectives on what constitutes their field and what it should accomplish. After all, global thinking is not inherently “critical” at its second, socially engaged, stage. An informal perusal of influential globalization literature produced during the last fifteen years suggests that nearly all authors express some
appreciation for Stage 1 critical thinking understood as a cognitive, analytic ability to see multiple sides of an issue (in this case, the issue is globalization). About two-thirds of well-published globalization scholars take their understanding of “critical” beyond the social-scientific ideal of value-free research and thus challenge in writing the dominant social arrangements of our time and/or promote emancipatory social change (Steger 2009). This locates the remaining one third of globalization authors within a conceptual framework that William Robinson has provocatively characterized as “noncritical globalization studies.” (Robinson in Appelbaum and Robinson 2005, 12). Obviously, GS scholars relegated to this category would object to Robinson’s classification on the basis of their Stage 1 understanding of critical thinking (see Figure 1).

The Basics of Critical Global Studies and the Responsibility of Intellectuals

Still, by the early 2000s, a growing number of globalization scholars were willing to adopt a socially engaged approach to their subject that became variously known as “critical globalization studies” (CGS), “critical global studies,” and “critical theories of globalization.” (Appelbaum and Robinson 2005; El-Ojeili and Hayden 2006). Regarding matters of conceptual analysis, CGS researchers adopted a broad range of methods and epistemologies. Yet, they were equally clear in their conviction that operating within the conceptual framework of globalization committed GS scholars to putting forward a cogent critique of the social dynamics and impacts of global capitalism. A proper understanding of emergent global society required sophisticated forms of political economy analyses capable of explaining the emergence of new transnational structures. Yet, even neo-Marxist CGS scholars like Appelbaum and Robinson (2005) rejected the orthodox Marxist emphasis on the economic mode of production as the determining factor of various forms of culture, ideology, law, and other superstructural dimensions. Instead, they adopted a more dialectical form of historical materialism as developed by Antonio Gramsci. Similarly, fellow neo-Gramscian global studies scholar Leslie Sklair (2001, 2002) employed a judicial mix of conceptual argument and empirical analysis to explore the formation of what he called the “transnational capitalist class.” In fact, his “global system theory” suggested that the new transnational practices of global capitalism operated simultaneously in three interrelated spheres: the economic, the political, and cultural-ideological. Such a holistic Gramscian understanding of the
reproduction of the economic system required, therefore, a close examination of all spheres, including the “profit-driven culture-ideology of consumerism” (Sklair 2001).

Another lucid contribution to the subject of intellectual responsibility in the global age flowed from the pen of the celebrated French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu who had become intensely involved with the global justice movement in the last years before his untimely death in 2002. Invoking Emile Zola’s role as an engaged “public intellectual” during France’s infamous Dreyfus Affair, Bourdieu (2002) argued that today’s intellectuals must engage in a permanent critique of all the abuses of power or authority committed in the name of intellectual authority. For Bourdieu (2002, 24–5), such critical thinking was especially important in a globalizing world where “scholars have a decisive role to play in the struggle against the new neoliberal doxa and the purely formal cosmopolitanism of those obsessed with words such as ‘globalization’ and ‘global competitiveness’.” Accepting their ethical responsibility meant that academics had to breach the “sacred boundary” inscribed in their mind that separated scholarship from social commitment. Ultimately, Bourdieu likened scholarly intervention on the world stage on behalf of the powerless to an indispensable act of giving symbolic force to critical ideas and analyses.

Whether applied by Bourdieu’s “public intellectuals” or Gramsci’s “organic intellectuals,” the dialectical method at the heart of critical GS serves the ultimate goal of attaining “self-knowledge of global society through active theorizing and political work” (Appelbaum and Robinson 2005, 14–17). Elaborating on such critical epistemological issues, James Mittelman offered additional insights into the methodological framework of CGS. For Mittelman (2004, 24–5), “The goal is to inculcate a new moral order in lieu of the dominant ethos – currently an ethos of efficiency, competition, individualism, and consumption inscribed in neoliberalism.” Echoing the overlapping social concerns of Gramsci and Bourdieu, Mittelman’s delineation of critical knowledge can be seen as a research agenda for public intellectuals committed to generating a “new common sense” about the negative consequences of neoliberal globalization. Bourdieu had called this production of alternative forms of knowledge “realistic utopias” and Mittelman refers to them in a similar manner as “grounded utopias.” Hence, CGS expressed emancipatory interests in scrutinizing the language used to frame globalizing processes; revealing the institutions in which knowledge and ideology are created; locating an analysis within definite cultural contexts; listening to different voices; and engaging in embodied and lived experiences in concrete social contexts (Mittelman 2004, 98).
Critical Global Studies and Global Activist Thinking

