



Deepening, broadening and re-asserting a postcolonial interrogative space in organization studies

Organization

18(3) 275–302

© The Author(s) 2011

Reprints and permission: sagepub.com

co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1350508411398996

org.sagepub.com



Gavin Jack

La Trobe University, Australia

Robert Westwood

University of Technology, Sydney, Australia

Nidhi Srinivas

The New School, New York, USA

Ziauddin Sardar

City University, London, UK

Introduction

A postcolonial interrogative space has finally, and we believe belatedly, emerged in management and organization studies (MOS). Since the term ‘postcolonial’ began to appear in the literature around the mid-1990s, there has been growing interest and some significant contributions that have conceptualized and empirically investigated the nexus of the postcolonial and organization. However, this seeming flourish should not be overstated; it is still a somewhat quiet and tentative voice around the margins of orthodox MOS. We believe that it is an interrogative space that needs to be deepened, broadened and re-asserted in order to contribute to the development of a more critical and heterodox examination of organizations and organizing. It is the starting point for this special issue that the diverse and rich resources of postcolonial studies in the humanities and wider social sciences have been only very selectively mined for productive dialogue with management and organization studies (MOS). Consider the following:

Corresponding author:

Gavin Jack, Graduate School of Management, La Trobe University, Vic 3086, Australia

Email: g.jack@latrobe.edu.au

- A book declares there is an *India Way* (Cappelli et al., 2010), and that a collection of distinctive management practices explain the superior economic performance of Indian corporations and the Indian economy in recent times. However, discussion of what precisely distinguishes these management practices is relegated to exhortations of trusteeship based on what are deemed Indian cultural values in an echo of *The Post-Confucian Hypothesis* (Bond and Hofstede, 1988; Redding, 1990).
- In San Cristobal de las Casas in the Chiapas, Mexico, the Universidad de la Tierra displays in its corridor an *organigrama* (an organization chart) of the formal units, authority and leadership systems through which the Ejercito Zapatista Liberacion Nacional (EZLN) and its supporters manage themselves. The organigram emphasizes autonomous, decentralized units only loosely connected to one another. This atypical organizational form reflects, among other things, the suspicions the EZLN holds in relation to both the Mexican state apparatus and the free market system (for related commentary see, for instance, Joseph and Nugent, 1994; Toledo, 2000).
- A woman, let us call her Lakshmi, endures every night a demanding commute to her job in a call center in Bannerghatta, Bangalore. Once there she becomes 'Carol' and calls various people in the United Kingdom and the United States, to remind them to pay their pending credit card bills in a scene and an identity game repeated in call centres across the 'developing world' (for related commentary see, for instance, Das et al., 2008; Ng and Mitter, 2006).
- Malea is a Filipina domestic helper for a wealthy Italian family in Genoa. The male head of the household seeks to impose himself on her sexually. When she refuses, he accuses her of stealing, sacks her and has her deported. This puts an immediate end to the vital repatriated funds she has been sending home monthly that supported her extended family in northern Luzon (for related commentary see, for instance, Lan, 2003; Tacoli, 1999).
- An Aboriginal woman approaches the front door of a Health Service Clinic in Rockhampton, Central Queensland, Australia. On entering the imposing colonial-style building, she heads to the large desk to ask the non-Aboriginal receptionist where the Indigenous Health Clinic is located. She is told that it is at the back of the building. On arrival in the waiting area of the clinic, she sits down and looks at the painting on the wall, Frederick McCubbin's (1904) *The Pioneer*, portraying the pioneering spirit of the white settler in the Australian bush (see Fredericks, 2009).
- A young scholar from Uganda completes his doctorate in organization studies at a well-known US university following a Ugandan bachelor's degree and an MBA from a UK business school. He has been well grounded in the epistemology, theory and literature that characterize mainstream organization studies in the Global North. He returns home to a lecturing post at a Ugandan university, and wants to do research that is publishable in international journals, an expectation of the performance management regime at his university. He scrutinizes the leading English-language journals in the field. In formulating his research interests he carefully considers what is being published in those journals and concludes that he needs to do research that uses Western-developed theoretical constructs and measurement scales and that it would be advisable to tackle issues that can be explicitly put into comparison with the Global North (for related commentary see, for instance, Alatas, 2003; Jack and Westwood, 2009).

Each of these scenarios signifies an important contemporary issue, or set of issues. Furthermore, each signifies a possible legitimate intersection of postcolonialism and organization studies.

However, we might ask whether, as things stand, the postcolonial in organization studies actually speaks for these themes and people? Our own response is that, for the most part, not yet, and not fully nor forcefully enough. Indeed, it should probably be noted that a number of the sources we cite in relation to the scenarios above are drawn from outside of organization studies. It is pertinent to ask, therefore, about the nature and status of the postcolonial in organization studies. What has it contributed thus far? What manner of postcolonial concern has been received from the humanities and social sciences by MOS? What are the attendant limitations and omissions? What are the prospects for a broader, more thorough and productive interrogation? We consider these questions in this essay both as a means for evaluating and stimulating debate on the postcolonial and organization as well as introducing and positioning the five articles that constitute this special issue. We begin with a selective representation of the broad scholarly terrain of postcolonialism.

A brief sketch of postcolonialism

Without embarking on a summary of postcolonialism (good overviews are available in Ashcroft et al., 2006; Loomba, 1998; McLeod, 2000; Moore-Gilbert, 1997; Young, 2001) we might suggest that ‘the postcolonial’ is a broad rubric for examining a range of social, cultural, political, ethical and philosophical questions that recognize the salience of the colonial experience and its persisting aftermath. In disciplinary terms, postcolonialism emerged from departments and scholars of comparative literature and literary criticism (primarily in the US and Australia). Such an institutional genesis accounts for the importance of issues of language, culture, difference and representation to the developing body of work on postcolonial themes.

It is not uncommon for the publication of Said’s *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* in 1978 to be cited as a foundational moment for postcolonial studies, cementing such important concerns with representation—refracted through conceptions of discourse, Othering and ethics—into the field. Said critically examined the discourse of European colonialism as portrayed in an array of sources during the period for formal European Empire. Theoretically indebted to Foucault and Gramsci, Said describes the manifold discursive forms (classifications, categories, images) — and their linguistic organization into binary oppositions—through which these sources culturally constructed notions of the Orient (the non-West), and also the Occident (the West) as a fictive reality. This discourse juxtaposed the West and the non-West in binary, asymmetrical terms; the former considered superior, civilized, developed, moral, scientific; the latter inferior, uncivilized, backward, immoral and superstitious. Said’s insights into Othering processes are as valid today as they are in the texts he surveyed. New varieties of cultural racism, such as those directed towards Muslims in Europe, are simply a reformulation of old stereotypes. The ‘right turn’ in Europe, encapsulated in the rhetoric of the far right and of anti-immigration (De Genova, 2010), has resulted in the growth in political influence of the Freedom Party and its anti-Muslim policies in the Netherlands, the election of anti-Muslim MPs in Sweden, and the banning of the burqa in France and Belgium.

Said’s analysis of *Orientalism* describes a discourse that produced a ‘colonial difference’ through which both the colonizer and the colonized were interpellated. As an ideological system, *Orientalism* was deployed to justify Empire and to bring of civilization and progress to ‘the natives’. More broadly, it articulated a European modernity (or more specifically British, French, German and other notions of modernity), one that was transposed onto the colonies through economic and cultural imperialism, military power, death and dispossession. Mufti (2005) labels this notion that history happened first in Europe, and only then elsewhere, ‘informal developmentalism’. With European powers imagining themselves as the theoretical subject of all historical knowledge, the history of other non-Western and colonized cultures is restricted to and refracted

through the knowledge structures of the West. This parochial view of world history was nonetheless posited as a universal vector for progress (Sardar, 1999). Postcolonial theory, as an ethical critique, attempts to provincialize (Chakrabarty, 2000) such a Eurocentric historical narrative. The overall concern of postcolonial studies has always been, and will always be, what Scott (1999: 12) describes as ‘the decolonisation of representation; the decolonisation of the West’s theory of the non-West’. This early interest in colonial discourse—and its provincialization and decolonization—is also reflected in the works of Bhabha (1990, 1994) and Spivak (1985, 1987, 1990, 1999) who, with Said, are viewed as the ‘Holy Trinity’ of postcolonial (High) theory. Since 1978, there has been a widening and deepening of postcolonial theory and analysis that cuts across and brings into tension a range of historical, discursive and materialist/systemic perspectives. As a result, ‘the postcolonial’ is now a multifaceted and contested term in at least three respects.

First, the intellectual and theoretical resources offered by postcolonialism are varied and reflect a complex provenance, one that extends beyond the ‘Holy Trinity’. Scholarship includes *inter alia*: critical examinations of, and protestations against, the colonial experience in work by resistance leaders such as Guevara (2002), Memmi (1965, 1968) and Fanon (1952/1986, 1961/1967); writers on race, revolution and the Négritude movement exemplified by Césaire (1955/1972), Glissant (1981/1989, 2005) and Senghor (1998); writers/speakers on decolonization and national independence such as Nehru and Nkrumah; dependency theorists such as Frank (1971, 1978) and historical sociologists like Moore (1978) and Wallerstein (1974, 1979, 2005); writers on re-historicizing the Third World and accounting for the subaltern, as led by Guha (1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1987); Third World and transnational feminist writers such as Mohanty (1984, 2003; Mohanty and Alexander, 1997) and Trinh Minh Ha (1989); and finally neo-Marxist and transnational materialist accounts of imperialism and neo-colonialism such as those offered by Lazarus (1990), Ahmad (1992) and San Juan Jr (1984, 1986). On this latter point, tensions between transnational and neo-Marxist writers (whom Moore-Gilbert refers to as ‘postcolonial analysts’) and others more interested in cultural or textual critique inspired by poststructuralist theory (whom Moore-Gilbert refers to as ‘postcolonial theorists’) have resulted in calls for work that articulate, or potentially bridge, their analytic differences. Furthermore, each of these trajectories and positions has its contemporary variants adding to the rich resources available for critical organizational scholars to consider and deploy.

Second, further complication exists in the configuration of postcolonial studies at the intersection of three distinct though at times overlapping moments: the *postcolonial* (or *postcolonialism*) as an epistemic critique; the *post-colonial* as a historically portentous moment; and *postcoloniality* as a condition experienced within the post-colonial. These different significations of the postcolonial co-exist within and beyond our field, yet their inter-relationships remain under-explored, as do their connections to other modes of critique under the banners of anticolonialism and decolonization within MOS. What they share with respect to MOS, however, is a commitment to questioning the prevailing ontologies, epistemologies and methods of the academic centre and offering alternatives to neo-positivistic and neo-modernist perspectives characteristic of the field. Another commonality is the recognition that the postcolonial is primarily an interrogative space not a theoretical discipline. There is not one postcolonial, nor one school of theory, rather an interpretive sensibility conditioned by different thinkers and positions, some of whom are mentioned above.

