



Military Institute of Documentation Evaluation and Prospective

STRATEGIA Journal

Legal Deposit: 2014-3027/ISSN: 2335-1705 /EISSN: 2830-9464

Academic biannual scientific journal dealing with all matter inherent to defense and foresight

The Geopolitics of Knowledge: Understanding U.S. Hegemony in a Global Context

جيوستاسية المعرفة: إدراك الهيمنة الأمريكية
في سياق عالمي

Dr. Lokmane Meghraoui¹, Dr. Yasmine Zittouni²,

1. National High School of Political Sciences (Algiers, Algeria),

Email: lokmeg76@gmail.com

2. National High School of Political Sciences (Algiers, Algeria),

Email: jassyztn@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper explores the concept of American hegemony and its impact on the global order since World War II. It examines the United States have maintained their leading position through various means, including economic, political, cultural, military, and technological advantages. The discussion highlights the importance of knowledge creation and innovation in upholding American hegemony, emphasizing the roles of intellectual elites, think tanks, and educational institutions in spreading American ideology around the world. The paper also delves into the principles of liberal internationalism and its effects on international institutions and norms. It investigates the idea of soft power and how the United States has used it to preserve its global influence. The document addresses challenges to American hegemony, particularly the rise of China, and considers the potential for new hegemonic powers to emerge. Furthermore, the paper looks at the relationship between globalization, knowledge capitalism, and American hegemony, examining how these factors have reshaped national and international institutions. It concludes by reaffirming the ongoing importance of knowledge generation and technological advancement in maintaining American global leadership and addressing any threats to its dominant position.

Keywords: Hegemony; knowledge; global order; culture; USA.

ملخص

تستكشف هذه الورقة البحثية مفهوم الهيمنة الأمريكية وتأثيرها على النظام العالمي منذ الحرب العالمية الثانية، وذلك من خلال تحليل سبل وأنماط حفاظ الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية لمكانتها الرائدة من خلال وسائل متنوعة، بما في ذلك تصدرها وسيطرتها على مجالات متعددة على غرار الفضاءات الاقتصادية والسياسية والثقافية والعسكرية والتكنولوجية. كما تركز الورقة البحثية على أهمية خلق المعرفة والابتكار في الحفاظ على الهيمنة الأمريكية، مؤكدة على أدوار النخب الفكرية ومراكز الأبحاث والمؤسسات التعليمية في نشر الأيديولوجية الأمريكية حول العالم. فضلا عن ما سبق، تتناول الورقة البحثية تحليل ومناقشة مبادئ الليبرالية الدولية وتأثيراتها على المؤسسات والمعايير الدولية، وصولا إلى فكرة القوة الناعمة وكيف استخدمتها الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية للحفاظ على نفوذها العالمي. كما تتطرق الورقة البحثية إلى التحديات التي تواجه الهيمنة الأمريكية، لاسيما صعود الصين، واحتمالية ظهور قوى هيمنة جديدة. علاوة على ذلك، يستعرض البحث العلاقة بين العولمة ورأسمالية المعرفة والهيمنة الأمريكية، ويفحص كيف أعادت هذه العوامل تشكيل المؤسسات الوطنية والدولية. إلى أن تختتم بتأكيد الأهمية المستمرة لتوليد المعرفة والتقدم التكنولوجي في الحفاظ على القيادة العالمية الأمريكية ومعالجة أي تهديدات لمكانتها المهيمنة.

كلمات مفتاحية: الهيمنة، المعرفة، النظام العالمي، الثقافة، الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية.

Introduction to Hegemony: Defining Hegemony: Political, Economic, and Cultural Dimensions

The term hegemony refers to the domination of one population over others, often supported by legitimizing beliefs and values. In this context, hegemony has been defined as the condition of knowledge for a particular accepted knowledge, which comes to be seen or treated not only by its believers but across all areas of reality-attempting dissemination and communication again with products (Rosamond, n.d.).

