

**Global Political Economy & Its Neocolonial Vices:
Postcolonial Theological Reflections on Economic Justice**

Keri Day
Assistant Professor of Theological & Social Ethics
Director of Black Church Studies
Brite Divinity School, TCU

As a black female liberationist theologian, I am deeply concerned about global capitalism and its project of neocolonialism around the world. In particular, I have found postcolonial theologies to be rich discursive theological resources for understanding the problem of neocolonialism, especially how it has affected communities of color worldwide. Postcolonial theologies claim the right of all people on this earth to the same material and cultural well-being by critically reflecting on how theological and religious ideologies support and/or challenge Western imperial structures of oppression. The reality, though, is that the world today is a world of inequality, and much of the difference falls across the broad division between people of the West and those of the non-West (being “people of color”). Edward Said rightly argues that the West (or Occident) produced the non-white, non-Western cultural “others” through a variety of discourses. This division between the West and the ‘cultural other’ (non-West) was certainly solidified by the nineteenth century with the expansion of European and European-derived powers, bringing about nine-tenths of the entire globe under their rule. A particular set of postcolonial discourses emerged in the 1960s as thinkers from former colonies began to create their own forms of knowledge to counter discourses of colonialism. These postcolonial discourses articulated the experiences of the colonized, rather than those of the colonizer.

Colonialism’s economic and racial systems are often seen as relics of the past, systems that ended with formal European occupation. Postcolonial theologies disagree with this assessment. Postcolonial theologies expose and deconstruct the ways in which economic and

racial colonial systems persist: through new forms of economic and racial imperialism, often referred to as neocolonialism. This essay not only explores the effects of neocolonialism on people of color around the world but also suggests how postcolonial theological reflection can help fashion a transnational vision of economic justice in response to global economic hegemony people of color experience and endure worldwide. Scholars concerned with postcolonial subjects should not only deconstruct neocolonial logic and practices but must also offer a vision of economic justice in response to the inequality and inequity postcolonial subjects consistently confront.

The Neocolonial Project and Global Economic Hegemony: Race & the “Postcolonial Gaze”

Neocolonialism is a new form of economic and cultural imperialism that continues to exploit and devastate developing countries. The term “neocolonialism” was first coined by Kwame Nkrumah, the first post-independence president of Ghana, and has been discussed by a number of twentieth-century scholars and philosophers, including Jean Paul-Sartre and Noam Chomsky. In particular, neocolonialism is a term used by postcolonial critics to discuss the exploitative actions of rich Western countries in the developing non-Western world.

Neocolonial discourses seek to ensure that existing or past international economic arrangements created by former colonial powers continue to be used to maintain control of their former colonies. The term neocolonialism combines a critique of current actual colonialism (where some states continue administrating foreign territories and their populations in violation of United Nations resolutions) and a critique of the involvement of modern capitalist businesses in nations that were former colonies. Critics of neocolonialism contend that multinational corporations continue to exploit the resources of postcolonial states, and that this economic control inherent to neocolonialism is akin to the classical, European colonialism practiced from

the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries. In broader usage, neocolonialism simply refers to the involvement of powerful countries in the affairs of less powerful countries, which is especially relevant in modern Latin America. In this sense, neocolonialism implies a form of contemporary “economic imperialism” in which powerful nations behave like past colonial powers in a supposedly “postcolonial” world.

The term neocolonialism first saw widespread use, particularly in reference to Africa, soon after the process of decolonization in the 1950s. Upon gaining independence, some national leaders and opposition groups argued that their countries were being subjected to a new form of colonialism, waged by the former colonial powers and other more developed nations. Kwame Nkrumah, who in 1957 became the leader of newly independent Ghana, was one of the most notable figures to use the term. A classical definition of neocolonialism is given in his *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism* (1965). The work is self-defined as an extension of Vladimir Lenin's *Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism* (1916), in which Lenin argues that nineteenth-century imperialism is predicated upon the needs of the capitalist system.

