Chapter I

Globalization: Evolution and Analysis

According to Oxford English Dictionary, the word globalization was first employed in a publication entitled *Towards New Education* in 1952 to denote a holistic view of human experience in education. Globalization is the coinage of the founder of the Bible student movement Charles Taze Russell who coined the term “corporate Giants” in 1897. It was not until the 1960s that the term began to be widely used by economists and other social scientists.

Globalization has been variedly defined by scholars of which a few are put below. Thomas Friedman writes:

> The simple definition of globalization is the interweaving of markets, technology, information systems and telecommunication, networks in a way that is shrinking the world from a size medium to a size small.

*(2010newsweek.com/top-10/most-overblown.../globalization.html)*

Tom G. Palmer of the Cato institute defines globalization as –

> … the diminution or elimination of state enforced restriction on exchanges across borders and the increasingly integrated and complex global system of production and exchange that has emerged as a result.

*(“Globalization is great”http:www.cato.org)*

The term globalization has quickly gained currency all over the globe. It is the most talk about buzz word of contemporary political and academic debate. Globalization functions as little
more than a synonym for one of the following phenomena: “the pursuit of classical liberal (“economic liberalization or free market”) policies in the world economy, the growing dominance of western (or even American) forms of political economic and cultural life (westernization of Americanization) the proliferation of new information technologies (“The Internat Revolution”) as well as the notion that humanity stands at the threshold of realizing one single unified community in which major sources of conflict have vanished.

Globalization is a historical process that results forms human innovation and technological progress. There are five different types of flows in terms of globalization. They are capital-flow, people-flow commodity-flow, image-flow and ideology-flow. Capital-flow implies transfer of money throughout banks all across the world by mode of transaction people travelling to anyplace in the world comprises of people-flow. Products made in China and then sold in the United States is a noticeable example of commodity-flow. Image-flow refers to any type of movie or television show circulated to other parts of the world other them where is it produced. Ideology-flow is the sharing of any belief or value between two different cultures. These five different cultural flows move in many different directions and help connect the whole world together.

The Course of Globalization cannot be exclusively determined by a few domineering nations in networks of “free” trade. Developing clear communication skills is invaluable in cultivating human kinship. Seeking and sharing fundamental compression of language is the first tool in cross cultural
understanding. Bi-lingual dexterity is crucial for every affinity of people. Further the modern traditions of language and commerce continue to emerge and grow in the ever-evolving cultural identity and language will be key in coloring a future of affinity and Kindness.

Globalization happens through three channels –

a) Trade in goods and services
b) Movement of capital
c) And flow of finance

Malcolm Waters has traced the history of globalization in his book Globalization (1995). He says that the word ‘global’ has been in usage for about 400 years from now. But it was not used in its technical connotation. The words ‘globalization’ ‘globalize’ and ‘globalizing’ did not exist until about 1960. In 1961 webster became the first dictionary to offer definitions of globalism and globalization. R. Robertson reports that the word ‘globalization’ was not recognized as academically significant until the early or possibly the mid 1980s. He further argues that the history of globalization is not new. In fact, globalization emerged before the coming of modernity. It came even before capitalism. He has mapped globalization is five phases:

1. The Germinal Phase (Europe 1400-1750)
   It saw the rise of international trade relations in Europe and Gregorian calendar has become common for all the western counties. In additional Catholic Church received the beginning of globalization.

2. The Incipient Phase (Europe, 1750-1875)
Formal international relations began to take shape. Alongwith, there was a sharp shift towards the idea of the homogeneous, unitary state.

3. **The Take–off Phase** (1875-1925)
   During the take-off time, globalization took the form of a concept in terms of four globalizing reference points-the nation-state, the individual, a single international society and a single humanity. Global competitions like Olympics implementation of world time, League of Nations etc.

4. **The Struggle for hegemony** (1925-1969)
   During this phase, each nation-state in its own way struggled to establish its hegemony. The areas of hegemony are – League of Nations, Second World War, cold war, and Universal nuclear threat of the atomic bomb.