Having dealt sufficiently with the first guiding question posed at the outset of this article – how, exactly, is critical thinking linked to global studies? – let us now tackle questions number two and three: do globalization scholars favor specific forms of critical thinking? and, if so, which types have been adopted and for what purposes? Given the obvious spatial limitations of this essay, I confine my discussion to “global activist thinking” – the dominant form of critical thinking utilized by influential CGS public intellectuals.

As the previous section has made clear, the dialectical approach embraced by critical global studies scholars like Appelbaum, Robinson, Sklair, and Mittleman allows for an analysis of the “totality” of emergent global society. It makes possible not only an investigation of crucial cultural dynamics within the related framework of global capitalism, but also sheds light on the connection of theoretical reflection with practical issues of social justice. As Appelbaum and Robinson (2005) observe, such forms of reflexivity inspire a style of critical global thinking that is deeply informed by their political activism. Explicitly committed to “building bridges between this field and the global justice movement,” they emphasize their moral obligation “as scholars to place an understanding of the multifaceted processes of globalization in the service of those individuals and organizations that are dedicated to fighting its harsh edges” (Appelbaum and Robinson 2005, xiii). Indeed, one of the most important achievements of their anthology, Critical Globalization Studies, highlights the skill of its contributors in providing their critical assessment of contemporary globalization dynamics in a language accessible to both socially engaged scholars and non-academic movement activists. The editors describe the style of critical thinking that informs their understanding of CGS in the following way:

We believe that the dual objectives of understanding globalization and engaging in global social activism can best be expressed in the idea of a critical globalization studies. We believe as scholars it is incumbent upon us to explore the relevance of academic research to the burning political issues and social struggles of our epoch, and to the many conflicts, hardships, and hopes bound up with globalization, more directly stated, we are not indifferent observers studying globalization as a sort of detached academic exercise. Rather, we are passionately concerned with the adverse impact of globalization on billions of people as well as on our increasingly stressed planetary ecology (Appelbaum and Robinson 2005, xii-xiii).

This “dual objective” of CGS to produce globalization theory that is useful
to emancipatory global social movements animates what I call “global activist thinking.” Articulated by dozens of scholar-activists hailing from different disciplines, this style of critical thinking also addresses the important spatial concerns of connecting local or national grievances to the larger normative ideals located at the global scale such as “global justice,” “global equality,” and “solidarity with the global South.” Indeed, most of the globalization scholars engaged in global activist thinking could be characterized as “rooted cosmopolitans” who remain embedded in their local environments while at the same time cultivating an engaged global consciousness as a result of their vastly enhanced contacts to like-minded academics and social organizations across national borders.

While this activist style of criticism engages a large number of themes associated with the main domains of globalization, let us just concentrate on just two significant issues: global citizenship and the tremendous impact of the global justice movement (GJM) on the evolution of CGS. As GS scholar Hans Schattle (2008, 2) points out, the idea of “global citizenship” is linked to the classical cosmopolitan traditions of ancient Greece and Rome that regarded each human as worthy of equal respect and concern, regardless of the legal and political boundaries of any government jurisdictions. But it was not until the latest wave of globalization starting in the 1990s that the term leapt into the contemporary public discourse. In the twenty-first century, “global citizenship” has been embraced by educational institutions, transnational corporations, advocacy groups, community service organizations, and even some national governments. Although the phrase means different things to different social groups, it has increasingly been associated with educational initiatives seeking to inspire young people to grow into morally responsible, intellectually competent, and culturally perceptive global citizens. For example, in September 2012, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon released his educational “Global Education First Initiative,” which aimed to make a major contribution to the global movement for education. The thirty-two-page document features as its “Priority Area 3” the objective to “foster global citizenship.” Noting that the interconnected global challenges of the twenty-first century call for far-reaching changes in how people think and act for the dignity of their fellow human beings, the document describes the crucial relationship between global education and global citizenship in the following way:

Education must be transformative and bring shared values to life. It must cultivate an active care for the world and for those with whom we share it … Education must fully assume its central role in helping people to forge more just, peaceful, tolerant and inclusive societies … We now face the much great-
er challenge of raising global citizens. Promoting respect and responsibility across cultures, countries and regions has not been at the centre of education. Global citizenship is just taking root and changing traditional ways of doing things always brings about resistance (Ban Ki-moon 2012).