Nkrumah argues that “Old-fashioned colonialism is by no means entirely abolished . . . In place of colonialism as the main instrument of imperialism we have today neo-colonialism. The essence of neo-colonialism is that the State, which is subject to it, is in theory independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside.”¹ He further asserts:

“The result of neo-colonialism is that foreign capital is used for the exploitation rather than for the development of the less developed parts of the world. Investment under neo-colonialism increases rather than decreases the gap between the rich and the poor countries of the world. The struggle against neo-colonialism is not aimed at excluding the capital of the developed world from operating in less developed countries. It is aimed at preventing the financial power of the developed countries being used in such a way as to impoverish the less developed.”²

Into 2011, Nkrumah's insights continue to capture what is stake for many developing countries: confronting and enduring new covert forms of economic and cultural imperialism that are as insidious as former colonial regimes. Viewed from a neocolonial framework, global financial investment does not improve the economic well-being of "underdeveloped" nations, but it exploits and uses the labor and natural resources of those nations to achieve the greatest amount of profit.

One can see how race and/or culture is central to how neocolonialism is constructed and employed in "two-thirds world" nations in which the West asserts economic hegemony over its non-Western counterparts. The history of colonialism has always been intricately connected with the economics of capitalist exploitation and the racialization of non-Western "others" to support such economic exploitation. Colonial and imperial rule was legitimized by anthropological theories that increasingly portrayed people of the colonized world (people of color) as inferior, requiring the paternal rule of the West for their own best interests (these best interests being "development"). The basis of such anthropological theories was the concept of race. The West's relationship to the non-West was conceived in terms of whites versus the non-white races, the civilized versus the primitive. White culture was regarded as (and conceptually remains) the true embodiment of "civilization." The "postcolonial gaze" exposes how racist logics continue to perpetuate current global economic hegemony. Neocolonialism exports European legal, religious, educational, military, political, and aesthetic ideologies in order to legitimate and secure a global capitalist regime. Western cultural standards are upheld and all other notions of culture are denounced as substandard to them. Simply put, neocolonialist regimes exploit people of color around the world through economic practices and racist cultural productions. The

postcolonial gaze stares down how racism and exploitative economics are inextricably linked in fostering inequality for people of color globally.

Neocolonialist regimes remain destructive to people of color around the world as one sees the widening gap between the West and the non-West. In order for developing countries to experience liberation and flourishing, this neocolonial project must be deconstructed, exposed, and resisted. However, neocolonialism and its economic and cultural hegemony are often denied because of the ways in which global capitalism and global political economy are perceived and understood.

Neocolonial Vices: Advanced-Capitalist Global Political Economy & Commodity Fetishism

The reality of neocolonialism is often denied because of how global political economy is defined and understood. For some, global political economy speaks of a new vision of wealth and a higher quality of life, sponsored by the riches of techno-capitalism. Free-market advocates often describe global political economy as a single entity of highly integrated national economies that are sustained by the global scope of information networks, markets, and labor. However, for others, global political economy elicits angst, as it names who are “globalized” versus who have yet to be globalized or are in the process of globalization (presumably away from primitive local culture). Critical commentators on global economy argue that it exacerbates disparities between the rich and poor. This term is charged with ideological and geo-political baggage and implications. Does global political economy reflect domination/colonization or liberation for local cultures?³ What type of work does “global political economy” do?

Proponents and critics of globalization generally agree that “global economy” can be partly described as a woven world of distant encounters and instant connections that has been able to generate more wealth, resources, and cultural interactions than has previously been

experienced around the world. However, the point of disagreement is on who has benefited from this intensifying explosion of wealth and resources. Have classes that directly control capital and labor largely benefited from globalized economic processes? If poorer groups are seen as the beneficiaries of global economy's booming creation of wealth, why has global poverty persisted and even intensified in some countries? When turning to the deep inequities and inequalities poor people of color continue to endure around the world, it is clear that the chronically poor do not benefit from global economic processes but experience an exacerbation of their impoverishment through neocolonial capitalist processes and practices.

In order to understand the persisting presence of deep inequities and inequalities, I describe global political economy as the manner in which neo-liberal values and projects shape and determine global economic outcomes. Neo-liberalism can be defined as a vision of society wherein competition of wealth is the dominant value and unregulated markets determine socio-economic decisions. This alternative description of global political economy debunks the idea of "economy" as a value-neutral arena, concerned with the "unbiased science" of market exchange and wealth creation. Instead, partisan political interests of economic elites often determine global economic outcomes. In order to understand the ways in which socio-political values shape global economic processes, I further delineate global political economy within the context of advanced capitalism.

