To study the colonialism and imperialism With Critical Approaches and Problems.

Author : MAHESH PRAKASH KAWALE

Abstract

Since the early twenty first century, scholars studying Roman Britain and other provinces have been looking for alternatives to the term Romanization to frame their examinations of Roman empire. Many of the concepts presented are derived from postcolonialism and globalization theory, two interrelated schools of thought that have arisen as frameworks for making sense of the modern world. Although these methods have been very effective in reinterpreting the ancient Roman world, they have also given rise to some novel issues of theoretical and practical coherence in their uses. These, in turn, highlight critical problems associated with the theory "s function in Roman archaeological excavations, problems that have been avoided until now but which impede cross-disciplinary discussion. The purpose of this paper is to do just that: evaluate and compare the perspectives of postcolonial and globalization theories; assess the strengths and weaknesses of each; and suggest some possibilities for linking the insights of these and other approaches in order to define a more holistic agenda for Roman archaeology.

Keywords: postcolonialism; globalisation; institutions; power; military archaeology; rural archaeology".

Introduction

After the demise of "Romanisation' as a framework commanding widespread acceptance, Roman archaeology has struggled to build a scoherent identity of its own, which is surprising for a field so focused with identity in recent years. Over the last two decades, archaeologists from different parts of the Empire, but perhaps primarily from Roman Britain, have been exploring ways to go beyond this paradigm, and a number of different approaches have been proposed. While some may argue that Romanization is still useful, the growing body of research into Roman imperial processes is indisputable; the question is where this leaves Roman archaeology today. The continuing disintegration of the previously dominant grand narrative of the subdiscipline has gone largely unremarked since the last round of introspection on these changes about a decade ago. This dissertation aims to assess how far-reaching the change of Roman archaeology has been by looking at the major currents of theoretical

development over the previous two decades, which have been derived mostly from the literature of postcolonialism and globalization theory. The author obviously thinks that Romanization is a tactic that has run its course and accepts as true the numerous current criticisms to this worldview. 4 Among them include Roman archaeology's strong links with the contemporary imperial circumstances within which it became formalized as a sub-discipline, and its incapacity to capture the variety of both processes and consequences of Roman-period cultural change (particularly as reflected in material culture). Instead, the study focuses on the notions that have emerged as a result of this critique and the difficulties that still prevent them from capturing the full scope of Roman society. In the article's second section, we discuss ways to deal with these issues and how Roman archaeology may be useful for a wide range of people. This latter issue is as important as the consistency of the notions discussed and used under the banner of theoretical Roman archaeology in determining the success or failure of this endeavor. The convergence of postcolonial perspectives may be a sign of the times. It's important to move quickly even in a seemingly mind-intensive area like company management. Research articles in journals or edited volumes, as well as a wide range of scholarly presentations at Post Colonialism Section of International Critical Management Studies (CMS) conferences and other academic conferences, have all been published on post-colonial theoretical writing on management and organizations over the past decade. Management is being rethought in light of postcolonial theory in these and other ways. CMS is being expanded to include findings from prior major management studies. offers in this special issue of CPOIB some new works that expand upon postcolonial theoretical critique In other words, administration and planning. It may be noteworthy to remark here that, at its base, the post-colonial philosophy is driven by Radical critiques of colonialism, imperialism and neo-colonialism. Motivated and influenced by political activists, liberation warriors and anti-colonial activists from Africa, India, South America and other places, post-colonial concepts advocate for rising countries from colonialism to 'colonizing their minds' and to contest elections The unchallenged supremacy of Western epistemological, economic, political and cultural categories.

In the fullest sense, the post-colonial approach attempts to Understand existing difficulties in developing countries by a retrospective Reflections on Colonialism. According to Prasad, there is intellectual merit in considering management issues from a postcolonial perspective since doing so may help bring to light the neo-colonial concepts that are inherent in fields like international and cross-cultural management. Without the traditional method of expanding

borders and Territorial control, but with elements of political, economic, and cultural control, ne colonialism may be seen as a continuation of direct western colonialism.