The definition of hegemony encompasses political, economic, and military supremacy by one state over another. Antonio Gramsci, a Marxist theorist and philosopher, developed the idea of cultural hegemony, explaining that Western capitalism controls not only production but also all other constituting functions within this value system, thereby facilitating domination (Bullock et al., 2000).

Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, who draw on this meaning in their post-Marxist work (see *Hegemony and Socialist Theory*, 1985), define hegemony as a form of political power relationship that operates by the subordinate society itself assuming social responsibilities that do not serve the interests of the corporate master but rather incorporate them into its ethos (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985).

1. The Worldwide System of Unequal Knowledge Production Challenges and Disparities in Knowledge Creation between the "Global North" and South

Knowledge creation in the Global South has historically faced numerous challenges for a long time. In the article “Inequitable Power Dynamics of Global Knowledge Production and Exchange Must Be Confronted Head On,” Laura Czerniewicz discusses the difficulties the Global South encounters in academia and research. These issues arise from Northern practices that influence research purposes to align with dominant interests, leading to ongoing inequality (Czerniewicz, 2013). This raises significant concerns about disparities in learning and sharing worldwide.

Most knowledge is funded by government or business investments, and many Southern countries struggle to allocate sufficient resources for research and they lack access to data and technology. The main issue is their inability to create and implement a plan that would help Southern countries to build and produce their own knowledge. Some scientists and researchers from the South attribute their low output and progress to the control exerted by Northern powers.

The conspiracy theory, adopted by leaders in southern countries to justify their shortcomings in various areas, acts as a way to avoid facing their own responsibilities. There is a clear disparity in knowledge production, highlighted by the fact that “international” often refers to the “Global North.” Scholars from the South find themselves constrained to produce papers and books that align with the Northern research agenda. If they attempt to explore topics related to their own understanding of Southern ideology, their submissions risk rejection. An analysis of four leading journals in social science management revealed that, despite having authors from different countries, all were based in Europe. It is evident that most major publications, journals, and websites tend to prioritize work by Western scholars (Czerniewicz, 2013).

This presents two potential paths for scientific research in the South: one is to focus on understanding and producing knowledge relevant to the Southern region, which could yield benefits without gaining recognition, while the other is to tackle subjects that attract attention from the Global North, thus achieving “international” acknowledgment. Additionally, Southern researchers face the challenge of unequal knowledge outputs, as only Northern scientists can access expensive academic databases, which facilitate their acquisition of resources and information more easily (Jazeel & McFarlane, 2010).

Open access to data and resources should not be treated as a financial asset; the primary goal is to assist a wide range of researchers in developing new ideas, technologies, social sciences, and innovative subjects. The availability of free access to academic platforms is expected to increase due to knowledge production in both the North and South, potentially resulting in the creation of partnerships and data sharing. The role of knowledge in fostering new technologies, theories, and scientific progress has led political leaders to emphasize the importance of keeping this information confidential (Czerniewicz, 2013).

Knowledge has become essential; government involvement now extends to various sectors such as healthcare, scientific research, and technology. Political leaders often consult with experts and researchers to better understand the decisions they need to make and the social needs at hand. As mentioned earlier, the creation and regulation of knowledge have turned into a matter of national security for countries. For these nations, sharing knowledge can be a double-edged sword, as it might help other countries advance and could undermine the power that the state once held.

1.1 The relation between knowledge and economy

Knowledge and the economy are deeply intertwined (Unger, 2019). Scientific advancements and technological innovations play a significant role in the economic cycle. Schumpeter argued that innovation is fundamental to growth, driven by the process of creative destruction (Cratannis, 2020). Today, scientific breakthroughs and research depend more on knowledge and technology than on raw materials. This knowledge economy includes efforts to enhance activities related to knowledge and technical production. It suggests that knowledge production activities are a key strategy for economic development. This may explain why the Global North is hesitant to share knowledge. The demand for technology and scientific expertise from Southern countries provides economic

benefits for the Global North, for example countries like Venezuela or Saudi Arabia in the field of oil extraction requires a technological framework that only affluent nations can produce. The extraction process primarily benefits developed countries, as they supply the technological tools and cover half the cost per barrel. The main goal for the North in leveraging this knowledge is to maintain their political and economic supremacy (Cratannis, 2020).