Third, there is internal and external criticism of postcolonialism as a scholarly domain. Above we noted the sometimes considerable antagonism that exists between postcolonial ‘theorists’ and postcolonial ‘analysts’. For Marxist scholars, the use of High Theory, especially in its poststructuralist incarnations, and the emphasis on writing and culture, is an aestheticizing distraction from the anticolonial goal of social change. Recent and renewed interest by humanities scholars in the

anticolonial scholarship and politics of Fanon represents an attempt to re-think an agenda for resistance and decolonization. External critique also exists, typically from historians who argue that the demarcation of a 'postcolonial critique' infelicitously circumscribes the 'proper' concerns of historians who had been dealing with colonial questions long before (and some would argue with greater success and complexity than) Said. Indeed, Moore-Gilbert (1997) notes that there was plenty of work by Arab scholars that pre-figured Said's arguments in *Orientalism*. Moreover, and as we discuss later, the prefix 'post' causes protest, especially from indigenous scholars. When used to signify a temporal disjuncture and ending of colonialism, the postcolonial is viewed as naively and problematically obscuring continuing colonial oppression.

This quick sketch is suggestive of the rich and diverse scholarship that currently exists in the wider humanities and social sciences. Drawing that compass, it is not an exaggeration to say that MOS has been excessively frugal in its consumption of such a panoply of resources. Each strand and facet has a potential or emergent place within MOS, but many have been glossed over in our field's reception of the key theoretical frames, themes and disputes of postcolonialism. This is despite, or perhaps because of, the conditions of reception for the postcolonial in organization studies.

Receiving postcolonialism in MOS

Whilst, as noted earlier, the mid- to late 1990s witnessed the earliest explicit use of postcolonialism as a set of intellectual resources with which to interrogate MOS, the conditions for its emergence were in development much before that time. There were certainly frequent critical interrogations of MOS orthodoxy that were resonant with subsequent postcolonial readings, but which were not located within a postcolonial frame. These interrogations are important precursors for postcolonial organizational analysis.

For one, MOS orthodoxy has been persistently criticized for its parochialism and ethnocentrism. Such accusations are embedded in longstanding critiques (for instance, Boyacigiller and Adler, 1991; Redding, 1994; Roberts and Boyacigiller, 1984) as well as more recent ones, some within orthodox domains, (for instance, Rousseau and Fried, 2001; Tsui, 2004) and others more critically located (e.g. Jack et al., 2008; Özbilgin, 2004; Wong-Mingji and Mir, 1997). Boyacigiller and Adler, for instance, describe how organization science suffers from three types of parochialism: contextual, qualitative, and quantitative. Contextual parochialism denotes the primacy afforded to US-centric issues and interests, whilst qualitative parochialism indexes the underpinning of the core concepts and orthodoxy in management and organization theory by US values and cultural orientations. Perhaps this situation is an inevitable outcome of the development of the field in the post World War Two period and the contemporaneous emergence of the US as a hyperpower. The non-West was increasingly on the receiving end of a deluge of (US) exported management and business ideas and practices that swept in on the shirt-tails of globalizing international business or was exported thence in a more direct way through the machineries of US/Western management/business knowledge and education. As for quantitative parochialism, Boyacigiller and Adler note that the majority of scholars publishing in MOS, and the countries and contexts on which they report, are very limited, leaving large parts of the world unrepresented. Jack and Westwood's (2009) recent review of international management scholarship shows that research in the area is predominantly carried out by scholars from the US and a small number of Western European countries, and that it draws overwhelmingly from sources published in the same locations. From a postcolonial perspective, these forms of parochialism gesture towards an epistemic colonization and cultural imperialism at the heart of MOS, though not uncontested.

In addition to this critique, there have been numerous attempts to articulate indigenous, non-Western and context-sensitive accounts of management and organization. These can be found around the world and again some are located in rather orthodox discursive positions (for instance, Andres, 1989; Chen, 1995; Kadra, 1990; Putti, 1991; Redding, 1990, 2002; Yeung, 2007) whilst others have expressly embraced a resistive and critical indigeneity (for instance, Chandrasekara, 2009; Gopinath, 1998; Henry and Pene, 2001; Mbigi, 1997). This does not even address those locally-produced accounts that are not published in English and do not show up in standard literature searches. What is also noticeable is that many of those accounts that are published in English and in international publishing houses, have been constructed by Western scholars speaking on behalf of the other in non-Western contexts (for instance Blunt, 1983; Pascale and Athos, 1981; Redding, 1990). To that extent they might still be positioned as appropriative and participant in the intellectual and cultural hegemony of the West, as Xu (2008), for instance, implies in her reading of Redding's (1990) work on Chinese business and management.

A different condition for the emergence of postcolonialism was the emergence within the field of post-structuralism and postmodernism and of the Critical Management Studies movement. The interrogation of MOS through the resources of post-structuralism/postmodernism dates to the mid-1980s (Cooper, 1986, 1987, 1989; Cooper and Burrell, 1988; Westwood, 1987). Critical Management Studies emerged a little later in the early 1990s (Alvesson and Willmott, 1992, 1996). Both these moments served to open up MOS and challenge its neo-functional and neo-positivist orthodoxy, its universalistic and totalizing pretensions. Scholars have had some success in introducing new pluralities and multivocalities into the field that served as a receptive ground for the emergence of postcolonialism. Calás and Smircich's (1999) well-known essay on what might await us 'past-postmodernism', for instance, provides an early exhortation for greater attention to the postcolonial. And with a postcolonial stream at every CMS conference since its inception—and with published output from most (notably Banerjee et al., 2009; Prasad, 2003a)—this scholarly domain has also facilitated the growth of postcolonial organizational analysis.

For reasons hard to fathom in light of the propitious conditions noted above, the kind of postcolonial critique that helped marshal such concerns so well in other fields of inquiry has been slow to take purchase in MOS and has done so only in a very selective manner. For one, postcolonial organizational analysts have very much relied upon the 'Holy Trinity' of Said, Bhabha and Spivak as resources to engage in textual/discourse based critiques of the field. Perhaps this is a reflection of the fascination with language and its constitutive effects that came with the interest in poststructuralism. In so doing, it could be said that organizational scholars are repeating the 'error' (as some would have it) of putting High Theory, and its Eurocentric underpinnings, front and centre in the early development of this area. As for the domain of CMS, and its conferences in particular, Eurocentrism is a notable feature, and along with it a white, androcentric, predominantly English-speaking and perhaps even bourgeois 'theory culture' (Mufti, 2005) that mitigates against the full realization of the promise of a postcolonial interrogative space. In any case, it is time to take stock of where we have managed to get to with postcolonialism.

Prasad's (1997) 'Major tendencies of postcolonialism'

One of the earliest deployments of postcolonialism was concerned to analyse and challenge the 'diversity industry' in business and management by offering a fresh theoretical location within postcolonial theory (Prasad, 1997a). In his introductory comments to this piece, Prasad offers a summary of the 'major tendencies' of postcolonialism that is of value to us here (Prasad, 1997a: 289). To paraphrase, these are:

- a) the Saidean analysis of the ‘language and rhetoric of imperialism’ and the unpicking of Orientalist discourses;
- b) the re-historicizing of the West’s accounts of its other and the resurrection of the voice of the colonially dominated subaltern as exemplified in the Subaltern Studies of Guha and colleagues;
- c) analysis via notions of hybridity foundationally articulated by Bhabha;
- d) work that examines the psychologically traumatic effects of the colonizing experience as originally documented by Fanon, Césaire and Nandy;
- e) excavations of the complicity of Western scholarship in the colonial and imperial projects (Asad, 1973; Chakrabarty, 1992);
- f) deconstructions of the idea of the nation-state and its effects (Chatterjee, 1986, 1993) and;
- g) critical readings of development discourse (Sachs, 1992).

We are not suggesting that this represents a complete and exhaustive catalogue of postcolonialism nor that these categories are mutually exclusive. Indeed, we would wish to modify it by drawing attention to a further three tendencies: h) critique via political economy; i) matters associated with transnationalism, including transnational feminist critique, and; j) resistive indigeneity. However, in its original form, Prasad’s list does provide the basis for a heuristic template through which to assess the contributions of postcolonialism to MOS to date. Next, we shall apply the template to the terrain of extant work and indicate which categories have received most attention, note exemplary studies, point to gaps and omissions, and offer prospective ways forward. We shall also situate the articles comprising this special issue within and across these categories. In so doing, we hope that we can contribute to the deepening and broadening of the agenda for postcolonial organizational analysis.

Deepening

Surveying the current terrain it is clear that only a limited number of major postcolonial tendencies have been explored in relation to MOS and, we would insist, few in great depth. It is those analytics that draw on Said and Bhabha (Spivak to a lesser extent) that have perhaps been to the forefront of the postcolonial in MOS—so categories a and c on Prasad’s catalogue. Prasad’s own 1997a piece is largely about the representation of the Other in the oil industry and draws significantly on Said, as does the introductory chapter to his major edited collection *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement* entitled ‘The Gaze of the Other: Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis’ (Prasad, 2003b). There are other contributions to that book that can also be considered as located in this space such as Kwek’s (2003) postcolonial reading of Hofstede’s *Culture’s Consequences*, Priyadarshini’s (2003) account of the construction of the non-Western ‘other’ in business and economics texts and Jack and Lorbiecki’s critique of cross-cultural training materials.

Beyond this collection there have been other works that have examined Orientalist practices and processes of othering. There are a number of critiques of whole areas of management scholarship, notably comparative and cross-cultural management (Jack and Westwood, 2009; Rhodes and Westwood, 2007; Westwood, 2001, 2006; see also Ibarra-Colado, 2006 on MOS), as well as of specific domains including product marketing (Jack, 2008), tourism (Echtner and Prasad, 2003), diversity management initiatives (Kalonaityte, 2010), Hofstede’s *Culture’s Consequences* (Fougère and Moulettes, 2007), political risk assessment (DeMaria, 2008), and management control (Mir et al., 2003). These critiques also demonstrate category (e) concerns for contemporary Western scholarship’s collusion with imperial and neo-colonial projects.

In a somewhat different vein Frenkel and Shenhav (2006) have explored Said's notions of Orientalism as a resource for MOS, but have also sought to argue that any analysis so driven is incomplete, as is an analytic based solely upon Bhabha's notions of hybridity. They attempt a reconciliation of the two as a way forward for MOS. In addition to the attempted integration of notions of hybridity and Orientalism by Frenkel and Shenhav (2006), Frenkel (2008) has also deployed Bhabha differently, making use of his notion of a *Third Space* in intercultural encounters to critically explore knowledge transfer within the context of multinational corporations. Bhabha's work has much to say about matters of identity, a dominant analytic focus within postcolonial theory, as well as critical organizational analysis in recent years. However, postcolonial readings of identity in MOS can only be considered as emergent.

Hybridized identities under conditions of postcoloniality have been a core theme within much postcolonial literature from Achebe and Naipaul, through Rushdie and Ondaatje, on to the current work of Zadie Smith and Aravind Adiga and are central under transcultural and transnational conditions. This has begun to receive some consideration in MOS for example in Das et al's (2008) account of identity work in Indian call centres or in Chio's (2008) analysis of the construction of 'modern market citizens' and consumers in Malaysia (which can also be read as a postcolonial critique of development discourse—category g). Currently within MOS, few articles as yet have really exploited Bhabha's central insights about hybridity; that it produces ambivalence, is disordering, and offers spaces for the disruption of asymmetrical authority relations and power and that culture is always hybridized. Nor has more recent work that extends Bhabha been taken up (for instance Kraidy, 2005). Of further relevance in this regard is the fact that we have found no MOS studies that explicitly address the psychological trauma of colonial and postcolonial experience (Prasad's category d). Such psychic dimensions of colonial or postcolonial identity and subjectivity could be accommodated within a Bhabhian perspective (especially given the debt to Lacan and psychoanalysis in his theoretical frame).