However, in addition to underlining the continuous significance of colonialism in today's world, the postcolonial approach also delivers something unique and original in the method it handles the study of colonialism. Postcolonial theory, in particular, takes a stance firmly committed to critiquing Eurocentrism and pays considerable attention not only to political and economic issues, but also to the cultural, psychological, philosophical, epistemological, and linguistic effects of colonialism and ne colonialism in the West. Postcolonialism may be summed up as a radical critique and deconstruction of (neo)colonialism's most basic practices and discourses. By associating the Occident with superior terms like civilized and modern, and the Orient with terms like archaic and superstitious that connoted inferiority, a representation of the Orient, or perhaps of the whole non-Western world, as ontologically inferior to the West was created. In this fashion, the ideological language of Orientalism tried to describe modern Western colonialism as a noble and redemptive mission aiming to aid the non-Western peoples all of whom were supposedly falling behind in the linear March of World History. At the same time, meantime, by apparently becoming a significant part of the vast belief system and 'common sense' of the West, the hierarchical binaries portrayed in the vocabulary of Orientalism also evolved to hold substantial relevance for the identities of Western humans,

The first three essays in this collection examine various aspects of the post-colonial existence of Australia's Indigenous peoples. Colonialism rested on the idea that indigenous people were the opposite of progress and civilization. Nonetheless, as these three examples show, colonial governmental practices continue to impact the language of development even in the postcolonial era. For instance, Richard Parsons raises concerns about the 'rhetorical elevation' of Indigenous communities to'stakeholders' and suggests that, despite appearances to the contrary, stakeholder or community participation may actually continue to support colonial processes of development, even as it appears to empower Indigenous populations. Discourse analysis conducted by Parsons at two Australian mining companies indicates the importance of Indigenous people's respect for and connection to the land to their knowledge and perception of community involvement. Corporations' ideas on community involvement and Indigeneity were heavily influenced by discourses on development and management. Indigenous and corporate participants have varied understandings of terms like 'development', 'businesses and 'industry'. Consequently, in the corporate worldview normative ideas underlying notions of

175

'stakeholders' and corporate social responsibility were strategically deployed rather than reflect differing ethical viewpoints in terms of land use or development. Patrick Sullivan investigates the genesis and influence of a culture of bureaucracy that pervades the administration of Indigenous people in Australia. The pictures of Indigenous life he portrays become the raw material of bureaucratic industry, and he uses this to show how a bureaucratic imagination affects patterns of behavior and existence for Indigenous people. Real-world effects of Indigenous policy are often focused at maintaining public sector bureaucratic interactions based on hierarchical flows of information and ideologies of responsibility. There's a possibility of bureaucratic involution when there's a lot of back-and-forth between different government agencies; in this scenario, policy formulation and innovation are prioritized above implementation".

Review of literature

(Bobby Banerjee and Prasad 2008) studied "Critical reflections on management and organizations: a postcolonial perspective discovered that and It is probably a sign of changing times that postcolonial theory has started to garner pace even in a seemingly academically staid subject like business management. The last ten years or so, for instance, have witnessed the publication of a host of postcolonial theoretic writings on management and organizations, including research articles in journals, and a wide range of scholarly presentations at the Postcolonialism Stream of the International Critical Management Studies (CMS) Conference (the Stream has been convened at each International CMS Conference, held every other year since 1999) as well as at various other academic conventions. In these and other ways, the postcolonial viewpoint continues to refocus criticism in the area of management, and to enlarge the territory of CMS represented by some prior critical studies of management). The current special issue of CPOIB includes a group of essays that make additional contributions to postcolonial theoretic criticisms of management and organizations".

(Version 1993) studied "The 'Relevance' of Anthropology to Colonialism and Imperialism by Jack Stauder found that and In the aftermath of a large student rebellion at Harvard in the spring of 1969, a graduate student in anthropology raised a criticism of our field which I have often heard: Social anthropology - traditionally a field concerned with explaining and understanding small-scale cultures and societies, especially in the non-Western world - is a field that could make relevant contributions to our understanding of major events and problems of the world: wars of liberation, the effects and causes of racism, economic exploitation, colonialism,

imperialism .However Departments ensure that anthropology will remain isolated from and irrelevant to social and political problem. Many students in anthropology want an anthropology that will provide them with an understanding of 'major events and problems of the world'. Therefore they demand 'relevance', meaning an anthropology relevant to their felt needs. I sympathise with this desire and share it. But the basic issues underlying the complaints in the quoted passage cannot be reached by posing the problem in terms of relevance".

