

Capitalism, "Hybrid Wars" and Confiscated Narratives: The Classico-Postmodernist Imperialism of Our Time

Md. Manzur Alam
East West University

Abstract

From the classical maxim that "empires are forged by war" to the notion of "hybrid wars", "aestheticization of war," exploitation of nation states, corporatization and commodification, imperialist powers with globalizing missions and *mission civilisatrice* have always resorted to means that the expansion of capital has sought. Though Hardt and Negri contend that "Empire", their terminology for global imperialism/capitalism, is a phantasmal, autonomous network of power where global flows of people, information, and wealth can hardly be monitored or controlled from a single metropolitan center, the reality is that the discourse and politics of neoliberal hegemony, coupled with unique exercise of power, allow the United States and its cohorts (a few powerful countries and multinational corporations) to dominate "Empire." This paper outlines the nature and *modus operandi* of this recent classico-postmodernist imperialist power project, one that combines tradition with novelty in its logic of rule, and argues that the "unholy trinity" of capital, US led imperialism and manipulated globalization has reached a climactic, volatile stage since the system it has created is undermining humanitarian values and justice. This paper also argues for a new collective mode of counter-hegemonic thinking needed to counter the kind of injustice and inhumanity spawned by late capitalism. Such resistance, the paper proposes, could be attempted through measures such as reawakening of humanitarian standards, "reinvent(ing) civil disobedience", globalizing labour movements and strengthening the structures of nation-states.

I

As theoretical overtures, TV debates, discussions, talks and conferences proliferate over issues of how the world order has substantially changed over the centuries and what the new world order is and will be like in coming decades, and as the

elements, forces and powers of the world order continue to be named and renamed, the most obvious problems that persist and intensify humanitarian crises are often bypassed for less important concerns in discussions and summits of transnational bodies created with an aim to maintaining global peace and balance. Some of the most persistent problems of our world include the ever-widening gap between rich and poor, denial of human rights in many regions, atrocities committed in military and democratic-pseudo regimes backed by world's neo-imperial powers, deaths of innocent people in the Middle East and other parts of the world, and so on. More and more people are becoming unemployed. They have less access to basic human needs, or go to sleep on the streets of this metropolis, only able to cast a last, long-lasting blank look at a TV program visible through the transparent glass of a Sony showroom.

The roots to the above and many other instances of inopportune issues and phenomena is a new world order regulated by capital, imperialism and globalization – three "different but interlinked forms and forces of exploitation and oppression in the world today" (Hussain 9). As European imperialist countries were responsible for oppressing and exploiting peoples from different parts of the world in different eras of history, many critics attribute the responsibility of today's instances of exploitation and injustice on a global scale to the USA and its supporters. Since the emergence of USA as a global power in the early years of the 20th century to the country's present heyday of power, USA has always acted shrewdly, even violently at times, to secure and also further strengthen its economical and political power. Thus, though the USA has taken judicious steps in many spheres, the country has also been accused of causing violence in different parts of the world for its own, self-centered interests. Even the very recent incidents of the Arab Spring that shook most Muslim countries in Asia and Africa are said to have been orchestrated by the US and its allies for regime change in those countries. It is thus important to discuss the ideas and works by critics like David Harvey, Arundhati Roy, Christian Salmon etc. who have attempted not only to discuss imperialism and its evils but also to analyze America's unilateral interests as the causes of various problems of our world today.

Globalization seems to have licensed an ever-increasing flow of money, products, technology and people across borders, and this fact poses a challenge to most nation-states as they try to monitor or control this flow. According to Hardt and Negri's *Empire*, "the sovereign power that governs the world" or "regulates these global exchanges" is "Empire" – which, they maintain, is the "new global

form of sovereignty...composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule" (xii). Hardt and Negri differentiate Empire from "imperialism" based on the fact that unlike imperialism, "Empire establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers" (xii). This Empire modifies the uncomplicated, spatial divisions of the three worlds by negating the rule of just one particular nation over the whole world, consolidating its own juridical, constitutional power, reducing the scope of ethics to its own usage, fighting "just wars" (10) around the globe, tending to encompass all time and history "within its ethical foundation" (11) and attempting to perpetuate its existence by suspending history.