The overwhelmingly respectful focus on thinkers such as Said (or, more specifically, his one text *Orientalism*) and Bhabha (or, more specifically, *The Location of Culture*) by previous scholars has the unfortunate effect, in many cases, of overlooking important shifts, contradictions and limitations within these thinkers' views. Said's overly compliant and homogenizing view of European colonial discourse, his failure to articulate the gender dimensions of Empire, and his later writings on Freud offer some avenues for a deeper, more nuanced exploration of his work for organizational scholars. Moreover, the interest in Said and Bhabha not only overshadows the work of Spivak (or, more specifically, the constant citation of her essays 'Can the Subaltern Speak?'), but the great variety of other thinkers that could bring to fuller fruition the postcolonial interrogative space in MOS.

In this issue McKenna deploys both Said and Bhabha in his neocolonial analysis of interview data from senior corporate managers in the US talking about China and India. There is clear evidence of orientalist and othering tendencies in the way these US executives construct representations of management and business in China and India. The other is positioned as threat and old binary constructions are visited. Furthermore, there is a recuperation of the convergence thesis in that the (economic) development that is so apparent in these places signifies, it is implied, that they are converging towards a US model of business and management. However, the executives also convey considerable ambiguity and are compelled to recognize the progression of these economies and the relative decline of the US. There are opportunities here to work Bhabha's notions of ambiguity and of the 'in-between' spaces of cross-cultural encounters. Also in this issue, Nkomo's postcolonial reading of African leadership in MOS can also be situated in this category. It too is concerned with the problematics of representation and in particular the notion and processes of *re-writing*. A nuanced critique of Eurocentric Othering practices and the negative discursive

construction of Africa is mounted. Nkomo's article is not constrained by one category and can also be read as a critique instance of Western scholarship's collusion with the imperial and neo-colonial project. It also has a bearing on our additional category of resistive indigeneity, but she sounds a note of caution by pointing to the dangers of new essentialisms in the assertion of unique indigenous management/organization.

Historical scholarship illustrates at least two important themes for organizational scholars. First, it demonstrates the development of certain managerial and accounting practices, and organizational forms in the colonial encounter. Cooke's (2003a) work (amongst others)—for which he explicitly refuses the label 'postcolonial'—illustrates the development of classical management theory, bureaucracy and the emergence of a managerial class in ante-bellum cotton plantations. In accounting history, Tyson et al. (2004) report on the development of tasking methods, and the use of accounting measures and valuations to implement and rationalize the labour structure used on British West Indian slavery plantations. Neu (2000) illustrates how changing the form of annuity payments in 19th century Canada was aimed at civilizing the natives and halting their nomadic lifestyles. Bush and Maltby (2004) show how the introduction of taxation by the British in West Africa created a wage labour and monetary economy that took natives out of their traditional non-monetary economies, and subjected them to Western conceptions of time and exchange.

Second, scholars have turned attention to the telling of management history, with Frenkel and Shenhav (2003) for instance re-inserting the explicit and implicit Orientalism, and racism, of early management writing (including that of Elton Mayo) into discipline historiography. However, the telling of 'histories from below', especially of colonial labour history, has not received much attention from organizational scholars, nor has the work of the Subaltern Studies collective. Khan's work (Khan et al., 2007, 2010) on the problems of the soccer ball stitching industry in Pakistan can at one level be interpreted as giving voice to the local subaltern groups engaged in that industry. Khan's article with Koshul in this issue covers entirely different ground as we will see, unless that is we take as a context for it the subalternization of Muslim voice within modern geopolitics and read Khan and Koshul as providing a platform for a silenced minority within MOS. Khan and Koshul offer a challenging interrogation of the inherent provincialism of Western-dominated MOS by presenting a critique of the machinations of capitalism delivered through different ontology and epistemology positions, ones grounded in the theocratic locations of Islam. The distance from Western orthodox analytics and stylistics is perhaps amplified by the fact that their critique is not only rooted in Islamic theology, but is delivered through poetics. They draw on the poems of one of Islam's leading postcolonial poets and critical commentators, Muhammad Iqbal, to construct this critique from a very different location. This is a vital reminder both that western, provincial orthodoxy is founded on particular ontological and epistemological positions, and that resistive indigeneity often will arise from and invoke alternative ontological and epistemological positions. Herein lie some of the more radical aspects of the distance of difference that we must come to understand.

Despite the historical studies mentioned, the postcolonial tenor of Prasad's 'major tendency' regarding subalternity and re-historicization has not been well ingrained in the postcolonial organizational space. Sometimes implicate in any historical or re-historicizing analysis is a consideration of Western scholarship's collusion with the colonial, neo-colonial and imperial projects. There is a strong tradition within postcolonialism of analysing this dynamic, pointing to forms of intellectual and cultural imperialism by which the West's knowledge systems have appropriated, displaced, marginalized or destroyed the knowledge systems of the rest of the world. Classic accounts include explications of the role of science in such collusion (Harding, 1991, 2006; Nandy, 1988; Raman, 1983; Sardar, 1988) as well as more specific critiques of the role of anthropology

(Asad, 1973; Fabian, 1983). Harding (1996) has applied her assessment explicitly in the organizational domain and Prasad (1997b) has problematized the provenance of Western science and its imbrications in imperialism. In current MOS there has been persistent if limited critique of the hegemonic and imperialistic tendencies of the West's knowledge systems, epistemologies and methodologies in relation to and in accounting for the rest of the world (Jack and Westwood, 2006; Jaya, 2001; Kipping et al, 2004; Mir et al., 2008; Özkazanç-Pan, 2008; Westwood, 2004). There is an ongoing need to provincialize MOS knowledge claims and universalistic inclinations, and to extend the scholarship cited earlier with respect to category (a) scholarship. The contribution of Khan and Koshul in this issue, with their critique of postcolonial CMS, its secularism and the silencing of a theistic voice for analysis, very much impels us on that trajectory. Misockzy's article in this issue also offers such a challenge, this time from a Latin American purview; one that critiques and shuns the homogenizing tendencies of the Global North's cultural and intellectual imperialism. We shall have more to say about Misockzy's contribution shortly.

Critical readings of development also entail an historical dimension. Critics such as Escobar (1995) demonstrate how development discourse emerged in consonance with post-World War Two processes of decolonization and US economic and foreign policy. He suggests that development agencies came to occupy the same spaces that colonial administrations had just vacated, with the West seeking to continue to secure its resource supply and markets, and to contest Soviet aspirations in various locations, for instance the development of socialism and communism in African post-independence states. Development is viewed as a reconstituted mechanism for the continued domination by which 'developed countries manage, control and even create the third world' (Tucker, 1999: 22) based on a Western model of modernization and industrialization that Third World nations should embark on. The previous work of Khan noted above bears on some of these failures of the development discourse and its related practices. Cooke (1998, 2003b) and Dar and Cooke (2008) critique the intersection of development and management, and suggest that managerialism has come to take up the mantle of a colonizing ideology being imposed upon local knowledge systems through contemporary development interventions. Banerjee (2000, 2003) focuses on sustainable development and the manner in which Western conceptions of land and property rights, and stakeholder relations, act as vehicles for the colonization of indigenous peoples, with particular reference to the Australian context. Moreover, and despite appearances, more recent debates about post-development—which seek to find more democratic and community-driven definitions of social problems and solutions (Mohan, 1999)—can still be viewed as part of a Western (and androcentric) imperial formation (Biccum, 2005; Saunders, 2003).

As noted, in this issue Misockzy offers a trenchant critique of the Global North's cultural and intellectual imperialism and of how the implacable alignment of modernity with rationality within that hegemonic practice has served to 'homogenize' knowledge in Latin America—and indeed across the globe. She too points to the provinciality of our intellectual practices and the need to create spaces for alternative, indigenous epistemologies and, where possible, cosmopolitan dialogue. Beyond that, Misockzy locates these epistemological struggles within a critique of new development practices and discourse, indeed the epistemic struggle is engendered and necessitated by these development practices. She examines critiques under post-development, (Marxist) dependency theory, and of managerialism in development administration as potential sources of interrogation for, what across Latin America, has come to be labeled neo-developmentalism with its basis in contemporary extractivism. Such neo-development practices based on extraction of natural resources are promoted by various rhetorics of justification across a number of Latin American state governments, but are resisted by various indigenous groups for their exploitive and destructive character. Misockzy provides illustrative cases of these points of struggle and explores the epistemic

implications of them. The article works on a number of fronts, but has a clear contribution in terms of our categories of resistive indigeneity and critical readings of development discourse.

What is absent from this selective overview of existing scholarship on the postcolonial and organization is work that might be situated in two of Prasad's original categories, namely: (d) examinations of the psychological trauma of the colonial/neo-colonial experience (as already noted); and (f) scholarship that deconstructs and problematizes the nation-state (although the latter is implicit in some of these studies cited). However, the review also illustrates the valuable contribution that postcolonialism can make to our understanding of organizations and organizing. Above all it has been used to defamiliarize management and organizational practices, and academic conceptions thereof, demonstrating their indebtedness to the colonial encounter and the manner in which they continue to channel colonial and imperial ideology through Orientalist and othering representational strategies. As Calás and Smircich (2003: 45) note, postcolonialism offers possibilities for 'thinking about thinking and for radically rethinking the modern idea of "progress" in organization and management studies. The stories we have written in much organization theory, our concepts and representations, no matter how "global" (or precisely because of this), represent the ways of thinking of certain people and not others'. Previous scholarship also demonstrates the role of institutional forms (such as development) in reproducing economic, social and symbolic inequalities between the West and the Rest and critiques structures of dependency thereby constructed. But it also shows tensions, ambivalences and forms of resistance, that mark the relationship and 'transfer' of knowledge between Western and non-Western contexts.

Despite these valuable contributions, we believe the postcolonial is still understood within MOS in ways that are excessively narrow. First, the import of postcolonial ideas into organization studies has tended to privilege a representationalist focus, to the detriment of a focus on political economy, or the relation between the political domain—of states, civil society and the assignation of rights and sovereignty—and the economic domain—of markets, transnational corporations, and national trade policy. The postcolonial continues to be understood in terms of symbolic and textual referents of difference within locales, rather than physical and material differences between locales. Second, while the twinning of the postcolonial with questions of difference (cultural, racial and gender) is to be welcomed, we need more direct recognition of the historical control of formerly colonized locales through organization, whether by present or absent powers. Third and as a consequence, questions of the postcolonial can in fact become less a discussion of the after effect of colonial practices in the peripheries, and more of the presence of these practices in colonial centres, realigning focus. Fourth, and more broadly, the project of postcolonial studies in organization studies should not be separated from a larger question, that of the task of management and the question of whom organization studies should serve. It is in part these reflections that lead us to suggest some additions to Prasad's original taxonomy of the major tendencies of postcolonialism, namely, political economy, transnationalism and resistive indigeneity. These categories are aimed at encouraging a broadening, as well as a deepening, of the postcolonial interrogative space in MOS. The articles that constitute this special issue all talk in different and related ways to these additional themes, whilst also, in certain cases and as noted, articulating existing interests.