I use "advanced capitalism" in the Habermasian sense in which it is understood that capitalism in the second half of the twentieth century colonized every aspect of life, turning everything into a commodity or transaction.⁴ Advanced capitalism and its systems of commodification become cultural and political values that inform social relations. For example, within advanced capitalism, labor is no longer seen as a human possession worthy of respect but

as a commodity that can be exchanged for profit maximization. In other words, labor loses its humanizing element and instead becomes de-personalized, nothing more than a commodity that is part of economic transactions. Advanced capitalism sponsors a type of morality that de-humanizes social relations so that they are used instrumentally as means toward the ends of market goals. Simply put, advanced-capitalist global political economy promotes “commodity fetishism” in which social relationships between people are expressed as objectified relationships between things (commodities and money).⁵

Commodity fetishism reinforces advanced capitalist hegemony.⁶ The human subject becomes a commodity. Social values that should sustain social relationships such as human dignity, mutual respect, and personal worth are replaced with free-market values (such as rabid individualism and crass materialism), turning social relationships into mere commercial relationships. This commodification of the human subject within advanced-capitalist global political economy fosters economic exploitation and subjugation, particularly among those who are most vulnerable. It de-humanizes social bonds and privileges economic profit maximization as a primary social value. In fact, such capitalist values are even reified by disadvantaged, poor communities as values to be pursued and achieved. Around the world, poor communities of color continue to experience chronic poverty because of hegemonic ideologies and practices of commodification, which fuel and sustain advanced capitalist global economy. The neocolonial vice of commodity fetishism promotes free-market values of individual success and profit-making to the exclusion of social accountability and responsibility to equity and equality within socio-economic spaces around the world.

This delineation of advanced-capitalist global political economy challenges a description of global political economy as “progressive” and “democratizing” for our world communities.

Free-market advocates such as Milton Freidman and Dinesh D'Souza tout our global economy as securing greater wealth for nations around the world.⁷ For certain, global political economy has contributed in some ways to the progress of the world through travel, trade, migration, spread of cultural influences, and dissemination of knowledge and understanding (including science and technology). However, poorer communities of color around the globe have not been able to benefit from such gains because of their lack of access to education, transportation, health, and more.

Linda Thomas, a womanist cultural anthropologist, provides an insightful example of how advanced-capitalist systems and its global economic practices have negatively impacted poor communities of color such as black South Africans. Thomas implicates U.S. economic policy and its financial practices as continual causes of poverty among communities of color around the globe. For example, Thomas notes that South African apartheid and its political apparatus maintained intransigence over and against overwhelming domestic and international pressures partly because of the globalized financial capital of the United States and other European countries.⁸ Without the presence of American transnational corporations and banks, apartheid could not have continued its socio-economic and political domination of the black African majority population.⁹

During the early stages of the apartheid era, financial support came from American banks such as City Bank of New York and Chase Manhattan Bank. Although these financial institutions helped initiate activities in South Africa, they often concealed their lending operations by coalescing with other bank branches. For instance, Chase merged its financial enterprises with British Standard Bank.¹⁰ In fact, American direct investments doubled by 1966. And by 1984, U.S. monopoly capitalist corporations held 60% of all foreign holdings on the

Johannesburg Stock Exchange. The United States became the apartheid state's leading trade partner for both exports and imports.¹¹ Despite opposition from other countries and outcries by South African citizens themselves, the United States continued to invest in an international outlaw country because of the enormous rates of profit return, cheap and abundant labor, low taxes, and favorable economic climate.¹² The continued economic imperialism and hegemony of the West through banks and corporations enabled racism and economic exploitation to persist in South Africa into the 1990s.

One might wonder if a neocolonial global economy is profoundly characterized by the commodification and exploitation of the human subject and social relations, can it provide the context in which poor persons of color can flourish? If global capitalism is more concerned with expanding the neocolonial domain of market relations than enhancing social opportunities among society's underdogs, then can it be a viable model of thriving for poor communities? For me, it would be naïve to assume that underdeveloped countries can "escape" advanced-capitalist global market economies. Many scholars argue that socialism is a more equitable and just politico-economic arrangement than capitalist models, but history has not proven this perspective. In fact, socialist programs in many countries have been as inequitable and exploitative of their poor as capitalist models such as the former Soviet Union and various African states such as Guinea-Bissau, Angola, and Mozambique.¹³ Consequently, the crucial question concerns the sharing of potential gains from global economy between richer and poorer countries and among differently economically positioned groups within a country. In other words, it seems that there must be clarity in formulating distributional questions in relation to global capitalist gains. Can poorer groups get a better deal from globalized economic relations?