It's important to recognize that competition in knowledge production occurs not just between countries in the Global South and those in the Global North, but also within the North itself. This Northern-Northern rivalry often arises from concerns about research programs that might threaten national security. The creation and sharing of knowledge lead to competition among nations and academic institutions.

Simultaneously, science can promote collaboration, inspire initiatives, and support scientific efforts to tackle global issues like environmental challenges, terrorism, and health crises. Knowledge is not only tied to power; it also has economic implications. Leveraging knowledge production is a key strategy for driving economic growth. For many researchers, the goal of acquiring knowledge goes beyond financial gain; it's about deepening our understanding of social issues and developing innovative technologies that can benefit various fields, such as medicine, physics, and the Social Sciences.

In a study by Tarik Jazeel and Colin McFarlane, the authors explore the idea of responsibility in academic research and how critical geographic knowledge is produced in both the global North and South. They focus on the political aspects of academic output and how Eurocentrism affects research conducted in Southern countries. Most recognized scientific and academic research takes place in Euro-American research institutions. It is crucial to understand that hegemonic knowledge, which upholds the interests of dominant elites and institutions, is often presented as objective through a language that legitimizes their authority. The dominant powers in the West use their influence to validate the information they produce, focusing on issues that mainly affect the Global North while also commercializing knowledge and culture (Jazeel & McFarlane, 2010).

It is important to explore the processes of identity and social inequalities that are often marginalized and largely ignored by the global powers that take on the role of knowledge producers. The current global order is shaped by a lingering colonial mindset. This hegemonic

colonial ideology presents a complex and uneven narrative that implies the North as more entitled to knowledge production due to its superiority (Grosfoguel, n.d.).

In contrast, the South is seen as lacking the ability to produce scientific research and knowledge, leading to its dependence on Western nations. Post-colonial literature has critiqued these narratives that arise from global dominance. The concept of “Othering” has operated through various narrative dichotomies, such as the West versus the rest and civilized versus uncivilized. Foucault’s insights highlight the role of discourse in establishing power, allowing authorities to create narratives that help them maintain control over the populations. This strategy is used by the Global North to uphold its dominance through the creation of a shared knowledge framework. The vital contributions of intellectuals should be recognized as “wildly”, as Edward Said puts it. The way we think about research and knowledge production changes how we classify regions as developed or underdeveloped.

We conclude that the process of knowledge creation has transformed into being the main focus of policy formulation and economic gain. If knowledge is power, then decolonizing knowledge production can be a way to challenge existing power structures. Research by Alfred Marshall and later by Krugman suggests that there are spatial constraints on how information flows and knowledge spreads, implying that the cost of sharing knowledge tends to rise with distance. The knowledge production function model indicates that innovative activities are likely to cluster in regions where knowledge inputs are concentrated (Andres Rodriguez pose & Rune Fitjar, n.d.). This knowledge innovation is expected to predominantly take place in the Global North. Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, in their analysis of the dialectic of enlightenment, explore how the homogenization of power affects our perception of nature as something that can be replicated. Capitalists strive to achieve this by producing knowledge and innovation to sustain their dominance in the economy and politics, thus normalizing their influence to create the impression that it has always been this way. The Global North exemplifies how the ability to wield authority and influence has allowed for the re-imagining of the very foundations of business, politics, and culture.

The conversation about the North (hegemonic) and South (peripheral) has often revolved around how the West perceives wealth and progress in spatial terms. The gap between the North and South has created a *continuum* of intellectual dependencies that shape how knowledge is produced and

regulated. For the South, this relationship is deeply rooted in the history of colonialism and capitalism. They argue that their struggle to produce knowledge is primarily tied to the Northern strategy of maintaining control through dominance and subjugation.

This discussion explores how hegemonic systems in science contribute to the overall lack of diversity in knowledge which has led to a reduction in intellectual innovations. This dynamic fosters and sustains academic dependency, which is closely related to the ongoing inequalities in the creation and sharing of scientific information.