Broadening

Political economy. Friedman (1994) describes a period of radical disorder in the world system since the 1970s in which the relative systemic stabilities of the early post-World War Two period have been challenged and are being transformed into an ever-emergent new world order. A world system of putatively stable core, semi-peripheral and peripheral linkages between the US/Europe (the

West) and the Rest is being undone by structural changes, as well as certain continuities, in the realms of economics and geopolitics. Today's global political economy, and the neoliberal foundations of much of its institutional architecture, presents postcolonial organizational scholars with many pressing issues and urgent challenges for inquiry and political action. For one, we might explore the postcolonial histories of organizations and management within the context of the historical transition of former colonies and of non-colonizers to capitalist economies. From a neocolonial viewpoint, we might ask about the continued reproduction of historical patterns of imperialism as well as new forms, and how both intersect with past and present forms of colonization. In short, the challenge is to investigate contemporary global political economy using the categories, and lived experiences, of imperialism, colonialism, and resistances to them. It is also to ask what kinds of new subjects are produced by contemporary forms of 'Empire' (Stoler, 2006), and who/what are the new agents and formations of this power?

To begin, Jomo (2006) argues that economic imperialism is alive and well, and is the outcome of a contemporary economic and geopolitical system which he refers to as a US network hegemony involving transnational corporate collusion. Recent academic and journalistic debates about Empire (Calhoun et al., 2006; Ferguson, 2003; Hardt and Negri, 2001; Ignatieff, 2003) have examined the evidence for, and nature of, such a US hegemony. Whilst the US may not (and this is arguable) count as a colonial power ('governing the internal affairs of a subordinated polity') (Calhoun et al., 2006: 2), critics suggest that it has institutionalized a consensual order using imperial ('intervening in a polity without actually governing it' (Calhoun et al., 2006: 2) and hegemonic power ('setting the rules of the game' (Calhoun et al., 2006: 2), and proffer varied economic, political, military and cultural data as evidence thereof. In the economic domain, Jomo (2006) asserts that this hegemony is sustained through the practices of foreign direct investment, international financial liberalization, international trade, technology and new international economic governance. Kelly's (2006) work on imperial and corporate structures of governance in the post-colonial period points to changes to the limited liability of corporations and nation-states as key mechanisms of imperialism and hegemony. However, Hardt and Negri's (2001) much-contested treatise on Empire takes the view that it can no longer be anchored to any one nation state—even the US—but is best thought of as a 'more or less seamless structure of global capitalism for which the US provides the primary enforcement without itself being the autonomous protagonist' (Calhoun et al., 2006: 283). Adding further nuance here is Jomo's (2006) portrayal of the US as hyperpower with vulnerabilities in the economic domain (as the recent GFC illustrated), and, in the pages of this journal, Marens (2010) assertion of the decline of American hegemony as the backdrop for his study of CSR and labour relations in the US.

Economically and geopolitically, recent shifts in global power towards China, India, Brazil and Russia cast further doubt over the notion of 'business as usual' where there is only one way to structure organizations and one way to regulate organizational life—the 'Western way'. McKenna's (this issue) US-based executives' reflections on changes in the order of things, resonates with this realization of the rise of China and India and relative decline of the US. Whilst their constructions still have diminishing orientalisms, they can see that it will not be 'business as usual' and recognize that there may be hybrid forms of economy, business and management emerging. It is increasingly made apparent that the non-West is not a 'passive' accommodator to US hegemony (if it ever was) but an active agent of change and global transformation and a participant in the construction of the key discourses of the time: on technology, economic exchange and justice, fairness and 'truth'. Equally, the non-West has a newly legitimized voice with respect to the structures and operations of capitalism further undermining the myth of a monolithic capitalism and strengthening its pluralization. This in turn adds credence to a usurping of any universalistic pretensions relating to modes

of business, organization and management. Indeed, ironically, all those years of US-led investigations comparing the dominant US modes of business and management against all others might finally be said to reveal that it is actually the US system that is the exception and an outlier.

In comparison to Jomo's (2006) conception of a US network hegemony, Hoogvelt (2001) conceives of contemporary political economy in terms of 'scattered hegemonies' and 'postcolonial formations', whose emergence she attributes to radical changes in capitalism driven by its internal contradictions. From a Marxist postcolonial and world systems perspective, Hoogvelt describes how:

a new stage of capitalism is fermenting in the core of the system, one in which the geographic core-periphery polarization is being replaced by a *social* core-periphery divide that cuts across territorial boundaries and geographic regions (...) the new global configuration drives a *politics of exclusion*, contrasted with the politics of incorporation (and 'developmentalism' in the broadest sense) that marked previous periods of capitalist expansion (2001: 64–65, emphasis added).

Her argument is that since the 1970s, Western interest in Third World and peripheral economies has shifted from one of structural exploitation (based on a politics of incorporation, as indexed in development discourse for instance) to structural irrelevance (based on a politics of exclusion). Different post-colonial nations and regions have experienced this politics of exclusion—and responded to it—in different ways, whence emerged multiple postcolonial formations, including: Sub-Saharan Africa; Islamic revolutions; the developmental states of East Asia; post-development in Latin America. Each of these formations represents a hybrid form of struggle and local experimentation with alternative forms of social and economic organization.

As for Jomo's reference to a political economy of 'transnational corporate collusion' from earlier, Banerjee's previous work on the imperial (rather than postcolonial) formations of contemporary political economy (Banerjee et al., 2009), and of so-called 'necrocapitalism' (Banerjee, 2008), is richly illustrative. His work on the intersection of state and corporate/market interests, particularly in the context of former colonies and with regard to the control and extraction of natural resources, demonstrates the violence (physical and symbolic) and physical displacement inflicted upon indigenous communities, the rural poor, and women and children by state militia and corporate security services. Banerjee (2008) calls this necrocapitalism and describes its foundation in three forms of management: management by extraction (of oils and mineral resources by state and corporate interests); management by exclusion (of indigenous peoples, and others, from democratic debate about decisions to extract resource); and management by expulsion (displacement of indigenous populations from their land). These direct management forms mean, according to Banerjee, that necrocapitalism is a particularly efficient set of imperial, colonial and economic practices. Banerjee's work acknowledges the vital contribution of Marxist geographer David Harvey to his thinking. Harvey's (2003) *The New Imperialism* describes the present state of capitalism as an inter-relationship between 'accumulation by dispossession'—where communities are being dispossessed of their land, assets and rights either by consent or by violence—and 'expanded reproduction'.

In this issue, Misockzy too positions her critique of neo-developmentalism based on a new version of extractivism very much within Harvey's assessment of the current operations of capitalism. The Andean communities, whose struggles she documents, are seeking to resist what they see as the exploitative and destructive effects of state development policies that support the extractive industries and the organizations that run them. The articulation of indigenous Andean resistance to neo-developmentalism leads Misockzy to re-examine critical moments in the development discourse and constitute a new form of synthesis. Banerjee (this issue) reprises his necrocapitalism

arguments to some extent, but also expands critique of the new extractivism to chronicle the pillaging of resources not only in the Americas, but also in Africa and the Asia-Pacific. The destructiveness of the 'resource wars' is not localized but endemic to the operations of contemporary capitalism. For Banerjee particular configurations of economic and social conditions enable imperialistic practices in the form of internal colonialism. Banerjee too offers prospects for resistance, but for him this centres on the possibilities of translocal modes of resistance.

Transnationalism. We have already noted that one of the limitations of extant postcolonial organizational analysis is that scholars appear to understand the postcolonial far more in terms of symbolic and textual references of difference *within* locales than physical and material differences *between* locales. As such, it can be argued that it is these transnational connections between locales that require further theoretical and empirical attention.

Whilst acknowledging contestation, Vertovec (1999: 447) maintains that there is agreement that 'transnationalism' broadly refers to 'multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation-states'. It is a variegated phenomenon with a plethora of studies that have dealt *inter alia* with transnational 'communities, capital flows, trade, citizenship, corporations, inter-governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, politics, services, social movements, social networks, families, migration circuits, identities, public spaces, public cultures' (Vertovec, 1999: 447). Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004), in a not entirely sympathetic treatment of the term, see transnationalism as supplanting globalization as a descriptive and analytical category that for them mostly bears on the 'connections between "here" and "there"' (p. 1117). The varieties of connection and their implications are explicated and an argument mounted that there are 'transnational communities'. There are those who see the emergence of transnational communities as emancipatory and as breaking the hold of the power structures of nation-states (Florini, 2000), whilst others, such as Waldinger and Fitzgerald (2004), are sceptical and perceive potentially regressive aspects to it.

Starting with understandings of the 'here' (*pace* Waldinger and Fitzgerald), a focus on transnationalism has implications for how we understand contemporary nation-states, thus presenting us with an opportunity to do the work of 'problematizing the nation state' suggested by Prasad (1997a). To begin, we are not subscribing to a view that transnationalism means the nation-state does not/should not hold interest any longer for postcolonial scholars. First, and as illustrated by Banerjee, and other indigenous scholars named later, the nation-state is a primary agent for the 'legitimate' exercise of violence against indigenous communities under conditions of necrocapitalism and internal colonialism. By curtailing the rights and notions of sovereignty for indigenous communities, either through legal or military means, national governments continue to play a vital role in a transnational political economy (Steinmetz, 2006).

Second, the nation-state continues to be an important form of affiliation for many people (Scholte, 2000) and a symbolic (though certainly not uncontested) resource in identity construction. In this latter regard, the nation-state has a difficult history, borne as it was in the era of formal European colonial encounter and connected as it was to attempts to build national cultures. Historically speaking, Featherstone (1993) argues that expressions of national culture indexed attempts by political elites to 'manage' ethnic and regional differences by submerging them in a national cultural identity. The projection of an imaginary nation-state at home in Europe was a central facet of Orientalist discourse and culturally imperious behaviour during colonization. It would also lay the foundation that has continued to this day, of an unresolved tension, and set of subjective experiences, between the two notions of 'nation' and 'state' connected by the hyphen. In this regard, Appadurai (1990: 304) suggests that:

(...) whilst nations (or more properly groups with ideas about nationhood) seek to capture or co-opt states and state power, states simultaneously seek to capture and monopolize ideas about nationhood. In general, separatist, transnational movements (...) exemplify nations in search of states (...). States, on the other hand, are everywhere seeking to monopolize the moral resources of community, either by flatly claiming perfect coevality between nation and state or by systematically museumizing and representing all the groups with them in a variety of heritage politics that seems remarkably uniform throughout the world. (...) Typically, contemporary nation-states do this by exercising taxonomical control over difference; by creating various kinds of international spectacle to domesticate difference; and by seducing small groups with the fantasy of self-display on some sort of global or cosmopolitan stage. (...) state and nation are at each other's throats, and the hyphen that links them is now less an icon of conjuncture than an index of disjuncture.