   During the phase, there is heightening of global consciousness in the world community. Identity of individuals is rendered more complex by gender, ethnic and racial considerations. This phase includes post-materialist values world communities international relations global environmental, Satellite Television etc.

   Large Scale global process of economic restructuring and international political power have a big impact on our individual lives. Cosmopolitism is seen to be more appropriate to a new global era. As a result there is a break from old approaches and development in new perspectives resulting further in the intermingling of cultures and where societies are no longer bounded with national borders. Cultures, coming from around the world and fusing together in localities produce dynamic and exciting hybrids,
new experiences end the possibility for greater commonality between divergent groups. New forms of identity emerge, made up of diverse global inputs from media and immigration and found in areas such as consumption, style and music.

Globalization has put identities in flux, constantly changing with no single source of stability. Identity is always plural and relates to status sets. It promotes category-based platforms of ideas, leading to new forms of sociability. The advent of globalization has led to a re-examination of sources of identities. Manuel castells distinguishes between three types of identities.

Legitimizing identities are those introduced and promoted by the domination institutions of society as legitimate, such identities produce the power relations in society. For instance national citizenship is an identity that confer rights to its holders but also excludes non-citizens, such as immigrants, from such recognitions.

- Resistant identities are those promoted by groups who feel marginalized and devalued by current social conditions. These may be groups that used to enjoy uncontested power but now feel they are losing ground. As a result they try to resist social change. Religious fundamentalist groups promote resistant identities.

- Project identities are those promoted by groups trying to build new identities as well as transform the whole social structure. These include the environmentalist and feminist movements.
Cultural identity partakes the visible as well as invisible aspects of a specific culture that differentiates its people from those of other cultures. To be precise, community identity in multiculturalisation stands above all kinds of elimination and humiliation of the marginalized groups. The upper hand of one culture is discouraged by encouraging social heterogeneity. It also promotes cultural pluralism to sensitize societies to the dangers of cultural dominance, hegemony and governance.

Ethnic and religious identities are also recognized so that the communities can express their religious/ethnic identity freely. If religious identity creates the awareness to keep each religion’s religiosity intact, ethnic identity puts the respective groups under a single umbrella with its different colors of language, religion, race, nationality, and cultural markers. Recognition is the tool against ethnic superiority and religions frictions. This includes the recognition of differences and equality. Charles Taylor in his book *Multiculturalism* writes:

> Non-recognition or misrecognition... can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted reduced mode of being, beyond simple lack of respect; it can inflict a grievous wound, saddling people with crippling self hatred. Due recognition is not just a courtesy but vital human need. (25)

That multiculturalism removes social marginalization, dispossess and exultation of minority is also pointed out by Will Kymlicka:
Modern societies are increasingly confronted with minority groups demanding recognition of their identity, and accommodation of their cultural differences.

(Multicultural Citizenship, 10)

Multiculturalism has had a long life in India. The travel from Vedic religion to Hindu religion is matter of substantial time. Indian society has been shaped by a number of castes, patriarchal practices and religious movements, gender discrimination and cultural-patterns. Since pre-independence, caste has been a major factor of disintegration. It is obvious that Hinduism is the basis of caste system which further geared “upper” caste hegemony – Brahmanism. Later named as Hindustava its splits the other half as Dalit Bahujans. The Hindutava represents, the upper strate and the Bahujans the lower masses. Hindutava/Brahaminism gave rise to a number of negative changes. This brought in the national leaders life Mahatma Gandhi to work for the emancipation of the untouchables but not to much good. Mahatma Phule is another distinguished leader who strove for the upliftment of women, peasants and untouchables. Equally prominent were the efforts of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, M.G. Ranade and Maharshi Karvem Chhatrapati Shahu Maharaj to name a few. Assessing the contribution of Gandhi and Ambedkar, Sheshrao Chavan said-

Gandhi softened the Hindu heart Ambedkar awakened self –respect and interest in politics among untouchables both are considered as saviors of the untouchables.