To illustrate the functioning of this hegemony, Dr. Dev Nathan, a Professor at the Institute of Human Development, explores the knowledge divide, which refers to the concentration of knowledge production in the Global North and its conversion into economic activities.(Nathan, 2021) He particularly emphasizes the pandemic era, pointing out that vaccines were mainly produced in the Global North, even though China and India played significant roles in vaccine development. The ability to utilize this information for vaccine production is widespread, and during his research, he uncovers the involvement of governments in promoting the proprietary profits of major pharmaceutical companies. Dr. Nathan also discusses how governments in the Global North resisted the Southern initiative to postpone intellectual property rights for the vaccine. This research sheds light on how knowledge plays a crucial role in creating inequality. This dominance in knowledge can generate excess profits beyond what is achieved from non-monopolized knowledge. The Global South needs to develop its own knowledge to boost its revenue and strengthen its economy as knowledge producers. Economists have analysed the policies required to nurture knowledge, known as the National Innovation System.

2. The U.S. Hegemony: The Role of Knowledge Production and Technological Innovation in Sustaining American Dominance

The newest stage of capitalist development includes the scientific-educational complex and social production, where knowledge itself becomes the chief means of creation.

Therefore, the production of knowledge and the accumulation of knowledge include social and economic reproduction. Informatics and new technologies have become vital in various sectors (scientific-education and social). This technological revolution and growth have changed the

face of the world both internationally and domestically and has produced both a positive and negative effect (Ordóñez & Sánchez, 2016).

This technological revolution and growth have changed the face of the world internationally and nationally. A country's power is mostly defined by its ability to create and innovate. The knowledge that it produces helps create development in all areas to maintain the state's stability and formulates internal and external strategies to maintain hegemonic presence in the international arena (Ordóñez & Sánchez, 2016).

The rise of hegemonic order within the international system depends most heavily on internal cohesion among economic, educational, political, and social bases. This cohesion between internal and external programs must correlate with the rationalization of the interests of the state's leadership. The production of knowledge is a necessity to the development of national and international policies.

In the modern day, knowledge and technological advancements govern the administration of international policy. An expansion of intellectual power contributes to the state's economic growth and quickly changes its standing as a powerful country in the world. The old policy of power was based in the industrial age, an age of military and economic hegemony, but the *Machtpolitik* of the modern world is primarily grounded in scientific and technological breakthroughs that mark the age of knowledge hegemony.

In modern times, knowledge and technologic advancements govern the administration of international policy. An expansion of intellectual power contributes to the state's economic growth and quickly changes its standing as a powerful country in the world. The old policy of power which was based on the industrial age, an age of military and economic hegemony is different from the *Machtpolitik* of the modern world that is primarily grounded in scientific and technologic breakthroughs that mark the age of knowledge hegemony. The dominance of knowledge in modern studies manifest an inequitable exchange in the global arena, characterized by the exploitation of valuable information pertaining to the production of technology. The roots of knowledge hegemony are found in the polarization of the intellectual class within the nation-state. The Western industrialized countries have utilized the power of knowledge and advanced technology to build a new world order based on their superiority in which the developing countries are still struggling to move into industrialized societies.

Eighty percent of scientific and technologic breakthroughs occur in developed countries. These countries have an epistemic privilege in the sense that they get to set the rules and parameters for knowledge (Ordonez, Sergio, and Carlos Sanchez, “Knowledge Capitalism, Globalization, and Hegemony” (Valori, 2021). The advancements in science and technology in the West facilitated the creation of sophisticated military equipment, while the potency of their media allowed for the expansion of influence in both civil and military domains, hence furthering their strategies to secure economic and political interests. The emergence of this new technological world order has established a novel economic paradigm characterized by ‘advantage creation’ disguised as international competitiveness, particularly disadvantaging those unable to compete internationally.