**Characteristics of Critical Global Studies (CGS)**

- integrates theory and practice
- contains a political dimension
- challenges unjust social orders

**Outcomes of CGS**

| Social Awareness | Historical Context | Social Transformation | Global Engagement | Global Citizenship |

As the UN General Secretary notes, the promotion of global citizenship in the educational arena involves a number of elements such as the cultivation of thinking beyond one’s imagined physical boundaries toward a global consciousness of planetary interdependence; a sense of one’s global responsibility and shared moral obligations across humankind; and the strengthening of democratic ideals of democratic empowerment and participation (Schattle 2008, 44–5; 2012). Educational psychologists Duarte Morais and Anthony Ogden (2011, 445–66) present global citizenship similarly as a multi-dimensional construct consisting of three factors: *social responsibility* understood as students’ perception of global interdependence and a social concern for other individuals, societies as a whole, and the environment; *global competence* defined as students’ openness to cultural difference, an interest in world issues, and an awareness of their own cultural biases and limitations, which strengthens a commitment to multiculturalism; and *global civic engagement* expressed in students’ understanding of local, national, and global issues and their involvement in social volunteerism, political activism, and community service. GS pioneer Mark Juergensmeyer (2012) has added another element by linking “global citizenship” to specific educational efforts to create “global literacy” – the ability of students to see themselves as active citizens of the world capable of critical examinations of
specific aspects of diverse cultures and economic practices as well as influential global trends and patterns.

Those CGS scholar-activists who committed themselves as early as the 1990s primarily to the educational enterprise of advancing the values and practices of global citizenship typically showed also a strong affinity for the global justice movement (GJM) and its contestation of the enormous injustices and inequalities produced by neoliberal globalization. Hence, their understanding of global citizenship entailed the search for emancipatory knowledge that would help the forces of global civil society to generate transnational forms of solidarity, especially with the poor and disadvantaged in the global South. This critical grounding of global studies in emancipatory practice connects the educational mission of public intellectuals to more explicit efforts to generate emancipatory knowledge in support of the struggles of the GJM – and, more recently, the global Occupy Movement (De Vries-Jordan 2014).

But during the last fifteen years, the World Social Forum (WSF) has served as a central ideological site of CGS scholar-activists. Established in 2001 as an alternative progressive forum to the market-globalist World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, the WSF was consciously designed as an “open meeting place.” Thus it encouraged and facilitated a free exchange of ideas among scholars and activists dedicated to challenging the neoliberal framework of globalization-from-above. In particular, the WSF sought to accomplish two fundamental tasks. The first was ideological, reflected in concerted efforts to undermine the premises of the reigning market-globalist worldview. WSF member organizations constructed and disseminated alternative articulations of the global imaginary based on the core principles of the WSF: equality, global social justice, diversity, democracy, nonviolence, solidarity, ecological sustainability, and planetary citizenship. The second task was political, manifested in the attempt to realize these principles by means of mass mobilizations and nonviolent direct action aimed at transforming the core structures of market globalism: international economic institutions like the WTO and the IMF, transnational corporations and affiliated NGOs, and large industry federations and lobbies (Steger, Goodman, and Wilson 2013).

GS scholar-activists Susan George and Naomi Klein emerged in the 2000s as two of the leading advocates for the “positive role of academia and intellectuals” in the GJM. At the same time, George made clear that the movement has no anointed “leaders” or a “cadre” empowered to give binding marching orders to the masses or prescribe rigid ideological injunctions. The GJM’s decentralized nature meant that the impact of social activism on theory formation was just as significant for affiliated public intellectuals as the more conventional dynamics.
of theory guiding practice – in this case the generation of conceptual blueprints that might help the GJM “attain its goals through the tools of scholarship.” In such a spirit of mutual collaboration and experimentation, George (2005) offered scholar-activists four concrete pieces of advice for the advancement of critical global studies.