(Gardner 2013) studied "Thinking about Roman Imperialism: Postcolonialism, Globalisation and Beyond discovered that and For the past twenty years or more, archaeologists of Roman Britain, among other provinces, have been investigating means of going beyond the notion of 'Romanisation' as a framework for thinking about Roman empire. Many of the concepts suggested have been derived from two related schools of thinking which have evolved as approaches of analyzing the current world: postcolonialism and globalisation theory. While gaining substantial success in altering views of the Roman world, implementations of these ideas raise some novel issues of theoretical and practical coherence. These in turn highlight to fundamental questions to do with the function of theory in Roman archaeology, topics which have seldom been handled head-on but which offer hurdles to interdisciplinary interaction. The purpose of this study is to examine and compare the views of postcolonial and globalisation theories, assess their strengths and shortcomings, and offer some options for combining the insights of these and other approaches to establish a more holistic agenda for Roman archaeology".

Conclusion

It is obvious that the "history of the many disciplines in the quest to build empires in the tenth and early twentieth century was quite different. Disparities did not necessarily stem from disagreements over how much exactness fernet discipline should be practiced. Culture, society, and the specific imperial system all played a part in how people of different backgrounds were expected to contribute to the expansion of imperial control throughout the Age of Empire. Penson's what empire meant in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is entirely lacking from the encounters with indigenous urban cultures that influenced science in colonial and postcolonial histories. In place of Penson's narrow perspective, we propose a far broader and more fulfilling view of the connection between science and imperial authority. However, before we go into that, we want to stress that for the vast majority of humankind, the era of scientific imperialism is long gone. When seen in this light, the significance of the issue

becomes clear: the growth of the discipline will be driven by the increasing number of scientific historians working for former colonial powers in the developing world. Too much was at stake for science and imperialism to be reduced to a proving ground for Western superiority or the Défense of arcane historiographical categories. We also recommend that historians focus on the scientific enterprises that were most important to imperial authority, and that the dichotomy between exact and descriptive sciences be abandoned in this context as it has been elsewhere. The differences in the scientific standings of different countries and regions are examined, along with the factors that contributed to their growth. We have discussed how the political, economic, and social history of imperial countries and their colonies might provide light on the history of science. This shift is significant because it allows us to focus more intently on the historical legacies of both imperialists and indigenous peoples, as well as on how indigenous peoples interacted with and transformed various forms of knowledge. To do differently is to extend in a very unwelcome justified manner the subordination of the history of the etuis of former colonial people to that of the West", and our own will be increased since our scientific heritage was not harmed by to follow pension.

References

1. Atleo, C., Jr. 2014. *Red skin, white masks:* A review. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 3 (2):

    a. 187–94.

2. Benton, L. A. 2010. *Search for sovereignty: Law and geography in European Empires, 1400–1900.* Cambridge, UK:

3. Cambridge University Press.

4. Coulthard, G. 2015. The colonialism of the present. Interview with Andrew Bard Epstein. *Jacobin Magazine* coulthard-interview/ (last accessed 2 November 2015).

5. Cowen, D. 2014. *The deadly life of logistics: Mapping violence in global trade.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

6. Cowen, D., and N. Smith. 2009. After geopolitics? From the geopolitical social to geoeconomics. *Antipode* 41 (1): 22–48.

7. Galeano, E. 1997. *The open veins of Latin America: Five centuries of the pillage of a continent.* New York, NY:

8. Monthly Review Press. Harvey, D. 2003. *The new imperialism.* Oxford, UK: Oxford

9. University Press. ———. 2005. *A brief history of neoliberalism.* Oxford, UK:

10. Oxford University Press. ———. 2010. *A companion to Marx's* Capital. London,

11. UK: Verso.