(Gandhi and Ambedakr: Saviors of Untouchable Mumbai: Bhartiya Vidhya Bhavan, 2001, 28)
After Gandhi’s assassination Ambedkar had to champion the cause single-handedly. Our constitutions stands as an evidence of the conscious efforts of Ambedkar in the all-round upliftment of the lower masses. The Indian constitution provides and institutional structure and principles that would allow diverse people to live together as citizens of India. Through constitution, Ambedkar showed us the ways to liberty, freedom, all justice development and education and gave us the courage to protest against exploitation, fight for our rights and all justices social, political economic and cultural.

Dalits are the broken people of the county and are considered to be polluting, filthy and dirty. They are still marginalized. Inspite of many Dalit movements and on going struggle the ruling elites and the dominate caste do not consider the Sc & ST Dalits as a people. Blackmail threat of session or removal and dismissal from employment, extraction of unredeemable fires, denial of equal wages delay or deprival of promotions are some of the recent woes of the Dalits at work. Dalit intellectual has described their plight as

We as Dalit are born to
Grace cows and sheep,
Rear the pigs, goats, chicken,
Ducks and bullocks,
Bathe the buffalo, donkeys,
horses or elephants
Plough the lands and saw the
Seeds for survivals
Whatever else we are indeed
Great big bonuses.
In 1991, the pace of globalization in India suddenly accelerated, as the Indian economy opened. Within a decade satellite television and Hollywood movies become widely available. This brought in spade some noticeable change in family and gender announcements in India- cosmopolitan lifestyles freedom for women and increased autonomy for young people in choosing spouse and changes in the gender culture. Appadurai famously argued that because of transnational cultural flows associated with migration, tourism and mass media people now consider” ... a wider set of possible lives then they ever did before”. (Arjun Appadurai, Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization 117).

The current wave of globalization has been driven by policies that have opened economies domestically and internationally. In the year since the Second World War and especially during the past two decades many governments have adopted free-market economic systems, vastly increasing then productive potential and creating myriad new opportunities for international trade and investment. A defining feature of globalization therefore, is an international industrial and financial business structure.

Alongwith technology has also been the principle driver of globalization. People around the globe have easy connectivity than ever before. Information and money flows more quickly than ever Goods and services produced in one part of the world are increasingly available in all parts of the world. International travel is more frequent and international communication is more commonplace. This phenomenon has been titled. ‘Globalization’ it
is defied by scholars with much apprehension for E.g. Thomas Friedman in his book *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* Writes –

“Globalization is not a phenomenon it is not just some passing trend. Today it is an overarching System shaping the domestic policies and foreign relations of virtually every country and we need to understand it as such”

and

globalization has dangers and an ugly side. But it can also bring tremendous opportunities and benefits. Just as capitalism requires a network of governing countries, globalization requires vigilance and the rule of law. ([www.cato.org/pubo/letters/palaver-catoletter.pdf](http://www.cato.org/pubo/letters/palaver-catoletter.pdf))

It is indeed true that the United States is a cultural attractor and that some people usually elites – oppose that. But consider the craze that has taken the entire world by storm, the little English Wizard Harry Potter, or the Craze that swept seven-years old world over a few years. India’s Bollywood film industry, and so many other contributions from non–American cultures, all of which are enriching us and each other.

Globalization and culture are integrally connected and are projected through two intellectual currents like cultural universalism and cultural particularism, cultural universalism conceives of the ideal of a borderless world of tolerance. Here culturally self–defining communities’ world co-exist in a harmonious way. Where even through cultural difference exist, a
sort which focuses on the independence and impotence of cultural
groups. They evocate for a fiancé defense against any effect coming
from globalization that might change the cultural groups and
transform them into a sort of hybridized cultural groups to integrate
through the very forces that are used to struggle against their
integration.

Globalization can very well lead humanity to the construction
of a sort of universal identity, what Antanio Negri calls a “Global
Citizenship” It implies that cultural identities will remain among
different cultural groups but would bring all of us unitedly to
pursue some common principles. Alongwith cultural differences
will remain several cultural groups will fusionate and only the
“Fittest ones” will retain their homogenous cultural identity.