All these aspects that form Hardt and Negri's Empire could, in most cases, be viewed as US imperialism's new order, a reconceptualization of the country's capitalist missions with its ever-changing politico-cultural global reach. The pattern of imperial rule has gone through so many stages of development and adjustment in relation to the changing history of the world (not to forget that imperialism, on the other hand, is largely responsible for changing the history of the world) that it has so far been called by many names, major and minor, starting from classical European empires that divided the world among themselves to Hardt and Negri's recent application of the upper-case term "Empire", a phenomenon of the postmodern period. Even though Hardt and Negri define Empire as a deterritorialized nexus of power, the fact that the US occupies the hot seat in it and dictates it is noteworthy when we consider that the country wields immense diplomatic and muscle power. The country has so far been instrumental in dominating global cultural, political and economical landscapes in recent times, with the help of its European allies, IMF, WTO and some corporate elites. The US as an imperialist power has both similarities with and differences from old European imperialist powers and operates through coercive strategies, manufactured consent, liquidation and cooperation. American power started to gain momentum in the aftermath of World War I, and since then the country has always found new ways of creating avenues for global supremacy and has opted to be pre-emptive to thwart potential challenges against its global domination. The classico-postmodernist tendencies of US imperialism today combine old strategies of rule such as coercion, invasion, mercantilism etc. motivated by ideas of "gold, god and glory" with an array of new strategies that leave its adversaries perplexed and guessing – strategies such as propagandas, spying, launching "holy" wars and creating and telling unique stories to justify and preserve its imperial missions.

Thus, the idea of today's imperialism that largely serves the unilateral interests of the US could be termed either as Empire, US empire or US imperialism. All these terms refer to the country's apparently imperial traits, its penchant for direct control over some countries through military bases, or its adaptation of a strategy combining coercion and consent, all of which is for capital accumulation. Ellen Meiksins Wood suggests that "one of the most important characteristics of capitalism is that the economic hegemony of capital can extend far beyond the limits of direct political domination". This characteristic, he contends, is true both in cases of relations between capital and labour and between imperial and subordinate states (128). And, the US, whose economic control of the globe exceeds its political control, surely excels in what it takes to be the major hegemon in today's capitalist world: "Money, productive capacity, and military might are the three legs upon which hegemony stands under capitalism" (Harvey 41). A sign of the US's military supremacy over the rest of the world is its military bases in about 150 countries of the world. Remaining as legacy of its engagements in warfare in the past and established in the name of peace-keeping missions, these panoptic bases actually help to secure markets, exert unhindered export of natural resources to the US and watch over signs of any potential threat to the country's elevated sense of security. Quoting from Richard Butler's Op-Ed piece in the *New York Times* (January 18, 2002), John Bellamy Foster notes how the war in Afghanistan helped the Californian oil company Unocal build a pipeline across Afghanistan and Pakistan. He observes that "...without a strong US military presence in the region, through the establishment of bases as a result of the war, the construction of such a pipeline would almost certainly have proven impracticable" (64). Ironically, although understandable since it is a part of its attempt to secure the political and capitalist interests, such bases around the world have apparently been used by the US to spark and then nurture sectarian violence in different countries and to maintain an aggressive posture for the US so that it can launch attacks on different regions of the world to further its varied interests.