The U.S., as the leader of information, knowledge, innovation, and production, have gained the most advantages from investing in developing new technologies. Between the years 1990 and 1994, during the inception of knowledge revolution when sectors of technology were overshadowed by traditional sectors, U.S. investors in emerging markets achieved returns of 117%. The United States accounted for 41.5% of global investments in information and technology, while Microsoft’s Windows system included 95% of global platform applications. Additionally, internet users in the U.S. represent over half of the global total, and 58% of all email traffic is processed through U.S. servers. Online shopping makes up three-quarters of the world total, with American business sites accounting for about 90% of the world’s share. There are nearly three thousand gigantic databases worldwide, and 70 percent of them are located in the United States. The proportion of U.S. GDP constitutes 28% of the global total. For the last 80 years, the United States have been integral to even the most fundamental breakthroughs in telecommunications and technology.

Technologic innovation and knowledge production in the United States are highly advanced. The US’s hegemonic position in technical production allows it to control all data/information infrastructures, and it facilitates the creation of a new economic order, one that is essentially founded upon technology (Valori, 2021).

The technological innovation and knowledge creation in the United States are highly advanced. It’s hegemonic position in technical production allows the United States to control all data/information infrastructures, and it is this technological and intellectual hegemony that facilitates the emergence of a new economic order, one that is essentially founded upon technological innovation and the creation of knowledge. The United States’ dominance in high technology sustains its geopolitical tactics and hegemony in the

emerging world order. For the last 80 years, the United States have been integral to even the most fundamental breakthroughs in telecommunications and technology (Delory, 2010).

Bell Laboratories, the research and development subsidiary of AT&T, fuelled the American technological revolution with innovations such as the first practical light-emitting diode, the transistor, the C programming language, and the Unix operating system. SRI International and Xerox PARC in Silicon Valley gave birth to the personal computer industry, while ARPA and NASA funded the development of ARPANET and the Internet (Abbate, n.d.).

The space age has unfolded almost simultaneously with the atomic age. Moxie produced oxygen from Martian atmospheric CO₂ using solid electrolysis on April 20th, 2021, marking the first-ever attempt at extracting a natural resource from another planet. The United States ranked 3rd in the Global Innovation Index for the years 2019, 2020, and 2021. President Biden's budget proposal for FY2022 allocates roughly 171.3 billion \$ for research and development, representing an increase of 13.5 billion \$ (8.5%) over the expected FY2021 level of 157.8 billion \$. All of the research and development funding is concentrated in only a few federal departments and agencies. Five agencies constituted 93% of all federal R&D funding in FY2021, namely the Department of Defense (40.1%) and the Department of Health and Human Services (27.6%). In FY2022, the Department of Defense experienced a budget decrease of 0.9%, which will account for 36.7%, while the Department of Health and Human Services will account for 29.9%. Most of the U.S. R&D budget goes to defense. The majority of defense research and development is categorized under research, development, testing, and evaluation. The Department of Defense also breaks it down with a code number for each category: 6.1 pertains to fundamental research, 6.2 to applied research, 6.3 to advanced technology development, 6.4 to advanced component development and prototyping, 6.5 to system development and demonstration, 6.6 to research, development, test, and evaluation management and support, and 6.7 to operational system development (federal research and development, 2020).

There is a world of difference in the amount of research conducted from state to state. Six states -New Mexico, Maryland, Massachusetts, Washington, California, and Michigan- spent 3.9% of their GDP in 2010 on R&D, which accounted for 42% of the national research expenditure. In

2010, almost 28.1% of research and development was focused in California, surpassing Massachusetts (5.7%), New Jersey (5.6%), Washington State (5.5%), Michigan (5.4%), and Texas (5.2%). Silicon Valley, California, is the area where all the major IT corporations and startups are located. Additionally, this state has some vibrant biotechnology centers, including the San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The research intensity in New Mexico is attributable to its hosting of two principal institutions: Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories, which are the foremost centers for energy research in the United States.