The notions of 'nation' and 'national identity' may be (historical) 'imaginary constructions' (Loshtizky, 2006), but states' attempts to manufacture them through seeking to monopolize the moral resources of community or by taxonomical impulse (as Appadurai notes above) are problematically real today. The nation-state serves as a demarcation between 'us' and 'them', 'native' and 'foreigner' and as the basis for institutional mechanisms of exclusion and separation. It is argued that nation states—or proxies like the European Community—are now even more becoming 'fortresses', containing virulent nationalistic sentiments backed up with boundary policing policies that work to sustain an imagined national cultural purity and keep polluting minorities at bay (Loshtizky, 2006).

Recent instances of state-sponsored multiculturalism—'a complex discourse of cultural pluralism, inclusion and equity found within liberal/humanist ideologies of various types as well as in existing policy structures of some Western settler nations like Australia and Canada' (Carter, 2006: 681)—can be said to mask underlying structures of difference and continuing practices of internal colonialism and racism in certain states (Banerjee and Linstead, 2001). In their published discourse on *Who Sings the Nation-State?*, Butler and Spivak (2008) pose questions about the subjective experiences of those who belong, and do not belong, as citizens of contemporary nation-states, especially in the context of migration.

On the other hand, when we consider what is 'there' (continuing with Waldinger and Fitzgerald)—that which transcends, fractures or flows out of the imaginary and real boundaries of the nation-state—there are further challenges and complexities requiring consideration. One example of a transnational phenomenon is the globalization of 'primordia'—perceived essential characteristics of a cultural group, whether of language, skin colour, neighbourhood, or kinship—noted by Appadurai (1990). He describes the challenges of the flow of such cultural resources in affective terms, as 'sentiments whose greatest force is in their ability to ignite intimacy into a political sentiment and turn locality into a staging ground for identity' (Appadurai, 1990: 306). He also notes the vital role played by the media and technology in facilitating such flows. This is just one of multiple forms of affiliation that become possible through the transnational flow of culture. Featherstone (1993) describes others including: re-immersion in local culture and the rediscovery of ethnicity; problematic acculturation by new migrants to First World contexts; cosmopolitan bonds and attitudes associated with greater levels of intercultural contact. These divergent cultural affiliations and identity positions are in part patterned by extended migratory patterns, diasporic proliferation and the connectivities of new media, but also by socioeconomic circumstance associated with the new global division of labour (Sardar, 2010).

The identity politics associated with these manifestations of the dynamics of the 'nation-state' is one area for potential fruitful engagement from MOS. Transnationalism has been taken up within MOS, indeed there is a *Journal of Transnational Management* and leading textbooks on

Transnational Management (for instance Bartlett and Ghoshal, 1992) as well as, naturally, a host of texts on transnational companies. However, much of this scholarship resides within MOS orthodoxy, attaches specific meanings to ‘transnational’ and does not pursue a critical or postcolonial line. There are, however, some studies that have begun to draw out some of the more critical implications of transnational life (for instance, Pries, 2001). One aspect of transnationalism that ought to be of particular interest to MOS pertains to immigration and labour flows. The idea of ‘immigrant transnationalism’ appears to have been coined by Glick-Schiller and colleagues (Glick-Schiller et al., 1992) and reflects, among other things, on commitments and identities that are neither host nor home located. Immigrant entrepreneurs have become the attention of some interest in organization studies (Al Ariss and Özbilgin, 2010; Drori et al, 2009; Essers and Benschop, 2007, 2009; Morawska, 2005; Pio, 2005; Portes et al., 2002), though there are no studies that specifically deploy and thoroughly develop a postcolonial frame.

In a related space, Mir and Mir (2009) and Mir et al. (2008) have provided a critical analysis of the knowledge transfer between a First World corporation and companies located in developing contexts suggesting that there are parallels with older unbalanced relationships within colonialism. Mir et al. (1999) problematize the notion of transnational cooperation. Adopting a position of reflexive deliberation that appears to owe much to Spivak, they seek to unsettle the presumptions of an ethos of cooperation anchoring it to traditions and practices and sources that are actually repressive and oppressive. These negative consequences are even more pronounced when gendered effects are included. However, the broad domain of gender studies and feminist theory, and the particular domain of women in the global economy, has received only limited attention by postcolonial organizational scholars, despite the important work of Third World (Mohanty, 1984, 2003) and transnational (and other) feminists (Acker, 2004; Mendoza, 2002; Schutte, 1998) within the humanities and in adjacent areas of MOS (Calás and Smircich, 2010; Chandrasekara, 2009; Fernandez-Kelly, 1994). Third World and transnational feminist scholarship has much to offer postcolonial scholars: It entails an anti-capitalist critique and a suspicion of, and resistance to, the corporatization of global life; it offers a critique of Western, First World feminism and its universal categorization of women, whilst also offering support for both general and specific portrayals of women’s domination in the global economy and their resistances to it; it pays attention to intersecting experiences of gender, race and class, and the androcentric construction of the postcolonial nation-state.

To go back to Mir et al. (2008), they do deconstruct GE’s interventions in India and trace the effects on women there. In this regard, there is another invocation of Spivak in raising questions of the silencing of the subaltern and expressions of a profound concern for the continued silence of subaltern groups in MOS discourses, including those around cooperation, and the absence or failure of properly dialogical research practices. This latter point is of central concern in debates by indigenous scholars and the relationship between indigenous knowledge systems and those of the hegemonic centre that have persistently worked an imperialistic practice. Resistance to that hegemony and the re-assertion of the legitimacy, value and veracity of indigenous knowledge systems has strengthened over recent decades both in the social sciences generally and within MOS more particularly.

Resistive Indigeneity. Maori researcher Linda Smith (1999), in her classic text *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* asserts that:

Indigenous peoples can be defined as the assembly of those who have witnessed, been excluded from, and have survived modernity and imperialism. They are peoples who have experienced the imperialism and colonialism of the modern historical period beginning with the Enlightenment (Smith, 2005: 86).

Indigeneity might be viewed as a category and an experience that emerged in the colonial encounter, a way of marking difference between colonizer and colonized. As such, it could be expected that postcolonial theory, with its emphasis on understanding difference, identity and imperialism, would be a welcome resource for studying contemporary resistive indigeneity by and for indigenous scholars and communities. However, the relationship between postcolonial theory and indigenous scholarship is fraught with difficulty, something that any putative approach from within MOS needs to engage with. There are at least two reasons for this.

First, the problem lies in large measure with the prefix 'post', and the reading that the post-colonial signifies a moment after colonization ended and decolonization processes began. Warrior (2009) for example talks of 'Native American scholars [...] widespread rejection of postcolonial studies ... [the] objection is grounded in the reality that Native Americans remain colonized peoples rather than people facing post-independence realities and challenges. Thus the post in postcolonialism creates a stumbling block to engagement' (p. 122). Similarly, in the Australian context, Moreton-Robinson (2009) asserts that indigenous Australians remain a colonized people (more below), a view also asserted strongly in this issue (and elsewhere) by Banerjee who talks of such internal colonialism as a feature of postcoloniality.

The label 'postcolonial' has also generated resistance from indigenous scholars and communities because it continues to work with Western-derived epistemology and categories of analysis. Following Weaver, Warrior argues that postcolonial studies' central concern with Western categories means that it has 'never accounted for Native worldviews' (cited in Warrior, 2009: 122). It has to be admitted that the provenance of postcolonial thinking is profoundly Eurocentric with the Holy Trinity drawing upon ideas and critiques of European modernity found in Foucault, Gramsci, Marx, Freud, Lacan, Derrida and others. This is a tradition embedded within a very particular epistemic space, one that might be at considerable odds with various indigenous epistemologies, particularly those that have been repressed, silenced and marginalized by Western intellectual imperialism (Smith, 1999).

A challenge for those postcolonial scholars who do not self-identify as indigenous is thus to engage with the potential for their theoretical frameworks and research and writing practices to appropriate and colonize indigenous knowledge and experience. Banerjee and Linstead (2004), for instance, draw attention to the neocolonial implications of the appropriation of indigenous knowledge from the Cree Nation on trapping as the basis for improved environmental management as published in the *Academy of Management Executive*. Smith (1999:1) articulates the challenge pithily as follows:

(...) it galls us that Western researchers and intellectuals can assume to know all that it is possible to know of us, on the basis of their brief encounters with some of us. It appalls us that the West can desire, extract and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce, and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nations.

Against this context, Moreton-Robinson (2009: 11) describes how indigenous scholars are 'politically and intellectually engaged in demonstrating how critical Indigenous studies as a mode of analysis can offer accounts of the contemporary world of Indigenous peoples that centre our ways of knowing and theorizing'. As an intellectual project, critical indigenous studies works with a larger research agenda derived from various transnational indigenous movements, and aimed at contributing to a self-determining indigenous world and from which postcolonial scholars can learn much. In the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, for instance, Kaupapa Maori research represents a strong example of critical indigenous studies located within the university context. Indeed, examples of such scholarship have already appeared in the pages of this journal (Henry and Pene,

2001). These authors describe kaupapa Maori research as underpinned by Maori cosmology, epistemology and methodology, and as radically different from the so-called Pakeha view of the world and its orthodox research practices. Moreover, Smith (1999) cites 25 different projects with names such as claiming, testimonies, intervening, remembering, gendering, protecting and argues that indigenous peoples' distinctive and different ways of naming and knowing the world as encapsulated in such titles, and not 'disguised', as can happen, she argues, 'with Westernized labels such as "collaborative research"' (p. 25).

In addition to asserting indigenous knowledge and of 'writing back' to the centre in these terms, a related but different perspective for postcolonial organizational scholars lies in the study of internal colonialism. Watson (2009) comments that the Australian nation-state (a federation of states and territories that were former settled and penal colonies of the British Empire) was borne of an originary act of violence against its native Aboriginal inhabitants. In common with many other scholars, Watson argues that this originary violence continues to be perpetuated against indigenous Australians as part of a project of white, patriarchal power. Perera (2007: 126) maintains that 'state projects of maintaining security, peacekeeping, nation building and aid in the region in turn reflect back on and reinforce an ongoing internal project of enacting or reasserting colonial sovereignty over Indigenous bodies and lands'. One recent example of this is the Northern Territory intervention, where the former liberal Howard government temporarily suspended racial discrimination legislation in Australia to 'tackle' a number of perceived problems of social deprivation, notably child abuse in Aboriginal communities. The government's package of measures included *inter alia* direct control over benefit payments and their uses, restrictions on alcohol and internet use, compulsory acquisition of townships currently held under the title provisions of the Native Title Act, removal of customary law and cultural practice from judicial proceedings, and direct implementation by police and armed services with enhanced powers. This package was enacted under a protective rhetoric, but it has been argued that such discourses of protection have been used to mask 'ongoing colonial relations' (Osuri et al., 2009). Or, to use Moreton-Robinson's (2009) critique (which is reliant on Agamben's state of exception, Foucault's biopower and his thesis in *Society Must Be Defended*), this is an expression of the intersection of race and war, waged through the judicial curtailment of indigenous sovereignty. She writes:

As a regime of power capillarising through rights and possession, patriarchal white sovereignty enables the law and government to intervene in the lives of Indigenous people to let them live and to make them live as welfare dependent citizens, not as property owning subjects with sovereign resource rights. (Moreton-Robinson, 2009: 77)

Within MOS, Banerjee (2000, 2003), as noted earlier, has consistently addressed Aboriginal indigeneity and the politics of whiteness in Australia, with more recent commentaries by Sullivan (2007) and Tedmanson (2008; Tedmanson and Wadiwel, 2010).