One of America's major sources of strength is that it is perceived to be the leader of the capitalist countries of the world. Even though capitalism has always adjusted itself to the contemporary order, the fact that capitalism depreciates labour, impoverishes people, maximizes profit and exploits nation state has always remained ingrained in its operative schema. Although the nature of capitalism has not changed much over the centuries, the question that needs to be asked now is where capitalism is poised now, and what the coordinates and characteristics of capitalism are in the new millennium. Lenin in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage*

of Capitalism (1916) indicated that capitalism had in his time evolved into a higher stage through its transition from free competition to monopoly. He declared, "...imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism" (105). To him capitalism and imperialism have become inseparable as they have joined hands to create monopolies that divide the world among themselves and regulate economic life. Lenin's idea of capitalism is still very much relevant today although the main control of global politics, resources and markets has shifted by now from Great Britain to the US. In his book *The Wor(l)d in Question*, Azfar Hussain repeatedly uses the term "late monopoly capital" (13) to recognize the endless complexity and flexibility he detects in the nature of capitalism today. Hussain borrows his term from Ernest Mendel's idea of "late capitalism" though Hussain appears repetitive in his attempts to tag the word "late" to capital's contemporary stage. The "lateness" he attaches to capitalism echoes Lenin's idea of monopoly capital though Hussain thinks that capital's capability to monopolize in recent times is unprecedented. However, Ray Kiely feels that Lenin's characterization of imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism is somewhat 'unconvincing' because capital in Lenin's time actually flowed between imperialist countries whereas "there was actually limited capital accumulation in the colonies" (59). This assertion actually reveals a futuristic Lenin whose insight is more tenable now than when it was formulated. The world today has indeed been witnessing an uncontrollable flow of capital crisscrossing virtually the whole globe. In today's-'globalized' economy, the influence of capital is so diffuse that it can take every possible direction, even though the global market is yet far from being integrated.

Apart from the changes capitalism has brought to the nature of power or domination, US imperialism's distinctive nature lies in the lessons it has learned from history in promoting itself from a colony to an imperial power. With the final phase of decolonization in the wake of World War II, when there was rapid disintegration of the European empires, mostly in Africa and Asia, it soon became clear to analysts that the era of uncomplicated, direct conquest of a country and subjugation of its populace by setting up a colony was over. What was clear was that only a complex, capitalist exercise of power backed by support maneuvered from different powerful countries and supranational bodies and organisms could be sustained in the long run.

The way the US operates its imperial missions, or has so far operated them in the Middle East, is noteworthy. The mix of a complicated version of the old "divide and rule" policy, and the so-called "war on terror"—this is how the US operates now. There have been attempts to divide the populations of the Middle

East and Central Asia according to their ethnic, religious, sectarian, national, and political differentiations. Conflicts between Kurds and Arabs in Iraq and Shiite and Sunni Muslims throughout the Middle East are assumed to have been aggravated by the US and its allies. Besides, the war between Iran and Iraq, the Gulf War, "wars on terror" - all these suggest a common recipe: make an autocrat, have him knock down the other(s), and then remove the very despot himself when a regime change is imperative. This formula has been effective not only in securing the oil market for the US but also in maintaining political control over the Middle East while strengthening US military might in this region, through creation of new bases. John Bellamy Foster observes:

"In 1990, prior to the Gulf War, the United States had no bases in South Asia and only 10 percent as many in the Middle East/Africa as in 1947...The appearance of new bases in the Middle East, South Asia, and Latin America and Plan Colombia therefore can be seen as a reassertion of direct US military and imperial power in areas where this had to some extent eroded." (62-63)

II

In addition to its unprecedented concentration of military and muscle power, US imperialism backs itself through its capacity for creating and telling stories - narratives that earn it support from transnational bodies and ex-imperial countries, keep a whole host of powerful countries in or out of its business, and attempt to silence voices of resistance at home and abroad. Through a synchronization of fiction with reality, US forces of power, which includes the Oval Office, Department of State, international proponents of the US cause and the corporate elites, manufacture stories to frame reality and expand its political and economic influence.