This American “globalization” has affected the spatial side of knowledge capitalism by building a national-centric topography. The American authorities used globalization as the practical embodiment of the American persona, derived mostly from economic and consumer tactics. This represents a novel approach to the characteristics of American relations with the global community, characterized by the establishment of diverse and inventive hegemony. Agnew argues that the United States must abandon its conventional perception of hegemony as mere “simple domination,” which is synonymous with the concept of empire (Ordóñez & Sánchez, 2016).

The scientific prowess of the United States forms the foundation of its economic, military, technical, and scientific hegemony. The technologic and scientific innovation of the U.S. can be quantified by the number of published scientific papers, the quantity of registered patents, and the inputs for research and development (investments). The United States have devised a strategy to sustain its scientific and technical pre-eminence by enticing and persuading foreign experts to reside in the country, employing a brain drain approach that offers economic and social advantages to non-nationals (Delory, 2010).

U. S. manufacturing companies, such as universities, have also come to rely heavily on foreign-born graduates for a large portion of their growing workforce. The United States continue to be the foremost nation of immigrants in the realm of science. States power lies in the fact that they can keep the control of the productive resources for their own use within the national boundary. Knowledge of the sciences and technical data are a great potion of power.

The acquisition of knowledge and technological development in other countries is considered a threat to American domination. The logic of knowledge hegemony demands the creation of an international morality that turns knowledge into private property defended by the state.

Ownership of knowledge particularly harms the Global South, especially in the area of medical and pharmaceutical access due to intellectual property rights.

This logic of domination primarily relies on economic gains. Expenditure on research and development activities to generate new knowledge and develop new technologies constitutes the primary foundational input for innovation. The U.S. has always led in R&D expenditures, but China has changed that. According to OECD data, China's research and development expenditure rose by more than 15% in 2018 to \$463 billion (federal research and development, 2020).

Many experts say that Chinese R&D will soon be on par with that of the U.S. As a result, prices in China have risen, and the estimated cost of attending school has skyrocketed. For instance, the two nations with the most R&D-intensive economies, Zionist entity and South Korea, actually spend less in absolute dollars than the U.S. or China, but a greater percentage of their GDP, which suggests that a larger portion of their economies is focused on science and innovation.

There is a hierarchy of states when it comes to producing knowledge and research. Today, the United States is nothing more than the issuer of certificates and a sponsor of international scientific research. In 2016, China endeavored to achieve its goal of being the global leader in innovation by 2030 with an increase in its research and development expenditures. The race among the best schools represents the idea that knowledge is power among nations and maintains their scientific hegemony as one of the elements of power. The ability to be strong in research and emerging strategic technologies causes tension between countries. In 2019, the United States and China experienced a dispute over Huawei, a Chinese corporation that was a leader in the 5G market. To mitigate reliance on this established corporation, the U.S. government denounced the threats to communication security and sought to restrict its operations. The rise of China threatens the hegemony of the United States. China is the only state with the potential to challenge the existing order; it will almost inevitably seek a position of predominant strategic importance and will clash with American hegemony.

In the post-Cold War world, the United States planned its dominance in the world order through American knowledge production. Research indicates American involvement in the dissemination of knowledge via curriculum design, particularly in the twentieth century, when academic trends prioritized inclusion and cosmopolitanism, aligning with American

economic and political objectives. Universities in the U.S. have produced and continue to produce knowledge for their national mission in the world. The primary objective of the U.S. approach is to disseminate uniform economic, educational, and cultural (linguistic) attributes globally. This American way of producing knowledge is necessary to uphold its hegemony. Upon examining the predominant theories of International Relations, it becomes evident that they primarily aim to exalt American policy through its domestic and foreign tactics. These ideas elucidate the unipolarity of the United States in establishing its hegemony through the development of economic, political, cultural, military, and technologic dominance, rendering it the sole state capable of creating and governing the international system.

As a result, the US has shaped the geopolitics of great powers and civilizations, reshaped the world economy in its own image, and created international, political and economic institutions to safeguard its sovereignty on the world stage. This durability is based on the United States ability to create new forms of innovation, that include the development of demands, technologic innovations, the instrumentalization and control of media, the creation of new international institutions, and the emergence of global issues (terrorism, cyberattacks).