The capillaries of power unsurprisingly generate resistance and it is important for organizational scholars to understand the forms of resistance enacted by indigenous groups and communities. Histories of colonial oppression are also histories of struggle and resistance. At one level, the emergence of indigenous studies is itself a form of resistance, a writing back. Outside the academy, and in the 'real world', such struggles have taken on a transnational flavour. Smith (1999, 2005), as noted earlier, locates her work within the modern indigenous peoples' project and the political struggles of transnational indigenous communities since the 1960s to work towards the 'development of global indigenous strategic alliances' (Smith, 2005: 108). Such social movements have created networks and alliances between different indigenous groups, as well as supportive

institutional elements such as publishing houses and websites. Within the pages of this journal, and others, studies of such social movements and of struggles between TNCs, local groups and the state are illustrative of this fruitful strand of inquiry. One example is Özen and Özen's (2009) study of peasant resistance against MNCs and the state in Turkey.

We have already noted how Misockzy in this issue describes the forms of resistance of the Andean indigenous communities to Latin American enactments of neo-developmentalism based on their own ontological and epistemological understandings. Also in this issue Banerjee's major contribution is the development of a theory of translocal resistance. The resistance struggles that Banerjee discusses are similarly situated to Misockzy's in the 'resource wars' and in opposition to the market-government nexus that reproduces imperialistic tendencies and effects and forms of internal colonization. The notion of the translocal intends a plurality of organizational forms and configurations that reach out of specific locales, but transcend them through networks that are often transnational in nature. The translocal is a network of spaces, actors, resources, rights and power relations that become resistively marshaled in struggles against the exploitive and destructive forces of extractive capitalism and internal colonialism.

Recent analysis has also focused on the idea of 'autonomy', particularly but not exclusively, in relation to contemporary resistance movements in the Muslim world. Muslims feel particularly aggrieved by their experience of recent history, for example in Palestine and Kashmir, Algeria and Egypt, and especially in Iraq and Afghanistan. And, as noted in the introduction, increasingly in Western Europe and the US, as America's imperious behaviour overseas has consequences for its race and faith/religious relations at home (Subrahmanyam, 2006). Even the most liberal Muslims now perceive an antagonistic relationship between Muslims and the West, and that old Orientalist representations have been given a new lease of life under the guise of the 'war on terror' (Sayyid, 2010).

Re-asserting a postcolonial interrogative space

In making our call for articles for this special issue we were motivated by what we saw as the significant promise of a productive interrogation of organization studies by the resources afforded by postcolonialism. We were also motivated, however, by the sense that it was, as yet, a promise unfulfilled. Despite the emergent work deploying postcolonialism in MOS, much of which we have sought to capture and position in our overview here, we hold to the opinion that such work has only begun to scratch the surface in terms of the intellectual resources available.

Using Prasad's set of postcolonial categories of interrogation as a template with which to survey the field revealed domains, for example around Saidean discursive/textual analysis, where streams of work have already materialized, but also gaps, omissions and blind spots. It is instructive to note, for example, the virtual absence of work from within MOS that explores a psychoanalytic perspective and that examines the psychological damages of postcoloniality. This was such a productive and important zone in early accounts of the colonial experience from a postcolonial perspective. There is still little too that tackles a much needed re-historicizing of MOS that will perforce contribute to its provincialization and de-colonization. Lacking too is a sustained problematizing of the nation state and its implications for MOS. However, aspects of this are emergent under the rubric of critical globalization and transnational conceptualizations and analytics and there are articles in this issue that help to broaden and deepen that line of interrogation. Our extension of Prasad's schema to include inquiry around matters of political economy, transnationalism and resistive indigeneity was intended to point to opportunities to broaden the scope of postcolonially-informed critiques of the domains encompassed by MOS. The former has perhaps been hampered by the fissures within postcolonial theory, but there is fresh impetus perhaps as the crises of

capitalism come increasingly to the fore, not just through the visibility of the horrible inequities, destructions and incoherences wrought in the periphery, but closer to home, in the very fabric of the machineries and institutions of capitalism at its very centre. Resistive indigeneity and various transnational formations are perhaps different but related aspects of precipitated reactions to the damage inflicted by capitalism as it continues to morph into new forms with new structures, actors and alliances. These are growing areas of critical interrogation, more developed in other disciplines/fields perhaps, but MOS is starting to fruitfully engage in these vital areas as certain articles in this issue attest.

We were motivated too, by the persisting parochialism, provincialism and universalistic pretensions of much of MOS, including that which calls itself Critical Management Studies, or which pursues a post-structuralist position. What is becoming apparent, and again this is revealed by articles in this special issue, is that to interrogate MOS via postcolonialism is not merely to shift the content boundaries, extend the range of issues or to query method, it is to more radically problematize the ontological and epistemological ground upon which the field traditionally stands. MOS, despite in some ways being an open field, continues to find itself ensnared in a limited and limiting paradigmatic location with narrow ontological and epistemological horizons. These have persistently been contested from within the field, but the challenge is perhaps even more acute and potentially transformative from a postcolonial perspective which demands nothing less than the decolonization of theory (and practice) and the acceptance and equal standing of different and alternative ontologies, epistemologies and world views.

Beyond these perhaps somewhat arcane and academic interests we were also motivated by the fact that there remain whole zones of organisation-related situations, relations and persons that still have no voice within MOS, whose interests are simply not attended to, and whose life-worlds seem to be taken as non-consequential. These are the types of situations, relationships and persons that we tried to signal in the sample of vignettes with which we started. MOS remains a field of study focused on and concerned with the actions and interests of large corporations and their leaders located in the Global North. It is a field researched by members of a privileged elite from the metropolitan centre, focusing on persons, organizations and systems of organizations from the centre, for and on behalf of audiences similarly located. Structures of intellectual and academic dependency and the workings of the publishing machine, serve to perpetuate that.

The work in this special issue, we feel, is further evidence of the fecundity of postcolonialism as a set of resources with which to interrogate MOS. The work has both deepened existing lines of inquiry, but also offered indications of some of the ways in which the scope of interrogation can be productively broadened. We hope this essay and this special issue, will serve to encourage and stimulate others to undertake further work and to contribute to a meaningful reconfiguration of the fields of management and organization studies.

References

- Acker, J. (2004) 'Gender, Capitalism and Globalization', *Critical Sociology* 30(1): 17–41.
- Ahmad, A. (1992) *In Theory: Classes, Nations, Literatures*. London: Verso.
- Al Ariss, A. and Özbilgin, M. (2010) 'Understanding Self-initiated Expatriates: Career Experiences of Lebanese Self-initiated Expatriates', *Thunderbird International Business Review* 54(4): 275–85.
- Alatas, S. F. (2003) 'Academic Dependency and the Global Division of Labour in the Social Sciences', *Current Sociology* 51: 599–633.
- Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. C., eds (1992) *Critical Management Studies*. London: Sage.
- Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H., eds (1996) *Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.

- Andres, T. D. (1989) *Management Filipino Style*. Makati, Philippines: St Paul.
- Appadurai, A. (1990) 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Culture Economy', *Theory, Culture, and Society* 7: 295–310.
- Asad, T., ed. (1973) *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*. London: Ithaca Press.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H., eds (2006) *The Postcolonial Studies Reader*, 2nd edn. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2000) 'Whose Land is it Anyway? National Interest, Indigenous Stakeholders, and Colonial Discourses: The Case of the Jabiluka Uranium Mine', *Organization and Environment* 13(3): 3–38.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2003) 'Who Sustains Whose Development? Sustainable Development and the Reinvention of Nature', *Organization Studies* 24(1): 143–80.
- Banerjee, S. B. (2008) 'Necrocapitalism', *Organization Studies* 29(12): 1–25
- Banerjee, S. B., Chio, V. and Mir, R., eds (2009) *Organizations, Markets and Imperial Formations: Towards an Anthropology of Globalization*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Banerjee, S. B. and Linstead, S. (2001) 'Globalization, Multiculturalism and Other Fictions: Colonialism for the New Millennium?', *Organization* 8(4): 683–722.
- Banerjee, S. B. and Linstead, S. (2004) 'Masking Subversion: Neocolonial Embeddedness in Anthropological Accounts of Indigenous Management', *Human Relations* 57(2): 221–48
- Banerjee, S.B. and Prasad, A., eds (2008) 'Critical Reflections on Management and Organization Studies: A Postcolonial Perspective', *Special Issue of Critical Perspectives on International Business* 4(2/3).
- Bartlett, C. and Ghoshal, S. (1992) *Transnational Management—Text, Cases and Readings in Cross Border Management*. Boston, MA: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Bhabha, H. (1990) *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.
- Bhabha, H. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Biccum, A. (2005) 'Development and the New Imperialism', *Third World Quarterly* 26(6): 1005–20.
- Blunt, P. (1983) *Organisation Theory and Behaviour: An African Perspective*. London: Longman.
- Bond, M. and Hofstede, G. (1988) 'The Confucius Connection: from cultural roots to economic growth', *Organizational Dynamics* 16: 4–21.
- Boyacigiller, N. A. and Adler, N. J. (1991) 'The Parochial Dinosaur: Organizational Science in a Global Context', *Academy of Management Review* 16(2): 262–90.
- Bush, B. and Maltby, J. (2004) 'Taxation in West Africa: Transforming the Colonial Subject into the "Governable Person"', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 15: 5–34.
- Butler, J. and Spivak, G.C. (2007) *Who Sings the Nation-State?* Oxford: Seagull Books.
- Calás, M. B. and Smircich, L. (1999) 'Past Postmodernism? Reflections and Tentative Directions?', *Academy of Management Review* 24: 649–71.
- Calás, M. B. and Smircich, L. (2003) 'To be Done with Progress and other Heretical Thoughts for Organization and Management Studies', in: E.A. Locke (ed) *Postmodernism and Management: Pros, Cons and the Alternative*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 29–56.
- Calás, M. B. and Smircich, L. (2010) 'In the Back and Forth of Transmigration', in D. Knights, J. Martin and Jeanes (eds) *Handbook of Gender, Work and Organization*. London: Wiley Blackwell.
- Calhoun, C., Cooper, F. and Moore, K.W., eds (2006) *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Cappelli, P., Singh, H., Singh, J. and Useem, M. (2010) *The India Way: How India's Top Business Leaders are Revolutionizing Management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Carter, D. (2006) *Dispossession, Dreams & Diversity: Issues in Australian Studies*. Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education.
- Césaire, A. (1955/1972) *Discourse on Colonialism*. (Trans. Joan Pinkham). New York NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Chakrabarty, D. (1992) 'Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?', *Representation* 37:1–26.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000) *Provincializing Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chandrasekara, I. (2009) *Ethnofinance: An Ethnographic Study of the Daily Accounting and Finance Practices of a Sinhalese Women's Community*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Leicester.