Before the era of globalization other existed local
autonomous, distinct, well-defined and robust culturally sustaining
connections between geographical place and cultural experience.
This connection constituted one’s identity was some sort of
collective treasure of local communities. Globalization has
destroyed stable localities obliterating locality-defined culture
globalization is therefore called by Micheal Billing (1995) banal
nationalism.’

Global identity can also be defined through cultural
universalism and other cultural particularism. The cultural
universalism tries to arrive to on ideal of borderless world of
tolerance. Globalization constructs a unique culture identity that
represents the human gender. Globalization constructs an
environment in which self-defining communities co-exist in a
harmonious way where even through cultural differences exist – a
sort of heterotopia. Globalization changes the cultural groups and
transforms them into a sort of hybridized cultural group. But it is difficult to deny that even the most indigenous and remote cultural groups on this earth are beginning to use the same weapons that ones were the harassment tools of the colonists and that are now used against by other individuals, with, different purpose, defend their cultural autonomy from kind of influence that Globalization might bring. Hence globalization can very well lead humanity to the making of identity where cultural identities will exist among different cultural groups, yet the concept of global citizenship will evolve involving every human being. Through cultural difference remain, yet the ablest would retain more or less homogeneous cultural identity. Cultural density is enriched by the exchange of culture and the differences are treated on the basis of discursive dialogue.

Globalization commercialization, communication are not unrelated aspects impacting culture in today’s world. In the Indian context particularly, all these knot together to strengthen the grip of ruling class hegemony over our society. The ideological hegemony exercised by the ruling classes in interpreted by Marx and Engels as –

The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch, the ruling ideas: i.e., the class which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal consequently also controls the means of mental production so that the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are on the whole subject of it. The ruling ideas are nothing more
than the ideal expression of the dominant material relations; dominant material relations. Grasped as ideas; hence of the relations which made the one class the rule one therefore the ideas of its dominance.

(German Ideology, Moscow, 1976)

It is this hegemony of the ‘ideas’ of ruling classes for which the state is only the “outer ditch” behind which stands a powerful system of “fortresses and earth works” – a network of cultural institutions and values which buttress the rule and domination of the ruling classes. The family, the community, caste, religion, its place of worship like temples, churches, mosques, gundwares etc. are the institutions that constantly feed the fodder to shape values and opinions bolstering ruling class hegemony of ‘ideas’ and common cultures both invoked and discarded when it suit the interests of the ruling classes.

Culture, therefore, constitutes the ideological formation that advances the interests of the ruling classes. On the obverse also arises the culture of the oppressed that opposes each culture of the ruling classes. Culture thus becomes the arena of class struggle in the specific context of India the co-existence of capitalism alongwith various form of pre-capitalist economic and social formations a mosaic of cultural milieu co-exist. What the communalists seek to achieve is to homogenize this diversity into a monolith expressed by their ‘slogan’ of “one country, one people, one culture”.

Globalization also creates favourable conditions for all forms of particularization, localization, and even fragmentation. The
interaction between global and local is also termed as hybridization of institutions or fragmentation of society.

The developing countries in Asia and Africa are much scared about the expansion of globalization. They consider it to be a new kind of imperialism, which exercises its hegemony in the fields of economy and culture. The U.S. is the leading champion which subordinates the nation-state cultures. The nation-state and grassroots culture are always in fear of its extinction. The other side of such a notion is that the proliferation of globalization would in the long run establish a uniform social order. The end of this process is homogenization.

Frans J. Schuurman (2001) is disappointed with the process of globalization. He is among those who argue that globalization has put an end to development. Privatization, which is an ingredient of globalization, does not bother for the marginalized sections of society. His comments run as under:

When modernity moved into crisis and postmodernity threatened to replace it, development studies also moved into what was called ‘the impasse’ and the notion of development received some serious attacks, various kinds of alternative ‘development’ notions were presented…. The specific reason why development studies feel challenged by the concept of globalization, is not only because globalization (even more than postmodernity) is heralding the end of the modern age, it is also because there is a changing view on the role of the nation-state.
Schuurman provides a large number of arguments in favour of development programmes. He says that every individual has a right to claim for development. And, this right of development resides in the state. In other words, right to development stems from the people and the people in turn are sovereign and are therefore equated with states. It is, therefore, the view of those who consider development as a part of the state/government. But, there is another side to this argument. The postmodernists claim that the society is run by the market. And, therefore, the market would look into the problem of development. Arguments cannot be alternatives to and programmes of development and therefore, in the years to come, development would cease to be an active part of state agenda.