Most importantly, the neocolonial project of global economy must be challenged through socio-political institutions that are empowered to promote economic justice for the poor. Globalized market relations do not work by themselves but critically depend on economic, social, and political institutions. In particular, market outcomes around the world are profoundly influenced by public policies in education, land reform, microcredit facilities, legal protections, and more. These policies can radically alter global economic relations. Public policies that are guided by normative commitments such as human dignity and communal accountability can cultivate the type of structural transformation and actualization of human potential needed to close the wealth gap between richer and poorer countries and within countries. Such public policies can help protect poor people of color from the neocolonial projects that multi-national corporations and businesses often enact. My point is that socio-economic and political institutions and policies in more developed and underdeveloped nations must protect the poor from neocolonial vices such as commodity fetishism that enable advanced capitalism to exploit the poor.

When critically examining advanced-capitalist global political economy, one “must interrogate the nature of power and resource configurations present—that is, who has influence derived from ownership and distribution of wealth.”¹⁴ By interrogating such configurations, a reconstruction of knowledge in relationship to poverty among poor communities can emerge. The historical factors that give rise to oppressed voices around the world point toward inequitable global productions. Knowledge forms that critique the symbolic and material dimensions of commodification and exploitation in relation to global political economy expose and shatter the assumed “innocence” and “benign” nature of global market economies and their effects on marginalized communities. These global market economies are part of neocolonial

projects that continue to exploit and further intensify deprivation and poverty in developing countries.

An Economy of Hope: Toward a Transnational Vision of Economic Justice within a “Global Village”

Postcolonial theologies try to envision an economy of hope wherein the global poor can flourish and thrive. While global political economy “commodifies” the human subject and social relations through its deployment of neocolonial values such as commodity fetishism, hope and flourishing become more possible as we intervene in the determining roles of public policies with normative commitments that can undergird justice and fairness. These normative values of equality, equity, and fairness debunk the “commodity fetishism” that pervades advanced-capitalist global economic relations. Postcolonial theologies can contribute to fashioning an economy of hope for the most poor, vulnerable segments around the world.

One fruitful way to fashion an economy of hope is for postcolonial theologies to relate their theological reflections to a substantive account of transnational economic justice for the global poor. However, in order to do this, postcolonial theology must confront some deep resistances in the international system to discussions on human rights and economic equity that have arisen in the very process of global change over the last several decades. Advanced-capitalist, neo-liberal rhetoric is not the only ideological obstacle to developing a sense of justice and flourishing for the global poor. For many regions of the world such as Iran, parts of Africa, and China, there is a growing rejection of any universal aspiration associated with the West.¹⁵ There is a denial that any values, especially those associated with former and current imperialist countries, can have universal application, which include questions on human rights for women and democratic rights for particular segments of societies (e.g. same-gender-loving persons).

When addressing the plight of poor people of color worldwide, the complexities of this debate must be engaged. Postcolonial theology's broad normative worldview concerning human rights and social justice can contribute to an idea of transnational justice. I think that these discourses' contribution can be best understood by relating their theological reflections to an idea of a global village, which can undergird and fuel a concept of transnational economic justice.

By "global village," I do not mean an essentialized "one world" or a single global order, which is fraught with imperialist meanings.¹⁶ Rather, I refer to global village as arising out of the global economic interaction and interdependence nations already experience, which creates the need for values and norms that can guide and regulate such global market interactions. As a result, this idea of global village is more an analytic category that describes an association of national communities, an association that recognizes the importance of the pursuit of social justice and a deeper sense of community.¹⁷ This idea of global village acknowledges the interdependence of nations in which the economic and cultural subjugation of one group adversely affects all members of a community or nation. Moreover, this pursuit of social justice and deeper community is ascertained locally rather than on a global scale. Because each local community has its own set of contextual problems in relation to advanced-capitalist global political economy, any norms associated with transnational economic justice may be cross-cultural but are applied differently within diverse societal contexts. Any global values worth commending that are associated with a concept of transnational economic justice should not be seen as abstractly derived but contextually framed. In other words, world community values such as a living wage (or equitable wages) could be seen as cross-cultural insofar as they improve the quality of life for all members within societies, not because these values are transcendental and abstractly universal.