- Chatterjee, P. (1986) *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Chatterjee, P. (1993) *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chen, M. (1995) *Asian Management Systems: Chinese, Japanese and Korean Styles of Business*. London: International Thomson Business Press.
- Chio, V. (2008) 'Transfers, Training and Inscription: The Production of Modern Market Citizens in Malaysia', *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 4(2/3): 166–83.
- Cooke, B. (1998) 'Participation, "Process" and Management: Lessons for Development in the History of Organization Development', *Journal of International Development* 10(1): 35–54.
- Cooke, B. (2003a) 'The Denial of Slavery in Management Studies', *Journal of Management Studies* 40(8): 1895–918.
- Cooke, B. (2003b) 'A New Continuity with Colonial Administration: Participation in Development Management', *Third World Quarterly* 24(1): 47–61.
- Cooper, R. (1986) 'Organisation/Disorganisation', *Social Science Information* 25(2): 299–335.
- Cooper, R. (1987) 'Information, Communication and Organisation: A Poststructural Revision', *Journal of Mind and Behaviour* 8(3): 395–416.
- Cooper, R. (1989) 'Modernism, Postmodernism and Organisation Analysis: The Contribution of Jacques Derrida', *Organisation Studies* 10(4): 479–502.
- Cooper, R. and Burrell, G. (1988) 'Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Introduction', *Organisation Studies* 9(1): 91–113.
- Dar, S. and Cooke, B. (2008) *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed Books.
- Das, D., Dharwadkar, R. and Brades, P. (2008) 'The Importance of Being "Indian": Identity Centrality and Work Outcomes in an Off-shored Call Center in India', *Human Relations* 61(11): 1499–1530.
- DeGenova, N. (2010) 'Migration and Race in Europe', *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(3): 405–19.
- DeMaria, B. (2008) 'Neo-colonialism Through Measurement: A Critique of the Corruption Perception Index', *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 4(2/3): 184–202.
- Drori, I., Honig, B. and Wright, M. (2009) 'Transnational Entrepreneurship: An Emergent Field of Study', *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 33(5): 1001–22.
- Echtner, C. M. and Prasad, P. (2003) 'The Context of Third World Tourism Marketing', *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(3): 660–82.
- Escobar, A. (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Essers, C. and Benschop, Y. (2007) 'Enterprising Identities: Female Entrepreneurs of Moroccan and Turkish Origin in the Netherlands', *Organization Studies* 28(1): 49–69.
- Essers, C. and Benschop, Y. (2009) 'Muslim Businesswomen Doing Boundary Work: The Negotiation of Islam, Gender and Ethnicity Within Entrepreneurial Contexts', *Human Relations* 62(3): 403–23.
- Fabian, J. (1983) *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Fanon, F. (1952/1986) *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto.
- Fanon, F. (1961/1967) *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin.
- Featherstone, M. (1993) 'Global and Local Cultures', in: J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson and L. Turner (eds) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. 169–87. London: Routledge.
- Ferguson, N. (2003) *Empire: The Rise and Demise of the British World Order and the Lessons for Global Power*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Fernandez-Kelly (1994) 'Making Sense of Gender in the World Economy', *Organization* 1(2): 249–75.
- Florini, A. (2000) *The Third Force: The Rise of Transnational Civil Society*. New York, NY: Carnegie Endowment.
- Fougère, M. and Moulettes, A. (2007) 'Development and Modernity in Hofstede's Culture's Consequences: A Post Colonial Reading', *Multicultural Discourse* 2: 1–19.

- Frank, A.G. (1971) *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Frank, A.G. (1978) *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*. London: Macmillan.
- Fredericks, B. (2009) ‘“There is Nothing That Identifies Me to That Place”: Indigenous Women’s Perceptions of Health Spaces and Places’, *Cultural Studies Review, Issue on Critical Indigenous Theory* 15(2): 29–44.
- Frenkel, M. (2008) ‘The Multinational Corporation as a Third Space: Rethinking International Management Discourse on Knowledge Transfer Through Homi Bhabha’, *Academy of Management Review* 33(4): 924–42.
- Frenkel, M. and Shenhav, Y. (2003) ‘From Americanization to Colonization: The Diffusion of Productivity Models Revisited’, *Organization Studies* 24: 1537–61.
- Frenkel, M. and Shenhav, Y. (2006) ‘From Binarism Back to Hybridity: A Postcolonial Reading of Management and Organization Studies’, *Organization Studies* 27: 855–76.
- Friedman, J. (1994) *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.
- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L. and Szanton-Blanc, C. (1992) *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*. New York, NY: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Glissant, E. (1981/1989) *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Translated and with an introduction by J.M. Dash. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Glissant, E. (2005) *The Collected Poems of Édouard Glissant*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gopinath, C. (1998) ‘Alternative Approaches to Indigenous Management in India’, *Management International Review* 38(3): 257–75.
- Guha, R., ed. (1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1987) *Subaltern Studies I–V: Writings on South Asian History and Society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Guevara, E. (2002) *Global Justice: Liberation and Socialism*. New York, NY: Centro de Estudios Che Guevara/Ocean Press.
- Harding, S. (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women’s Lives*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Harding, S. (1996) ‘European Expansion and the Organisation of Modern Science: Isolated or Linked Historical Processes’, *Organization* 3(4): 497–509.
- Harding, S. (2006) *Science and Social Inequality: Feminist and Postcolonial Issues*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2001) *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2003) *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henry, E. and Pene, H. (2001) ‘*Kaupapa Maori*: Locating Indigenous Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology in the Academy’, *Organization* 8(2): 234–42.
- Hoogvelt, A. (2001) *Globalization and the Postcolonial World*, 2nd edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006) ‘Organization Studies and Epistemic Coloniality in Latin America: Thinking Otherness from the Margins’, *Organization* 13(4): 463–88.
- Ignatieff, M. (2003) ‘The American Empire: The Burden’, *New York Time Magazine*, January 5.
- Jack, G. (2008) ‘Postcolonialism and Marketing’, in M. Tadajewski and D. Brownlie (eds) *Critical Marketing: Contemporary Issues in Marketing*, pp. 367–87. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Jack, G. A., Calás, M. B., Nkomo, S. M. and Peltonen, T. (2008) ‘International Management and Critique: An Uneasy Relationship’, *Academy of Management Review* 33(4): 870–84.
- Jack, G. and Westwood, R. (2006) ‘Postcolonialism and the Politics of Qualitative Research in International Business’, *Management International Review* 46: 481–501.
- Jack, G. and Westwood, R. (2009) *International and Cross-Cultural Management Studies: A Postcolonial Reading*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Jaya, P. S. (2001) ‘Do We Really “Know” and “Profess”? Decolonizing Management Knowledge’, *Organization* 8(2): 227–33.
- Jomo, S. K. (2006) ‘Imperialism is Alive and Well: Globalization and East Asia After September 11’, in C. Calhoun, F. Cooper and K.W. Moore (eds) *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, pp. 253–68. New York, NY: The New Press.

- Joseph, G. M. and Nugent, D. (1994) *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Kadra, B. M. (1990) 'The Prophetic-Caliphal Model of Leadership: An Empirical Study', *International Studies of Management and Organization* Fall: 37–51.
- Kalonaityte, V. (2010) 'The Case of Vanishing Borders: Theorizing Diversity Management as Internal Border Control', *Organization* 17(1): 31–52.
- Kelly, J. D. (2006) 'Who Counts? Imperial and Corporate Structures of Governance, Decolonization, and Limited Liability', in C. Calhoun, F. Cooper and K.W. Moore (eds) *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, pp. 157–74. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Khan, F. R., Munir, K. A. and Willmott, H. (2007) 'A Dark Side Of Institutional Entrepreneurship: Soccer Balls, Child Labour And Postcolonial Impoverishment', *Organization Studies* 28(7): 1055.
- Khan, F. R., Westwood, R. I. and Boje, D. M. (2010) "'I Feel Like a Foreign Agent": NGOs and Corporate Social Responsibility Interventions into Third World Child Labour', *Human Relations* 63(9): 1417–38.
- Kipping, M., Üsdiken, B. and Puig, N. (2004) 'Imitation, Tension, and Hybridization: Multiple "Americanizations" of Management Education in Mediterranean Europe', *Journal of Management Inquiry* 13(2): 98–108.
- Kraidy, M. (2005) *Hybridity: Or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple.
- Kwek, D. (2003) 'Decolonizing and Re-Presenting Culture's Consequences: A Postcolonial Critique of Cross-Cultural Studies in Management', in A. Prasad (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, pp. 160–94. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Lan, P.-C. (2003) 'Maid or Madam? Filipina Migrant Workers and the Continuity of Domestic Labor', *Gender and Society* 17(2): 187–208.
- Lazarus, N. (1990) *Resistance in Postcolonial African Fiction*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lomba, A. (1998) *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge
- Loshitzky, Y., ed. (2006) 'Fortress Europe: Migration, Culture and Representation', *Third Text, Special Issue* 20(6): 83.
- Marens, R. (2010) 'Destroying the Village to Save It: Corporate Social Responsibility, Labour Relations, and the Rise and Fall of American Hegemony', *Organization* 17(6): 743–66.
- Mbigi, L. (1997) *Ubuntu: The African Dream in Management*. Randburg, SA: Knowledge Resources.
- McLeod, J. (2000) *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Memmi, A. (1965) *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. New York, NY: The Orion Press.
- Memmi, A. (1968) *Dominated Man: Notes Towards a Portrait*. London: Orion Press.
- Mendoza, B. (2002) 'Transnational Feminism in Question', *Feminist Theory* 3(3): 295–314.
- Mir, R., Banerjee, S. B. and Mir, A. (2008) 'Hegemony and its Discontents: A Critical Analysis of Organizational Knowledge Transfer', *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 4(2/3): 203–22.
- Mir, R., Calás, M. and Smircich, L. (1999) 'Global Technoscapes and Silent Voices: Challenges to Theorizing Global Cooperation' in D. Cooperrider and J. Dutton (eds.) *Organizational Dimensions of Global Change*. London: Sage.
- Mir, R. and Mir, A. (2009) 'From the Colony to the Corporation: Studying Knowledge Transfer Across International Boundaries', *Group and Organization Management* 34(1): 90–113.
- Mir, R. A. Mir, A. and Upadhyaya, P. (2003) 'Toward a Postcolonial Reading of Organisational Control', in A. Prasad (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, pp. 47–74. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mohan, G. (1999) 'Not So Distant, Not So Strange: The Personal and the Political in Participatory Research', *Ethics, Place and Environment* 2(1): 41–54.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1984) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', *Boundary* 12(3)/13(1): 333–58.
- Mohanty, C. T. (2003) *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mohanty, C. T. and Alexander, M. J., eds (1997) *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.
- Moore, B. (1978) *Injustice: The Social Bases of Obedience and Revolt*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