First, she warned against the concentration of research efforts on the conditions of the world’s poor and disadvantaged: “Those who genuinely want to help the [global justice] movement should study the rich and powerful, not the poor and powerless.” Her rationale for this unusual suggestion was rather striking: “The poor and powerless already know what is wrong with their lives and those who want to help them should analyze the forces that keep them poor and powerless. Better a sociology of the Pentagon or the Houston country club than of single mothers or L.A. gangs.” Second, she made a strong case for the significance of transdisciplinarity as the mode of critical thinking par excellence: “One should also take as a given that, just as rules are made to be broken, disciplinary boundaries are made to be crossed.” Third, she urged public intellectuals eager to contribute to the GJM that they had to be more rigorous than their mainstream colleagues. “If you’re in the academic minority, you must assume that the majority will be out to get you and you’ll need high-quality body armor to be unassailable. One way to do this is to use the adversary’s own words” (George 2005, 8).

Fond of citing that “ideas have consequences” – the 1950s slogan of American conservatives – George also reminded CGS scholar-activists of the importance of creating permanent think tanks and effective intellectual networks committed to the spread of global critical thinking. George’s last point deserves some additional elaboration. While the GJM has not been able to endow major left-leaning think tanks that rival conservative institutions like the Adam Smith Institute in London or the Heritage Foundation in Washington, DC, considerable progress has been made in the expansion of intellectual networks linking globalization scholars and movement activists. In addition to the WSF and its multiple affiliated regional social forums, there has been a proliferation of smaller academic networks dedicated to the direct support of counter-hegemonic globalization movements.

For example, the Global Studies Association (GSA) was founded in 2000 at Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, and is now based at the Centre for Global and Transnational Politics at Royal Holloway, University of London. Its purpose is to bring together and advance the efforts of critical scholars and activists interested in promoting the creation and dissemination of transdisciplinary knowledge in the social and human sciences concerning globalization.
Its sister organization, the GSA North America, was established two years later. More recently, the International Network of Scholar Activists (INoSA) was organized by Jackie Smith, a prominent scholar of global social movements based at the University of Pittsburgh, and other like-minded public intellectuals from around the world. INoSA is a fast-growing network of teachers and scholars from many disciplines committed to advancing social movements and radical democracy – both within and outside academia. The organization supports scholarship and educational work related to these efforts, especially within the World Social Forum process. Indeed, Jackie Smith (2008, 2012, 2014) has published a steady stream of influential work on the WSF and its pivotal role in the effort to articulate an alternative vision of globalization-from-below.

Ultimately, then, our brief exploration of the critical thinking framing of GS points to multiple forms of social engagement that link educational engagement and the production of emancipatory knowledge for social movements to political projects committed to advancing social justice on a “glocal” level.

Concluding Remarks: Critiques of Global Studies

As this article draws to a close, the only subject left to consider is the capacity of GS for self-criticism as expressed in our fourth guiding question: what forms of internal and external criticism have been leveled against global studies and how have these objections been dealt with? Obviously, the critical thinking framing creates a special obligation for all scholars working in the field to listen to and take seriously internal and external criticisms with the intention of correcting existing shortcomings, illuminating blind spots, and avoiding theoretical pitfalls and dead-ends. As is the case for any newcomer bold enough to enter today’s crowded and competitive arena of academia, global studies, too, has been subjected to a wide range of criticisms ranging from constructive interventions to severe criticisms raised by globalization rejectionists, skeptics, world-systems theorists, IR experts, and other critics. We will limit our discussion in this concluding section to a brief overview of two influential critiques of the field.