America has established numerous worldwide organizations and discussions that promote American ideology. This program may have been beneficial due to its significant advantages for the Americanization initiative. The theory of Liberal Internationalism, developed by American intellectuals asserts the primacy of the “Western idea” and a rules-based institutional order, supposedly universal in scope. This framework is deeply embedded in the epistemic communities of the American political and intellectual establishment, including think tanks, universities, scientific societies, research centers, and corporate media.

The “Western notion” constitutes a fundamental strength of the US order, representing a successful civilizational legacy, supported by America’s New Deal liberalism and disseminated abroad through Bretton Woods, the Marshall Plan, and NATO. “Soft power” is the hegemonic strategy of the United States. Gramscian hegemony is essentially a form of power to rule and manage significant changes in the international system (Flockhart et al., 2014).

The American elitist knowledge creators are the backbone of ideology, institutions, and policy making, and these oligopolistic information networks facilitate the global transmission of ideas and policies that serve the American perspective and interests.

The role that the top intellectuals play in producing knowledge that supports the American agenda is a crucial element of American power and may well be a vital factor in America's continued hegemony in the world system. Or else face economic or political sanctions, all countries must conform to this American economic and educational system.

This is the dominant path of development, of course implying different ways, and the absorption of a new techno-productive base of knowledge capitalism into the old socio-spatial and institutional structure. The emergence of this new global order resulted from the reestablishment of the ruling classes' influence over society, predicated on a power struggle predominantly advantageous to these groups. The liberation of that socio-spatial and institutional structure leads to the rise of the dangerous question of passive solutions among the subaltern classes, which are the basis of this hegemony over those classes and groupings.

Fukuyama's idea of the "end of history" is that American ideology will bring about world peace, basically saying that capitalism is the best way to ensure peace (Sergio Ordóñez & Carlos Sánchez, 2016). But this theory only really serves to promote U.S. interests and focuses on recognition and individualism which can easily be achieved through a free market, private property rights, and material prosperity all of which feed back into a global consumer culture. Under the U. S. hegemonic system, neoliberalism has operated alongside two main types of developmental experiences, based upon a new technological-productive core, but with different socio-spatial and institutional structures. Globalization is the spatial dimension of Knowledge Capitalism, and it is the latest stage in the development of capitalism. The process of globalization is the transformation of nation centered geography into a global capital space. The impetus for altering and reshaping the national landscape, influenced by the evolving dynamics of regional and local contexts, contributed to modifications in both the national and international systems. Some scholars see the United States as the number one world power, the only one with the ability to produce knowledge, create new ways to uphold its political and economic empire by the means of scientific and technological research and economic development.

With the economic rise of China and its new role as a major political player in international conflict mediation, many scholars (J.H. Coatsworth, Mour Fellows, C. Layne) have suggested that U.S. hegemony is on decline (National Science Foundation, n.d.). Some searchers noticed that the Chinese government has built up its economic structure and institutions by using the American capitalist system. The Chinese approach essentially involves taking American ideas and adapting them to Chinese social standards. The only hegemony that can stand up to American hegemony is another hegemony with a different ideology and perhaps a more compatible or alternative economic structure to the current world order.

American knowledge production has significantly contributed to the development of strategies that serve both the internal and external interests of the United States. Technologic advancements and the relentless pursuit of innovative methods to sustain American hegemony have been the primary factors contributing to the prolongation of its supremacy. This also serves to dismantle any other power that dares to challenge American hegemony. The main focus of American policy at the moment is on technological strides and scientific exploration. The U.S. is trying to bring together scientists from around the world to absorb and create knowledge. The creation of knowledge has always been the primary method for shaping and altering the world system while keeping American hegemony intact. The economy has been, and always will be, the number one resource that the United States invests in, using knowledge and technologic advancements as its tools of global power. The United States government employs global techniques to control elements that may pose a danger to its hegemonic position through various economic and political sanctions.