In his intriguing book *Storytelling: Bewitching the Modern Mind*, Christian Salmon thus discusses how technocapitalist US imperialism has adopted strategies of power to such an extent that the modern mind has been immersed in an illusory universe that maneuvers perceptions, frames feelings, behavior and ideas, and "...tacks artificial narratives on to reality" (10). Salmon opens his book by describing a video game used to train American troops fighting in Iraq. This game was developed by the Institute for Creative Technologies founded by the Pentagon in 1999. This research center at the University of Southern California makes use of Hollywood's creativity in creating stories to augment Pentagon's training methods. This novel role of stories in smartening up war tactics reflect

the fact that, as Salmon puts it, "The empire has confiscated narrative" (12). The US's use of extraordinary narratives ranges from domestic election campaigns to creating new political realities, creating fake terrorists and launching wars on countries labeled as "failed states" by US master storytellers.

From Agamemnon to Bush of America, the classical formula that "Empires are forged by war" (*Troy*, the movie) has not lost much of its application; it is only the tactics, *modus operandi* and methods of launching wars that have had to be so fine-tuned in successive imperial eras. In the post Cold-war age, the nature of modern warfare has evolved innovatively. It has now earned brand names such as 'hybrid war', 'postmodern war', 'aesthetic war' etc for itself. In his book *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*, Frank Hoffman reviews the background and the changing temperament of warfare in our time. He uses the term "hybrid wars" to redefine modern day wars that incorporate different modes of warfare that include conventional and unconventional capabilities, tactics, propaganda activities, indiscriminate violence, coercion etc. The wars the US launched in the last few decades have employed combinations of different types of warfare that were unprecedented, and in effect, have been continuously evolving. Battlefields and the actual site of warfare have now been relocated and are in cyberspace, international forums and the media. These virtual wars are being fought in a new hybrid environment where along with old weapons, "...data, systems for decoding information, and storylines whose ultimate goal is not so much the annihilation of the enemy as the mythical construction of the enemy" have been employed to a great extent (Salmon 121). The US fights these postmodernist "hybrid wars" all over the globe. Hardt and Negri observes that "Empire is formed not on the basis of force itself but on the basis of the capacity to present force as being in the service of right and peace" (15). Wars are thus "aestheticized" by the US on a regular basis through a whole host of propaganda activities and advertising that go on prior to and during a war. Even some post-war justifications are smartly drawn into the act through supposedly humanitarian initiatives such as healthcare, rehabilitation etc. carried out on a small scale on a war- evacuated landscape.

The US led 'wars on terror' of recent decades surely exemplify all the above-mentioned brands of war, and a discussion on US motives behind Iraq war would illuminate why all these identical wars are fought in the first place. The actual reasons that the US went to war against Iraq deserve scrutiny, now that most of the truths are out. David Harvey explains why "there is indeed a long history of governments in trouble domestically seeking to solve their problems

either by foreign adventures or by manufacturing foreign threats to consolidate solidarities at home" (12). Harvey then provides accounts of how the country was in a more troubled situation in the year 2002 than its near past. Problems such as recession, unemployment, corporate scandals, messy healthcare, poor administration were threatening the stability of the US. However, those who opposed the war and doubted its necessity think that oil was the key motive behind the war as Iraq was a threat to the flow of oil to international markets. After all, "whoever controls the world's oil controls the world's markets," (Roy 37). That is why US's capitalist precautions sought to dismantle Iraq. It was reported after the war how the then Vice President Cheney's old company Halliburton won billion dollars of contract for oil services immediately after the war. Arundhati Roy, while quoting from Thomas L. Friedman's national bestseller *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, observes how imperialist power and corporate globalization have joined hands to secure markets. To quote from Friedman: "... McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the designer of the US Air Force F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies to flourish is called the US Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps" (464). Another argument that might make it clear that Iraq war was no holy mission is the time chosen for and reasons offered behind this war. There was no proof that Saddam's Iraq had weapons for mass destruction. Besides, he was not attacked earlier when, backed by the US and its European allies, he was conducting his worst atrocities of killing hundreds of Kurdish people by using chemical weapons. He thus had to be removed when he became an obstacle pain for America's global interests and internal economy.