Postcolonial theologies (and even liberationist theological discourses) can enrich their own theological frameworks by relating their theo-ethical values, concerns, and commitments to an idea of global village and transnational economic justice. One implicit theo-ethical value within postcolonial theologies is the concept of the *Imago Dei* or the idea that humans are made “in the image of God.” The human subject is constructed within these discourses as being made in the divine image which accords equal worth and dignity to each person, regardless of one’s race, gender, age, sexuality, nationality, and the like. This particular theological resource that frames human subjects challenges and debunks advanced-capitalist’s commodification of them. Within these discourses, the human subject is not understood as a mere commodity or object. Instead, each person is foremost seen as a human being that deserves to experience the type of equitable structures and policies that ensure his/her sense of thriving and flourishing within our present socio-economic system. This theo-ethical value rejects the commodification of human beings within international markets. The concept of *Imago Dei* can contribute to the development of such values as human equality, fairness in market exchange, and defending the most vulnerable segments of society, values that are worthy of commendation. Moreover, postcolonial theological discourses could also recommend theological concepts such as Jubilee or the idea of debt as slavery, which can provide meaningful normative orientations for cultivating an idea of global village grounded in equality and equity. These discourses’ theological understandings of social justice and flourishing can aid in the development of transnational economic justice for poor people of color around the world.

In addition, racial productions of the non-Western “cultural other” need to be challenged through a more critical postcolonial cultural literacy. Inviting social actors in the West to critically assess how representations of non-Western difference are constructed is paramount.

For example, the “Arab” is culturally constructed and represented in America and Europe as violent, dangerous, irrational, and uncivilized. The Western media portrays the majority of Arabs (and even Muslims) as an immediate threat to any civilized, democratic society. Similarly, the “African” is construed as savage, backwards, unintelligible, and dependent upon the West as a cultural savior of sorts. These racist cultural productions have a utilitarian usage. These representations fuel and justify neocolonial capitalist expansion and its exploitative practices toward people of color around the world. A postcolonial cultural literacy empowers people to “read” the real neocolonial interests that fund and sponsor such racist cultural productions of non-Western others. This type of cultural literacy is equally important to addressing how material deprivations and inequalities are sustained and strengthened within our global economy. This cultural literacy supports a transnational vision of economic justice.

This transnational vision of economic justice for the global poor is essential not only to critiquing global political economy but also *offering an alternative vision that is able to secure economic justice for poor people of color*. While this brief suggestion (that postcolonial theologies can use their theological resources to develop a transnational idea of economic justice) is not exhaustive or “thickly” described, it nonetheless does provide a departure point from which to discuss the ways in which postcolonial theologies might offer constructive strategies in building an economy of hope. It seems that their theological reflections can help fashion an idea of a global village wherein nations can acknowledge the humanity of one another and promote economic practices that reject neocolonial vices in favor of more virtuous, just ways of being in the world.

¹ Nkrumah, Kwame, *Neo-Colonialism, The Last Stage of Imperialism* (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd., 1965), 3.

² Ibid.

³ These questions are asked by Enrique Dussel in “The Sociohistorical Meaning of Liberation Theology (Reflections about its Origin and World Context),” in *Religions/Globalizations: Theories and Cases*, eds. Dwight Hopkins, Lois Ann Lorentzen, Eduardo Mendieta, and David Batstone (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001). These questions probe the implications and even dangers in using the language of globalization in relationship to marginalized communities around the world. While globalization has fueled cross-cultural dialogue and exchange, its contradictions are disclosed in the misery of numerous human sectors of society excluded from globalizing processes. While Dussel explores how these questions relate to the South, where two-thirds of the entire population of the world is located, it is also important to explore how these questions relate to impoverished, alienated communities within the United States such as African-Americans, Latinos/as, etc.

⁴ Refer to Jürgen Habermas, *Legitimation Crisis* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), *Moral Consciousness and Communicative Action* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1990), and *On Pragmatics of Social Interaction* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2001) on discussions of advanced capitalism realities.