- Moore-Gilbert, B. (1997) *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*. London/New York, NY: Verso.
- Morawska, E. (2005) 'Immigrant Transnational Entrepreneurs in New York. Three Varieties and Their Correlates', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research* 10: 325–48.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2009) 'Imagining the Good Indigenous Citizen: Race War and the Pathology of Patriarchal White Sovereignty', *Cultural Studies Review, Issue on Critical Indigenous Theory* 15(2): 61–79.
- Mufti, A. (2005) 'Global Comparativism', *Critical Inquiry* 31(2): 472–89.
- Nandy, A., ed. (1988) *Science, Hegemony and Violence: A Requiem for Modernity*. Tokyo/Delhi: The United Nations University and Oxford University Press.
- Neu, D. (2000) "'Presents" for the "Indians": Land, Colonialism and Accounting in Canada', *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 25: 163–84.
- Ng, C. and Mitter, S. (2006) 'Valuing Women's Voices: Call Centre Workers in Malaysia and India', in C. Ng and S. Mitter (eds) *Gender and the Digital Economy: Perspectives from the Developing World*, pp. 132–58. London: Sage.
- Osuri, G., Dreher, T. and Laforteza E. (2009) 'Introduction: Acting Sovereign: Interventions in a Politics of Gendered Protectionism', *Borderlands* 8(1): 1–11.
- Özbilgin, M. (2004) "'International" Human Resource Management: Academic Parochialism in Editorial Boards of the "Top" 22 Journals on International Human Resource Management', *Personnel Review* 33(2): 205–21.
- Özen, S. and Özen, H. (2009) 'Peasants Against MNCs and the State: The Role of the Bergama Struggle in the Institutional Construction of the Gold-mining Field in Turkey', *Organization* 16(4): 547–73.
- Özkazanç-Pan, B. (2008) 'International Management Research Meets "The Rest of the World"', *Academy of Management Review* 33(4): 964–74.
- Pascale, R. T. and Athos A.G. (1981) *The Art of Japanese Management*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Perera, S. (2007) 'Introduction' in S. Perera (ed.) *Our Patch: Enacting Australian Sovereignty Post-2001*, pp. 1–22. Perth: Network Books.
- Pio, E. (2005) 'Knotted Strands: Working Lives of Indian women Migrants in New Zealand', *Human Relations* 58(10): 1277–300.
- Portes, A., Haller, W. and Guarnizo, L. (2002) 'Transnational Entrepreneurs: An Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation', *American Sociological Review* 67(2): 278–98.
- Prasad, A. (1997a) 'The Colonizing Consciousness and Representation of the Other: A Postcolonial Critique of the Discourse of Oil', in P. Prasad, A. Mills, M. Elmes and A. Prasad (eds) *Managing the Organizational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*, pp. 285–311. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Prasad, A. (1997b) 'Provincializing Europe: Towards a Post-colonial Reconstruction: A Critique of Baconian Science as the Last Strand of Imperialism', *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies* 3: 91–117.
- Prasad, A., ed. (2003) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Prasad, A. (2003a) 'The Gaze of the Other: Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis', in A. Prasad (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, pp. 3–45. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pries, L., ed. (2001) *New Transnational Social Space. International Migration and Transnational Companies in the Early Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge.
- Priyadharshini, E. (2003) 'Reading the Rhetoric of Otherness in the Discourse of Business and Economics Towards a Postdisciplinary Practice', in A. Prasad (ed.) *Postcolonial Theory and Organizational Analysis: A Critical Engagement*, pp. 171–92. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Putti, J., ed. (1991) *Management: Asian Context*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Raman, A. (1983) *Intellectual Colonisation: Science and Technology in West–East Relations*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Redding S. G. (1990) *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Redding, S.G. (1994) 'Comparative Management Theory: Jungle, Zoo or Fossil?', *Organization Studies* 15(3): 323–59.

- Redding, S.G. (2002) 'The Capitalist Business System of China and its Rationale', *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 19(2/3): 221–49.
- Rhodes, C. and Westwood, R. I. (2007) 'Letting Knowledge Go: Ethics and Representation of the Other in International and Cross-Cultural Management', in C. Carter, S.R. Clegg, M. Kornberger, S. Laske and M. Messner (eds) *Business Ethics as Practice: Representation, Reflexivity and Performance*, pp. 68–86. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Roberts, K. H. and Boyacigiller, N. A. (1984) 'Cross-national Organizational Research: The Grasp of the Blind Men', *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 6. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Rousseau, D. M. and Fried, Y. (2001) 'Location, Location, Location: Contextualizing Organizational Research', *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22: 1–13.
- Sachs, W., ed. (1992) *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books.
- Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. London: Penguin.
- San Juan, E., Jr (1984) *Literature and Revolution in the Third World*. Third World Studies Program, College of Arts and Sciences, University of the Philippines.
- San Juan, E., Jr (1986) *Crisis in the Philippines: The Making of a Revolution*. New York, NY: Bergin and Garvey.
- Sardar, Z., ed. (1988) *The Revenge of Athena: Science, Exploitation and the Third World*. London: Mansell Publishing.
- Sardar, Z. (1999) *Orientalism*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Sardar, Z. (2010) 'Welcome to Postnormal Times', *Futures* 42(5): 435–44.
- Saunders, K. (2003) *Feminist Post-Development Thought: Rethinking Modernity, Post-Colonialism and Representation*. London: Zed Books.
- Sayyid, S. (2010) *Recalling the Caliphate: Decolonisation and World Order*. London: Hurst.
- Scholte, J. A. (2000) *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Schutte, A. (1998) 'Cultural Alterity: Cross-cultural Communication and Feminist Thought in North-South Dialogue', *Hypatia* 2: 53–72.
- Scott, D. (1999) *Refashioning Modernities: Criticism After Postcoloniality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Senghor, L. S. (1998) *Leopold Sedar Senghor: Selected Poetry* (trans. Melvin Dixon). Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.
- Smith, L. T. (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London/Dunedin: Zed Books and University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2005) 'On Tricky Ground: Researching the Native in the Age of Uncertainty', in N. K. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, pp. 85–107. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Spivak, G. C. (1985) 'Can the Subaltern Speak? Speculations on Widow Sacrifice', *Wedge* 7(8): 120–30.
- Spivak, G. C. (1987) *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York, NY: Methuen.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990) *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. London: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999) *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Steinmetz, G. (2006) 'Imperialism or Colonialism? From Windhoek to Washington, by Way of Basra', in C. Calhoun, F. Cooper and K.W. Moore (eds) *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, pp. 135–56. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Stoler, A.L. (2006) 'Imperial Formations and the Opacities of Rule', in C. Calhoun, F. Cooper and K.W. Moore (eds) *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, pp. 48–62. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Subrahmanyam, S. (2006) 'Imperial and Colonial Encounters: Some Comparative Reflections', in C. Calhoun, F. Cooper and K.W. Moore (eds) *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, pp. 217–28. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Sullivan, P. (2008) 'Bureaucratic Process as Morris Dance: An Ethnographic Approach to the Culture of Bureaucracy in Australian Aboriginal Affairs Administration', *Critical Perspectives in International Business* 4(2/3): 127–41.
- Tacoli, C. (1999) 'International Immigration and the Restructuring of Gender Asymmetries: Continuity and Change among Filipino Labor Migrants in Rome', *International Migration Review* 33(3): 658–82.

- Tedmanson, D. (2008) 'Isle of Exception: Sovereign Power and Palm Island', *Critical Perspectives in International Business* 4(2/3):142–65.
- Tedmanson, D. and Wadiwel, D. (2010) 'Neoptolemus: The Governmentality of New Race Wars?', *Culture and Organization* 16(1):7–22
- Toledo, V. M. (2000) *La paz en Chiapas: ecología, luchas indígenas y modernidad alternativa*. Morelia, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Ecología.
- Trinh, T. Minh-Ha (1989) *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press
- Tsui, A. S. (2004) 'Contributing to Global Management Knowledge: A Case for High Quality Indigenous Research', *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* 21: 491–513.
- Tucker, V. (1999) 'The Myth of Development', in R. Munck and D. O'Hearn (eds) *Critical Development Theory*, pp. 1–26. London: Zed Books.
- Tyson, T. N., Fleischman, R. K. and Oldroyd, D. (2004) 'Theoretical Perspectives on Accounting for Labor on Slave Plantations of the USA and British West Indies', *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 17(5): 758–78.
- Vertovec, S. (1999) 'Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 447–62.
- Waldinger, R. and Fitzgerald, D. (2004) 'Transnationalism in Question', *American Journal of Sociology* 109(5): 1177–95.
- Wallerstein, I.M. (2005) *Africa: The Politics of Independence and Unity*. Fairbanks. Alaska: University of Alaska Press.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1974) *The Modern World-System*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, I. M (1979) *The Capitalist World-Economy: Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Warrior, R. (2009) 'Native American Scholarship and the Transnational Turn', *Cultural Studies Review—Issue on Critical Indigenous Theory* 15(2): 119–30.
- Watson, I. (2009) 'In the Northern Territory Intervention What is Saved or Rescued at What Cost?', *Cultural Studies Review, Issue on Critical Indigenous Theory* 15(2): 45–60.
- Westwood, R. I. (1987) 'Social Criticism: A Social Critical Practice Applied to a Discourse on Participation', in I. L. Mangham (ed.) *Organisation Analysis and Development*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Westwood, R. I. (2001) 'Appropriating the Other in the Discourses of Comparative Management', in R. I. Westwood and S. Linstead (eds) *The Language of Organisation*, pp. 241–62. London: Sage.
- Westwood, R. I. (2004) 'Towards a Postcolonial Research Paradigm in International Business and Comparative Management', in R. Marschan-Piekkari and C. Welch (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for International Business*, pp. 56–83. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Westwood, R. I. (2006) 'International Business and Management Studies as an Orientalist Discourse: A Postcolonial Critique', *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 2(2): 91–113.
- Wong-Ming Ji, D. and Mir, A. H. (1997) 'How International is International Management? Provincialism, Parochialism, and the Problematic of Global Diversity', in P. Prasad, A.J. Mills, M. Elmes and A. Prasad (eds) *Managing the Organisational Melting Pot: Dilemmas of Workplace Diversity*, pp. 340–64. London: Sage.
- Xu, Q. (2008) 'A Question Concerning Subject in The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism', *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 4(2/3): 242–76.
- Yeung H.Y.C., ed. (2007) *Handbook of Research on Asian Business*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Young, R. J. C. (2001) *Postcolonialism: A Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Biographies

Gavin Jack is Professor of Management, Graduate School of Management, La Trobe University, Australia. His publications include a co-edited special issue of the *Academy of Management Review* (2008) on international management and (with Robert Westwood), the book *International and Cross-Cultural Management Studies: A Postcolonial Reading* (2009, Palgrave MacMillan). He is an Associate Editor of *Organization*. Address: Graduate School of Management, La Trobe University, Vic 3086, Australia. Email: g.jack@latrobe.edu.au

Robert Westwood is Professor of Organization Studies, University of Technology Sydney, Australia. He has published extensively on critical aspects of international management (with Jack, 2009, above) and organization studies, including the recent books *Humour, Work and Organization* (with Carl Rhodes, 2007, Routledge) and *Critical Representations of Work and Organisation in Popular Culture* (with Carl Rhodes, 2008, Routledge). Address: School of Management, University of Technology, Sydney, NSW 2007, Australia. Email: robert.westwood@uts.edu.au

Nidhi Srinivas is Associate Professor of Non-Profit Management at the New School. His research is on organizations in postcolonial civil societies, and ensuing material and epistemic exclusions. His work has appeared in *International Studies of Management & Organization* and *Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, and his book *Against NGOs* is forthcoming with Routledge. Address: Milano The New School of Management and Policy, New York, USA. Email: srinivan@newschool.edu

Ziauddin Sardar is a writer, broadcaster, and cultural critic as well as a Visiting Professor, School of Arts, The City University, London, UK. He works across a number of disciplines ranging from Islamic studies and future studies to science policy, literary criticism, information science and critical theory. Address: Visiting Professor, School of Arts, The City University, London, UK. Go to: <http://www.ziauddinsardar.com>