III

The proponents of globalization hypothesize it as an effective apparatus for creating homogeneity among nation states, thereby reducing disparity among them. But in reality, globalization has inherently become an important tool for sustaining imperial interests that depend on a system built up by cross-communications and interactions of multiple countries behind which lies the logic of expansion of neoliberal capitalism limited to a great extent to the trajectory of few corporate elites. The monopoly power of advanced capitalist countries dominate trade, finance, production, services and flows through neoliberal free trade and open capital markets, and for that purpose they make use of transnational financial bodies and governments of different nation-states. The nation state is surely one such apparatus whose legal and political authority over its people is required to maintain the economic and operational stability of

the systems of capitalism. The state is used to keep a class from owning property so that these people can be exploited whenever required. They are not allowed to cross borders at their will, and are forced to fulfill capitalism's growing demand for labour by bringing out other family members who also join the labour force for survival. On the other hand, transnational financial bodies, dominated by the US, help the global network of capital to function smoothly. David Harvey observes: "The emergence of a 'Wall Street-Treasury' complex within the United States, able to control institutions such as the IMF and to project vast financial power across the world through a network of other financial and governmental institutions, has exercised massive influence over the dynamics of global capitalism in recent years." (134)

Although globalization has brought the world closer in many respects, its impact is not identical or symmetrical in all fields. As Eric Hobsbawm points out, "We can have a globalized economy, we can aspire to a globalized culture, we certainly have a globalized technology and a single global science, but politically speaking, we have a world that remains in reality pluralist and divided into territorial states" (43). Globalization, indeed, has widened the gap between the economic and political power of capital and has helped transnational capitalism, represented by Microsoft, McDonald's, Nike etc., extend its reach and systems beyond the grasp and boundaries of the nation state. One common trait that the transnational corporations or the TNCs share is their intent to maximize profit by exploiting the pools of cheap labour in the third world countries. The undaunted facility that they have in such countries is cheap labour coupled with necessary supports from the state to have the labour force in control; for example, Suharto's Indonesia in the mid-1960s experienced what amounted to almost a ban on trade union activities. The Bangladesh government's recent agreement with ConocoPhillips, an USA energy giant, for exploration in two deepwater gas blocks in the Bay of Bengal offshore reflects a similar condition where Bangladesh will get only 20% of the extracted gas and the rest, as the agreement goes, could be bought by Bangladesh. Studies reflect that most TNCs earn more revenues outside than in their countries of origin, and their global reach and profitability have also earned them a place amongst the world's biggest economic entities. According to data stated by D. Steven White, and released in July 2010 by *Fortune Magazine* and the World Bank, the world's largest 175 economic entities in terms of their revenue generation include 109 corporations (62.3%). Wal-Mart, Royal Dutch/Shell, Exxon Mobil, and British Petroleum rank among the top 40 entities in the world, far above countries such as Finland, Portugal, Ireland, Malaysia and New Zealand.

Corporate globalization claims increase in the world's total income though the computation leaves out the fact that the number of the poor across the world has increased accordingly. It also threatens democracy of poorer countries by impairing their legal functioning as they attempt to take necessary reforms for privatization devoid of necessary state intervention. This practice goes against the interest of the poor and forces them to buy those things as commodities that they once enjoyed without spending money. The term "globalization" should thus be seen as "corporate globalization", "globalization of capitalism" and so on, to highlight specific evils of the phenomena over the idea of righteousness that the generic use of the term suggests. In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels too hint at the fact that the general idea of globalization is an outcome of the dynamics inherent in the very nature of capitalism that seeks to expand its dominion everywhere in the world: "The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connexions everywhere" (5).