⁵ Marx refers to commodity fetishism in his opening chapter of *Das Kapital* (1867). Marx describes commodity fetishism as the way in which commodities and money mediate human relationships so that such relationships are emptied of their human value. For example, a \$100 note is not really worth \$100 (it costs only a few cents to produce), but if people accept it as a currency, it can claim \$100 worth of goods, in which case it really seems to be worth \$100, and the goods seem to be worth \$100. The money has the power to claim \$100 worth of goods, and the goods have the power to exchange for \$100. Then it seems like the value of \$100 inheres in the money and the goods themselves. The buyer is worth \$100 to the seller, and the seller is a \$100 expense to the buyer. In considering the trade between buyer and seller, how the buyer and seller are socially related, or what their identities are, doesn't really matter (except perhaps for marketing purposes). All that matters is that \$100 trades for \$100 worth of goods.

⁶ I refer to Antonio Gramsci's concept of cultural hegemony. He describes hegemony as the way people learn to accept as natural and in their own best interests an unjust, oppressive social order. A particular unjust order educates its citizens on how to embrace as “given” certain beliefs and political conditions that work against their interests while serving the interests of the most powerful. If hegemony works as it should, there is no need for the state to employ coercive controls to maintain social order (e.g. heavy policing, torture, curfews, etc.). Instead of recognizing beliefs and practices as repressive, people come to accept these beliefs and practices as pre-ordained rather than contingent, historical, and constructed out of imbalanced power relations that privilege the interests of the elite. Refer to Antonio Gramsci, *Further selections from the prison notebooks: Antonio Gramsci*, ed. D. Boothman, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), particularly pages 150-157.

⁷ Milton Friedman, the most well-known American proponent of free-market ideology, penned two historic accounts of the significance of free-market economics for America and the larger world. In *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), he writes a series of essays that establish his position on public policy issues in relation to free-market economics. He argues that free-market economics allows for the maximization of each individual's economic interest, regardless of race, gender, class, and the like. He also argues that free-market economics is the ultimate solution to creating greater wealth for democratic societies. In *Free to Choose: A Personal Statement* (New York: Mariner Books, 1980), he argues that the free market works for all members of society (in any nation that chooses to be democratic), producing wealth for the poor and rich. He provides historical examples as a way of contending that *laissez-faire* economics has succeeded where other economic models from the past have failed.

⁸ Linda Thomas, “Macroeconomy, Apartheid, and Rituals of Healing within an African-Indigenous Church,” in *Religions/Globalizations: Theories and Cases*, eds. Dwight Hopkins, Lois Ann Lorentzen, Eduardo Mendieta, and David Batstone (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001), 139.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 137.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 138.

¹¹ *Ibid.* In fact, over ten American banks invested in the Apartheid government despite the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960. In March 1960, the South African Apartheid Nationalist government massacred black demonstrators protesting nonviolently against mandatory identification passbooks in Sharpeville.

¹² Thomas, “Macroeconomy, Apartheid, and Rituals,” 138.

¹³ While some scholars are dubious as to whether the goal is to integrate poor persons into modernizing processes (supplanting current advanced-capitalist arrangements with alternative economic models such as socialism), other scholars argue that advanced capitalist systems and its practices can be penetrated, critiqued, and transformed into more just economic arrangements that reflect mutuality and reciprocity instead of gross profit maximization. Kathryn Tanner's *Economy of Grace* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 2005) contends that our present global political economy must not be reified or its processes seen as inevitable as all economic systems are shaped and sustained by

social and political forces. She proposes a model of “theological economy” that presents subversive principles and ways of being, which can breed transformation of exploitative structures and practices within political economy. Tanner represents this tension between the radical corruptibility of capitalist structures and recognizing the need to transform such structures within political economy.

¹⁴ Linda Thomas, “Womanist Theology, Epistemology, and a New Anthropological Paradigm,” in *Living Stones in the Household of God: The Legacy and Future of Black Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 47.

¹⁵ Fred Halliday, “Global Governance: Prospects and Problems,” in *The Global Transformations Reader*, eds. David Held and Anthony McGrew (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), 440.

¹⁶ I do recognize that the idea of global village or “world community” has been grossly imperialistic throughout history. When speaking of global village, I am referring to an ideal of a plurality of morally autonomous, just communities relating to one another in a framework of peace and law rather than a single international society governed by universal morals. Moreover, in articulating global village or world community, I am rejecting the Western meta-narrative that sees global order as the natural progression of civilization (kin, tribe, city, state, etc.). I do not subscribe to this overarching imperialistic, European story of “world History” and “History’s” Hegelian march towards “civilization.”

¹⁷ Chris Brown, “The idea of World Community, in *The Global Transformations Reader*, ed. David Held and Anthony McGrew (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000), 460.