Malcolm Waters argues that globalization is basically a theory of social change. Sociologists have been studying social change through a variety of social change theories. But, in the context of globalization, is it possible for us to employ Marxian theory of conflict and functionalism to analyze the consequences of globalization?

Ulrich Bech has talked about the risks, which are characteristics of modern and postmodern societies. People in these societies are obliged to experience much of ecological degradation. Capitalism has remained as the only alternative, after the collapse of Soviet Russia. Earlier, technology was predominantly oriented to maximize the production and whatever was gained by massive process of globalization has made the nation-state quite impotent.

Globalization has also done the worse in degrading environment. Capitalism thinks only for its expansion. For Beck, modernization is the primary globalization force. Global risks are
the product of global industrialization. But, because risk is itself inherently globalizing, the advent of risk society accelerates the globalization process. It is in terms of this effect that Beck makes his contribution to the conceptualization of globalization. Risk globalizes because it universalizes and equalizes, it affects every member of society regardless of location and class position. Moreover, it respects no border.

Hence globalization is in no sense an ordinary process of social change. It involves a large number of themes such as modernity, postmodernity, development, risk and time-space compression. There is no general agreement over all these issues and themes covered by globalization.

Globalization has reduced the status of nation-state. The idea of nation-state has today become redundant. Besides globalization, the postmodernism also rejects the notion of ‘society’ as a totalizing concept. If globalization succeeds in its objective of establishing a world society, what would happen to the concept of Indian society or the Japanese society? The kind of culture, music, architecture, lifestyle and language that we find in India is not genuinely Indian. It is borrowed from different corners of world in the wake of increasing speed of globalization. In such a situation, how does Indian society fulfill the criteria of a society?

Before the onset of globalization in a systematic way during 1990, there was not much of labour migration in the world market. The nation-states keep a vigil on such movements. But, recently, there has been much leniency in allowing labour migration.

In the context of globalization, there are two situations for class struggle. The first situation is one in which the state society has declined. And, therefore, there is no struggle for the
distribution of rewards at the nation-state level. At this level, the classes cease to exist. In the second situation, we have marketization and globalization of the international economy that may be depriving classes of an arena in which to struggle. It is a global economic market that has no centre, there might be no place in which classes can confront one another.

However, Van der Pijl developed an idea about international classes. He argues that as globalization proceeds, the capitalist class transforms itself in an international direction. And, therefore, they assume international status. However, there are few takers of the proposition given by Van der Pijl. On the one hand, it is argued by Malcolm Waters and a few others that though classes in globalization have lost their strength, it should not mean that there is no stratification in the postmodern society. Instead of class, there has emerged a stratification pattern, which is charged by consumption. And, now classes are based on consumption pattern.

Inequality has been world’s old problem. It is the basic aspect of stratification. All through the history of social science, inequality has remained a running theme of discussion. But, the emergence of globalization has hastened up the process of insecurity and inequality. It is found that the benefits of globalization have largely been cornered by the rich countries which have potentiality to invest money. The developing countries have only to satisfy themselves as the consumer society of the rich countries. The poor countries have further received a sharp divide between the rich and the poor.

The globalization of culture is chaotic rather than orderly. The absolute globalization of culture would involve the creation of a common hyperdifferentiated field of value, taste and style
opportunities, accessible by each individual without constraint for purposes either of self-expression or consumption. This is simple but very difficult. Under a globalized cultural regime, it is not possible to link Islam or Hinduism to the global territories. To develop a global culture, it is essential to have a continuous flow of ideas, information, values and tastes mediated through mobile individuals, symbolic tokens and electronic simulation. The prerequisites for the development of a global culture are difficult indeed to attain. Despite some structural difficulties, globalization has a strong impact on the culture of different countries which have received influence of globalization.