IV

Because of its preference for profit over people and its contradictory practices, capitalist empire is in itself an anarchist, contradictory system that always needs newer terrains and surplus labour at its disposal for exploitation. Capitalism reduces wages for labour but needs more consumption on part of even the labour force, which is one of its contradictory logics. The worst sufferers of the capitalist expansion are thus the labour force who are devalued constantly and are ultimately caught in a system that seems to dehumanize them eternally. As Marx points out in *Capital*: "Capital is dead labor, which, vampire-like, lives only by sucking living labor, and lives the more, the more labor it sucks" (342). The singular motto of endless capital accumulation in space and time also ceaselessly searches for profits indiscriminately, thus creating tensions, according to David Harvey, "...between competition and monopoly, between concentration and dispersal, between centralization and decentralization, between fixity and motion, between dynamism and inertia, between different scales of activity..."(101). These tensions lead to capitalism's creation of a geographical landscape to run its activities, only to exhaust it in the end and look for a new landscape. Again, capitalism thrives on competition but after a point it has to foil competition to survive, or look for new places to expand its horizon. Moreover, through necessary intervention of the nation state, capitalist globalization, to a large extent, prevents integration of markets universally to enhance the profitability of capital, maintaining an ironic balance between opening borders to global capital and dissuading the integration of markets.

As new inter-imperial rivalries seem improbable in present times, the vulnerability of US empire thus springs from its over-ambitious capitalism and inner contradictions. Aijaz Ahmad rules out the possibility of China becoming a possible threat to US ascendancy because, according to him, "China is extremely vulnerable to the United States, militarily and economically..." (60). Ahmad argues that the US is very much capable of creating internal conflicts and separatist movements in China. This longevity that Ahmad claims for US empire could be negated by the fact that the country's global, capitalist ambitions and international conflicts are too expensive and expansive to sustain in the long run. Citing the information that the United States spends billions of dollars every year on nuclear weapons, intelligence, modern warships and aircrafts, and sends out millions of soldiers to fight, Fidel Castro in one of his speeches delivered on 3 July 1998 envisaged that this thoughtless culture of the US's hunger for domination would one day make the country suffer a profound economic crisis, more so because of its unsustainable stock markets and inflation of value. Castro sounds quite prophetic when he says: "We maintain, based on mathematical facts, that such a neoliberal globalization is not sustainable; that the crisis is inevitable" (Speech delivered on 3 July 1998).

Though power relations in capitalist systems are often so diffuse that it is tough to find a target of resistance, if any exploitations are to be opposed in the first place, it has to be those done by the US's capitalist, tri-continental missions. There are countries such as Cuba and Venezuela that are continuously holding onto their ideologies against US aggression. Leaders around the world could use Latin America as a model where an ideological revival of the successes against Spanish imperialism in the past is now being assimilated and practiced by leaders and activists against present-day oppressive power. In recent times, the ideologies and praxis of the recently deceased Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez, known as New Bolivarianism which "... combines continental nationalism and social-democratic reforms fuelled by oil revenues", have been posing a massive moral challenge to US expansionism (Ali, *Pirates of the Caribbean: Axis of Hope* 41). Having paid off his country's debts to the World Bank and the IMF, Chávez freed his country's economy from the clutches of such lending institutions that promote the priorities of the Washington Consensus. He, along with a few other Latin American leaders, has already set up a new financial institution called "Bank of the South" run by Latin American nations and has vowed to support it with Venezuela's thriving oil revenues.

Getting velocity around the world is also an increasing amount of public opinion, movements and labour organizations shaping against labour exploitation, corporatization and US aggression. Anti-imperial thinkers and

activists now need to form close ties among all these scattered initiatives and movements fighting against the same set of evils. Arundhati Roy offers the following guideline for confronting empire:

Our strategy should be not only to confront Empire, but to lay siege to it. To deprive it of oxygen. To shame it. To mock it. With our art, our music, our literature, our stubbornness, our joy, our brilliance, our sheer relentlessness - and our ability to tell our stories. Stories that are different from the ones we're being brainwashed to believe. (86)

Roy's passionate outcry should be mingled with the voices raised in organized movements to challenge the capitalist empire's exploitative authority that denies the rights of the vast majority. Roy also urges "reinvent(ing) civil disobedience in a million different ways" (85) to render the power structures of empire inactive. Inspiration can be found from 15 February 2003, days before the Iraq war when over eight million people converged on different streets of different continents to dissuade the US and its allies from attacking Iraq. Unsuccessful though it was, Tariq Ali still calls it, the "first truly global mobilization unprecedented in size, scope or scale..." (*Front Lines I*). Movements such as this and labour movements scattered here and there need to be truly globalized to face an adversary that is globalized in its extreme form.