The first criticism concerns the intellectual scope of GS as well as its current status in various academic settings around the world. Perhaps the most polished formulation of this criticism comes from Jan Nederveen Pieterse (2013), a discerning internal critic hailing from UCSB’s Global Studies Department – the most successful of its kind in the United States. Much to his credit, Piet-
Pieterse’s privileged position of being affiliated with the first full-fledged GS PhD program in the country does not prevent him from engaging in constructive self-criticism. In his recent assessment of the field, he presents a rather bleak picture of “actual global studies as it is researched and taught at universities around the world.” For Pieterse, the crux of the problem lies with the field’s immaturity and lack of focus: it has, intellectually, “barely developed” beyond a discipline-based study of globalization. Moreover, he alleges that currently existing GS programs and conferences are still relatively rare and haphazard; they resemble “scaffolding without a roof.” Finally, the GS scholar bemoans the dearth of intellectual innovators willing and able to provide necessary “programmatic perspectives on global studies” framed by the “multicentered and multilevel thinking” capable of “adding value” to the field (Pieterse 2013, 499–514).

Pieterse’s intervention is important for a number of reasons. For one, it provides a necessary corrective to the idealized and romanticized accounts that often accompany the rise of a new academic endeavor. Moreover, he is certainly right in pointing to the current childhood stage of GS as, in many respects, a serious weakness plaguing this inexperienced academic initiative. Incidentally, most academic fields deemed “barely developed” are prone to display, paradoxically, a certain kind of youthful arrogance expressed in exaggerated aspirations to “set things straight” and brash proclamations of serving as bastions of intellectual innovation. GS is no stranger to such boastful behavior. At times, its invidious airs of superiority displayed toward conventional disciplines have given just cause for consternation, as did some of its hubristic and ultimately unproven claims to novelty and universality. As James Mittelman (2013, 516) has pointed out, there lies a severe risk “in any attempt to encapsulate all phenomena in a single, totalizing framework, irrespective of whether it is named ‘global’ or ‘globalization studies’.”

To be sure, there is nothing wrong with sincere aspirations to universality. But, as IR critic Justin Rosenberg’s (2000) important, yet somewhat dated, appraisal of globalization theory suggests, the “grand theory” claims of some thinkers have not been substantiated. He charges that globalization studies has set itself up as a field capable of generating a new “general social theory” in which “globalization” serves as both the evolving outcome and the explanatory category for social change in the contemporary world. The result has been the new field’s lamentable tendency to indulge in “a conceptual inflation of the ‘spatial’, which is both difficult to justify ontologically and liable to produce not explanations but reifications” (Rosenberg 2000, 13; 2005). Although most of Rosenberg’s early broadsides against globalization theory have been effec-
tively countered in subsequent years, many thinkers share his distaste for the overblown intellectual ambitions of some GS scholars (Axford 2013, 17–20; 183–88).

Finally, Pieterse’s criticism hits the nail on its head when it points to the often shocking discrepancy between the rich conceptual promise of the field and the poor design and execution of “actual global studies as it is researched and taught at universities around the world.” There is some truth to the complaints of some external critics that a good number of actually existing GS programs lack focus and specificity, which makes the field appear to be a rather nebulous study of “everything global.” Like most of the other interdisciplinary efforts originating in the 1990s, GS programs sometimes invite the impression of a rather confusing combination of wildly different approaches reifying the global level of analysis.

But perhaps the most troubling development this author has observed in recent years is that academic entrepreneurs eager to cash in on its popularity with students have increasingly used “global studies” as a convenient catch phrase. Thus, this desirable label has become attached to a growing number of conventional area studies curricula, international studies offerings, and diplomacy and foreign affairs programs – primarily for the purpose of boosting their intellectual and instructional appeal without having to make substantive changes to the familiar teaching and research agenda attached to such programs. Unfortunately, these vacuous and instrumental appropriations have not only caused much damage to the existing GS “brand” but also cast an ominous shadow on the future of the field.

In spite of its obvious insights, however, Pieterse’s critique of “actually existing global studies” strikes me as unbalanced. Much of the empirical data presented in the appendices of this study shows that there are promising pedagogical and research efforts underway in the field. These initiatives suggest that Pieterse’s instructive pessimism must be balanced with cautious optimism. To be sure, our empirical examination of the field shows GS as a project that is still very much in the making. Yet, its tender age and relative inexperience should not deter globalization scholars from acknowledging the field’s considerable intellectual achievements and growing institutional infrastructure. GS “as it actually exists” has come a long way from its rather modest and eclectic origins in the 1990s. Of course, there can never be enough GS conferences and workshops, but it simply defies reality to characterize the current choices of pertinent academic programs and professional gatherings as “scaffolding without a roof.” After all, the regular meetings of the Global Studies Associations (UK and North America) and the annual convention of the Global Studies Con-
sortium provide ample networking opportunities for globalization scholars from around the world. In fact, Pieterse himself is a founding member of the Global Studies Knowledge Community, a very active GS organization holding large conferences and publishing a refereed scholarly journal devoted to mapping and interpreting past and emerging trends and patterns in globalization.