Conclusion

The generation of information and scientific progress has played a vital role in establishing and maintaining American dominance since the Cold War. The United States have leveraged their strengths in science, technology, and education to shape the global order in ways that reflect their interests and values. This has been achieved through various strategies, including:

- Major investments in research and development ;
- Promoting American educational institutions and curricula around the world ;

- Creating global economic and political frameworks ;
- Spreading American ideas and culture internationally ;
- Advancing and overseeing new technologies.

This dominance faces challenges, particularly with China's rise as a competitor in knowledge production and technologic innovations. The ongoing competition between the U.S. and China in areas like 5G technology and artificial intelligence highlights the importance of scientific and technologic leadership in maintaining global influence. As we move further into an era defined by knowledge capitalism and globalization, the ability to create, manage, and share knowledge will be a key factor in shaping global power relations. The United States, as the leading source of information, must continue to innovate and adapt to uphold its dominant position in an increasingly multipolar world. In the coming decades, the future of global power dynamics will likely hinge on how countries navigate the complex landscapes of information generation, technological advancement, and economic development.

Bibliography

1. Abbate, Janet. (n.d.). From ARPANET to Internet: A history of ARPA-sponsored computer networks, 1966-1988 - ProQuest. Retrieved 2 November 2024, from <https://www.proquest.com/docview/304104775>
2. Andres Rodriguez pose, & Rune Fitjar. (n.d.). Purpose-built versus serendipitous innovation links: New survey evidence | CEPR. Retrieved 2 November 2024, from <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/purpose-built-versus-serendipitous-innovation-links-new-survey-evidence>
3. Bullock, A., Trombley, S., & Lawrie, A. (2000). The New Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought. HarperCollins.
4. Cratannis, Elias G. (2020). Encyclopedia of Creativity, Invention, Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Springer International Publishing.
5. Czerniewicz, Laura. (2013, April 29). Inequitable power dynamics of global knowledge production and exchange must be confronted head on. Impact of Social Sciences. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2013/04/29/redrawing-the-map-from-access-to-participation/>
6. Delory, P. J. (2010). Les états Unis, superpuissance de la connaissance. <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&>

url=<https://www.lajauneetlarouge.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/651-page-020-023.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwj4iPDWnL6JAxUWcaQEHcdSIWAQFnoECBoQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2HTRE2b6pFVxYyCeVkFWIg>

7. Federal Research and Development. (2020). Research and Development (No. FY 2022). white house.
8. Jazeel, T., & McFarlane, C. (2010). The limits of responsibility: A postcolonial politics of academic knowledge production. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(1), 109–124.
9. Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso.
10. Nathan, D. (2021, August 23). Global inequality and the knowledge divide. Globaldev Blog. <https://globaldev.blog/global-inequality-and-knowledge-divide/>
11. National Science Foundation. (n.d.). Report shows United States leads in science and technology as China rapidly advances. ScienceDaily. Retrieved 2 November 2024, from <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2018/01/180124113951.htm>
12. Ramón Grosfoguel. (n.d.). Colonial Difference, Geopolitics of Knowledge, and Global Coloniality in the Modern/Colonial Capitalist World-System | Scholars Portal Journals. Retrieved 2 November 2024, from https://journals.scholarsportal.info/details?uri=/01479032/v25i0003/203_cdgokacitmcw.xml
13. Rosamond, Ben. (n.d.). Hegemony | Definition, Theory, & Facts | Britannica. Retrieved 2 November 2024, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/hegemony>
14. Sergio Ordóñez, N., & Carlos Sánchez, N. (2016). Knowledge Capitalism, Globalization, and Hegemony: Toward a Socio-Spatial Approach. *World Review of Political Economy*, 7, 4–28. <https://doi.org/10.13169/worldrevipoliecon.7.1.0004>
15. Unger, R. M. (2019). *The Knowledge Economy*. Verso.
16. Valori, G. E. (2021, August 4). *The hegemony of knowledge and the new world order: U.S. and the rest of the world*. Modern Diplomacy. <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2021/08/04/the-hegemony-of-knowledge-and-the-new-world-order-u-s-and-the-rest-of-the-world/>