The manipulation of governments of most nation states by financial institutions such as IMF and WTO to strengthen the capitalist empire is now globally recognized by experts as the major problem of political economy in most third world countries. To quote from Harvey again: "With the core of the political problem so clearly recognized, it should be possible to build outwards into a broader politics of creative destruction mobilized against the dominant regime of neo-liberal imperialism foisted upon the world by the hegemonic capitalist powers" (179-180). If a just world government is not established, or some supranational bodies like the UN are not strengthened to provide regulation to this capitalist global village, then this volatile situation might turn into an anarchist one, leading to regional power conflicts and in effect a more destabilized world. The immediate task at hand then is to strengthen the structures of nation-states and force the representatives of people to work for the cause of the masses, not for corporations. The situation is dire now, but things can get even worse unless we come up with the right measures so that the evils of Neoliberal hegemony and the stranglehold of military might incarnated in the shape of the "United States of North America" and its close associates do not reach the point of no return in its mission to exploit the rest of the world.

Works Cited

Ahmad, Aijaz. "Imperialism of Our Time." *The New Imperial Challenge: Socialist Register 2004*. Eds. Leo Panitch and Colin Leys. Kolkata: K P Bagchi & Company, 2004. 49-71.

Ali, Tariq. *Pirates of the Caribbean: Axis of Hope*. New Delhi: LeftWord Books, 2007.

_____. "Re-colonizing Iraq." *Front Lines: Selections from New Left Review*. Calcutta: Seagull Books, 2006.

Castro, Fidel. Closing Speech, The International Meeting Economía'98. International Conference Center, Havana. 3 July 1998. Accessed December 6, 2006. <http://www.cuba.cu/gobierno/discursos/1998/ing/f030798i.html>

Foster, John Bellamy. *Naked Imperialism: The US Pursuit of Global Dominance*. Delhi: Aakar Books, 2006.

Friedman, Thomas L. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books, 2000.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. London: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Harvey, David. *The New Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Antonio Polito. *The New Century: Eric Hobsbawm in Conversation with Antonio Polito*. Trans. Allan Cameron. London: Abacus, 2000.

Hoffman, Frank. *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*. Arlington: Potomac Institute Press, 2007.

Hussain, Azfar. *The Wor(l)d in Question*. Dhaka: Samhati Publications, 2008.

Kiely, Ray. *Empire in the Age of Globalisation*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman, 2007.

Lenin, V.I. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1965.

Marx, Karl. *Capital, Volume I*. Trans. Ben Fowkes. New York: Penguin, 1990.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. "The Communist Manifesto." Trans. Samuel Moore. Encyclopædia Britannica. 2009. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 07 Dec. 2009 <<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/129206/The-Communist-Manifesto>>.

Roy, Arundhati. *An Ordinary Person's Guide to Empire*. New Delhi: Penguin Books, 2005.

Salmon, Christian. *Storytelling: Bewitching the Modern Mind*. Trans. David Macey. London: Verso, 2010.

Troy. Dir. Wolfgang Petersen. Perf. Brad Pitt, Eric Bana, Orlando Bloom, Diane Kruger, Sean Bean and Brian Cox. Warner Bros. Pictures, 2004. Film.

White, Steven. Home page. 07 July 2011. <<http://dstevenwhite.com/2010/09/13/the-top-175-global-economic-entities-2009-2/>>.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. "Globalisation and the State: Where is the Power of Capital?" *Anti-Capitalism*. Ed. Alfredo Saad-Filho. New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited, 2007. 127-141.