Moreover, the growing GS literature reveals the existence and ongoing emergence of profound intellectual innovators. Equipped with the necessary intellectual hard and software, they are furnishing those trailblazing “programmatic perspectives” that contain “multicentered thinking,” “multilevel thinking,” and many other favorable features Pieterse deems essential for the evolution toward a “value-added” GS. Many GS teaching programs and research centers around the world already incorporate a good number of these desired qualities. For example, GS scholars are developing serious initiatives to recenter the social sciences toward global systemic dynamics and incorporate multilevel analyses. They are rethinking existing analytical frameworks that expand critical reflexivity and methodologies unafraid of mixing various research strategies. In short, the delineation of GS as a reasonably coherent, transdisciplinary “space of tension” dedicated to the exploration of globalization processes and framed by both disagreements and agreements – yields a more complex and accurate picture of the young field. Actually existing GS appears to be in better shape than Pieterse would have us believe. Where he sees intellectual underdevelopment and scaffolding without a roof, I also observe intellectual innovation, cutting-edge research, and thriving teaching programs. Such guarded optimism notwithstanding, however, I appreciate the critical interventions of GS insiders like Pieterse and agree that there is plenty of room for further improvement.

The second criticism discussed in this concluding section comes from postcolonial thinkers located both within and without the field of GS. As Robert Young (2003) explains, postcolonial theory is a related set of perspectives and principles that involves a conceptual reorientation toward the perspectives of knowledges developed outside the West – in Asia, Africa, Oceania, and Latin America. By seeking to insert alternative knowledges into the dominant power structures of the West as well as the non-West, postcolonial theorists attempt to “change the way people think, the way they behave, to produce a more just and equitable relation between the different people of the world.” Emphasizing the connection between theory and practice, postcolonial intellectuals consider themselves critical thinkers challenging the alleged superiority of Western cultures, racism and other forms of ethnic bias, economic inequality separating the global North from the South, and the persistence of “Orientalism” – a discriminatory, Europe-derived mindset so brilliantly dissected by late postco-
lonial theorist Edward Said (1979). Thus, Young (2003, 6–7) concludes, postcolonialism is a socially engaged form of critical thinking “about a changing world, a world that has been changed by struggle and which its practitioners intend to change further.”

A good number of postcolonial and indigenous theorists have examined the connections between globalization and postcolonialism (Krishna 2009). While many have expressed both their appreciation and affinity for much of what GS stands for, they have also offered incisive critiques of what they see as the field’s troubling geographic, ethnic, and epistemic location within the hegemonic Western framework. The noted ethnic studies scholar Ramón Grosfoguel (2005, 284), for example, offers a clear and comprehensive summary of such postcolonial concerns: “Globalization studies, with a few exceptions, have not derived the epistemological and theoretical implications of the epistemic critique coming from subaltern locations in the colonial divide and expressed in academia through ethnic studies and women studies. We still continue to produce a knowledge from the Western man ‘point zero’ god’s-eye view.”

Other postcolonial thinkers, like the WSF-connected scholar-activist Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014), have taken their epistemic criticism beyond the confines of GS in their indictment of the hegemonic academic framework as failing to recognize the different ways of knowing by which people across the globe provide meaning to their existence. In fact, his charge of “cognitive injustice” moves far beyond conventional academic approaches and methodologies, deeply penetrating into the supposedly “counter-hegemonic” territory of most of the critical theories mentioned in this article. De Sousa Santos argues that “genuine radicalism seems no longer possible in the global North,” because “Western, Eurocentric critical theory” has lost the capacity to learn from the experiences of the world. Haunted by a “sense of exhaustion,” he charges, the tradition of critical theory has lapsed into irrelevance, inadequacy, impotence, stagnation, and paralysis. Hence, his ideal of “epistemological justice” contains the radical demand to end what he calls “epistemicide,” that is, the suppression and marginalization of epistemologies of the South by the dominant critical theories of the North. De Sousa Santos (2014) concludes that if the critical impulse is to survive in the 21st century, it is imperative for radical thinkers around the world to distance themselves from the Eurocentric critical tradition that has provided only weak answers for the strong questions confronting us in the global age.