What globalization has done to the culture of ethnicity and nation? Has it developed cosmopolitanism? Hall et al. have summarized the impact of globalization on ethnicity and nationhood on the following counts:

1. Globalization is full of dialectics: it is a process, which creates differentiation and also homogenization. It has pluralized the world by recognizing the cultural variability.
2. It weakens the prejudices against the minorities, which have been absorbed in the national mainstream.
3. The globalization process brings the marginalized groups to the centre. In the case of India, the weaker sections have developed their own elites and groups of middle class people who leave their periphery to move towards the centre of the national mainstream. (Formations of Modernity, 92)

But, there is also a dark side of globalization of localism. It also happens that in the enthusiasm of borrowing so much from global culture, there is always fear of the extinction of local culture. The local culture faces an identity crisis. At
India’s level, if western music or remix of cinema music becomes pervasive and popular through the mediation of cinema and TV, there are ample chance of the disappearance of Punjabi *bhangara*, Rajasthan’s puppetry, Maharastra’s *tamasha* and Madhya Pradesh’s *pandvani*. Definitely, the interaction between the global culture and local culture is so powerful that there is always a fear of the oblivion of local culture. The fear of the loss of local culture is the consequence of cultural globalization.

Arjun Appadurai is an internationally known authority on globalization. Being an Indian, he is much familiar with the form and direction of globalization in India. He says that everywhere in the world globalization is the subject of debate. It is the name of a new industrial revolution (driven by powerful new information and communication technologies), which has barely begun. Because of its newness, it taxes our linguistic and political resources for understanding and managing it. In the United States and other most wealthy countries of the world, globalization is certainly a positive buzzword for corporate elites and their political allies. In the remaining countries of the world, the underdeveloped and the truly destitute ones, there is a double anxiety: fear of inclusion on draconian terms, and fear of exclusion, for that seems like exclusion from history itself.

The studies of Arjun Appadurai (1996) and Yogendra Singh (2000) are in the book-length form. Besides these two notable publications, there are a few important articles also which have appeared in the *Economic and Political Weekly* and the *seminar*. In the field of economic
globalization some noteworthy book-length publications have also appeared. Amita Bhaduri and Deepak Nayyar (1996), G.S. Bhalla (1994) and Deepak Nayyar (1995) are some of the economists who have taken long exercises to establish the hegemony of international economics funding agencies over the nation-state.

There is yet another important article by Lloyd Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, the American husband-wife sociologists. This article appeared in the *Economic and Political Weekly* (May 5-11, 2001). Their thrust of enquiry is to discuss the Indian economy’s shift from the status of command economy to the federal market economy. According to them, the power of nation-state has shifted to the federal state.

The history of globalization in India has gained specificity. Here, it is linked with liberalization and privatization. Both the sociologists and economists talk about liberalization though inevitably their reference is to economic liberalization. They hardly discuss modernization and its extension. However, they focus heavily on the status of nation-state in the new situation of liberalization. Normally, it is asked in India: what is the role of the nation-state in globalization? Do we say the state is dead and publish an obituary to that effect?

Thus, the political globalization in India ends up with the discussion on the survival and weakening of nation-state. Beside the nation-state, another issue relating to globalization is that of political ethnocentrism.
Yogendra Singh, Arjun Appadurai and J.N. Pieterse argue that change in technology, Liberalization and privatization have created social, cultural and institutional forces which surpass the boundaries of the nation-state. What Indian sociologists argue is that technology, communication and market have disintegrated our folk culture and folk societies. The marketization of economy and commodification of production processes through entrenchment of the capitalist mode of production in agriculture converts ‘peasants’ into ‘farmers’, eroding the traditional cultural patterns. It is evident, therefore, that in conceptual and theoretical terms, the relationship between the local culture and the processes of globalization should take into account both the analytical and substantive perspectives of the changing cultural realities.
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