Postcolonial critics like Grosfoguel and De Sousa Santos provide an invaluable service to GS by highlighting the conceptual parochialism behind its allegedly “global” theoretical and practical concerns. Indeed, their interven-
tion suggests that GS thinkers have not paid enough attention to the post-colonial imperative of contesting the dominant Western ways of seeing and knowing. They also force all scholars working in the field to confront questions that are often relegated to the margins of intellectual inquiry. Is critical theory sufficiently global to represent the diverse voices of the multitude and speak to the diverse experiences of disempowered people around the world? What sort of new and innovative ideas have been produced by public intellectuals who do not necessarily travel along the theoretical and geographical paths frequented by Western critical thinkers? What are pressing issues and promising intellectual approaches that have been neglected in CGS? Some of these questions also point to the central role of the English language in GS. With English expanding its status as the academic lingua franca, thinkers embedded in Western universities still hold the monopoly on the production of critical theories. Important contributions from the global South in languages other than English often fall through the cracks or only register in translated form on the radar of the supposedly “global” academic publishing network years after their original publication.

At the same time, however, it is essential to acknowledge the progress that has been made in GS to expand its space of tension by welcoming and incorporating global South perspectives. As early as 2005, for example, a quarter of the contributions featured in Appelbaum and Robinson’s path-breaking Critical Globalizations Studies anthology came from authors located in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Since then, pertinent criticisms from within that demanded the inclusion of multiple voices and perspectives from around the world have proliferated. Consider, for example, Eve Darian-Smith’s (2015) recent condemnation of taken-for-granted assumptions on the part of Western scholars to speak for others in the global South. Moreover, scores of public intellectuals hailing from the global South such as Samir Amin, Arjun Appadurai, Mohammed Bamyeh, Walden Bello, Nestor Garcia Canclini, Wang Hui, Sankaran Krishna, Achille Mbembe, Eduardo Mendieta, Walter Mignolo, Jamal R. Nassar, Vandana Shiva, Supriya Singh, Chico Whitaker, and Paul Tiymbe Zeleza have not only produced influential studies on globalization, but also have stood in solidarity with movement activists struggling against the forces of globalization-from-above.

Finally, we must not forget that it was the Mexican Zapatista movement – mostly composed of indigenous campesinos in the region – that confronted neoliberal globalization with a resounding ‘Ya basta!’, thus inaugurating what eventually became the GJM. In this context, it is important to remember the point we made earlier in this chapter about the role of the West, and the Unit-
ed States in particular, as a magnet for postcolonial scholars from around the world. As Keucheyan (2013, 73) suggests, “For today’s critical theorists, U.S. universities constitute a site of recognition comparable to Paris for writers in the first half of the twentieth century.” Still, with regard to the postcolonial criticism of GS, it makes sense to come to the same conclusion as in the previous charge related to the field’s underdeveloped scope and status. We should appreciate and take seriously the postcolonial interventions and agree that there is still plenty of room for further improvement.

Finally, true to the title of this article, let me offer one more constructive criticism with regard to the future evolution of global theory. Perhaps the most pressing critical task for GS in the next decade is to keep chipping away at the disciplinary walls that still divide the academic landscape today. Animated by an ethical imperative to “globalize knowledge,” such transdisciplinary efforts have the potential to reconfigure our discipline-oriented academic infrastructure around issues of global public responsibility (Kennedy 2015, xv). This integrative endeavor must be undertaken steadily and tirelessly – but also carefully and with the proper understanding that diverse and multiple forms of knowledge are sorely needed to educate a global public. The necessary appreciation for the interplay between “specialists” and “generalists” must contain a proper respect for the crucial contributions of the conventional disciplines to our growing understanding of globalization. But the time has come to take the next step. The rising global imaginary demands nothing less from students and faculty committed to producing cutting-edge global social theories.
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