RESISTANCE OR DIFFUSION?
GLOBAL CULTURE MEETS NATIONAL IDENTITIES

This chapter aims to examine the impact of global culture on weak states. An elaborate account of such an examination requires handling of several questions. Firstly, what are the available theoretical insights in the existing literature on the subject? Secondly, which framework should be employed in order to arrive at any plausible conclusion pertaining to the influence of global cultural artifacts on the national identities of weak states? Thirdly, do the binary oppositions explain the complex reality of intercultural interactions sweeping much of the contemporary globe or the picture is much more complicated than depicted by dichotomies such as used in the title of the chapter? What is meant by cultural imperialism? How do national identities respond to global culture? What is the nature of resistance to global culture? What is meant by Southern culture? What images are created during the struggle between global and local forces? How are identities formed? How can they be securitized? How can they be transcended? All these questions will be briefly dealt with in this chapter.

Western domination over the rest of the world has not remained unchallenged in history. Anticolonial struggles that took place in much of Asia and Africa in nineteenth and twentieth centuries stand as a testimony to the stiff resistance (violent as well as non violent) of the dominated. It has been properly documented and schematized at the level of scholarship as well. In fact, it is not an exaggeration to comment that much of post war Political Science and International Relations scholarship has been preoccupied with this enterprise. Terms such as colonialism, imperialism, neocolonialism, post-colonialism and so forth reflect the burning desire to expose the Western hegemony that has taken practically the entire world within its reach. A brief examination of all these theoretical insights along with their shortcomings is in order.

Colonialism: In its original form “colonization........ signified not the rule over indigenous people, or the extraction of their wealth, but primarily the transfer of communities who sought to maintain their allegiance to their own original culture while
seeking a better life in economic, religious or political terms.....” (Young, 2001: 20). Instead of ruling the indigenous population colonialism was driven by the people who wanted to migrate from one place to another in search of a better life. Domination of the local population was mostly involved in colonization but it was a by-product of the latter. In course of time colonizers started maintaining the distinction between colonizers and the colonized. Rather than integrating with local people as the cases of Portuguese and to some extent Spanish America demonstrate, colonizers started not only ruling but exterminating indigenous people of territories they sought to colonize. Most of the Spanish and Anglo-Saxon people preferred this strategy in America and Australia and vehemently pursued it after the independence. If not exterminated natives were forced out of the land colonizers occupied resulting in the settlement colonies in Algeria, Kenya, Rhodesia and South Africa. Such an appropriation of land and space renders colonialism an act of geographical violence that was targeted against native population along with their land rights. Moreover, the natives were not found suitable for the purposes of colonizers (industrialization and plantation) people were brought and deployed (mostly from India, China and West Africa) as salves in the newly held colonies. As was to be expected these people were not allowed any rights and were forcefully removed from their original social and political affiliations. Bereft of their socio-political origins with absolutely no contact with their native land these people were the first and the foremost target of the colonial domination (Ibid: 20-23).

What facilitated this process? How can it be justified? History of modern Europe provide ample evidence to prove that technological revolution, modern civilization and the emergence of European capitalism have gone hand in hand. New navigation technologies with sea going ships, printing press, railway engine along with other major scientific discoveries buttressed the process of colonization. The search of sea-routes, trade, religious crusades, economic extraction, civilizing others, commercial profits, emulation are some of the main reasons frequently cited for justifying colonization along with all of its consequences.

A few words on the consequences of colonization are in order. Despite all heterogeneity of its rationale, colonialism left strikingly similar disruptive influences in all parts of the world. Its wide-ranging effects vary from the transformation of local
economy into capitalist one through the ideological and economic aspects of capitalism to
the complete extermination of local sources of wealth. Colonization, most of the times,
completely destroyed pre or non capitalist mode of production leading to territorial
occupation of the land as well. Most of agricultural settlements took place where local
population was sparse or nomadic. The same process, if seen from European perspective,
made the nomadic life of local population impossible resulting in the stabilization of their
lives. Plantation economies that were established in Americas completely and radically
restructured the local economies implying oppressive social and political practices,
slavery being its crudest form. Where local population already has some kind of
industrialization, colonization depending on the interest of its rulers forcibly
deindustrialised these economies. Indian textile industry was destroyed by British rulers
in India in favour of British clothes in the early and mid nineteenth century. Conversely,
industrialization of colonized territories occupied the last place on the agenda of imperial
policies because colonial master needed raw materials and markets to fuel their domestic
industries. Colonial powers did not impose European culture on the local people for they
were either indifferent or cultural relativist or extermination was preferred over
affiliation. Transplantation of cultural values was not the purpose of the colonization.
European values both political as well as cultural, instead, came as the side effect of trade
and economic exploitation (Ibid.: 23-24).

Imperialism: Imperial is a broad term that covers all kinds of asymmetric relations
based on domination and dependence between affluent and backward societies.
Consolidation of European empires made it a centerpiece of international politics. It
characterized “the exercise of power either through direct conquest or (latterly) through
political and economic influence that effectively amount to a similar form of domination:
both involve the practice of power through facilitating institutions and ideologies” (Ibid.: 
27). It connotes two different meanings. First meaning indicates actual conquest and
occupation mostly by violent means. Second meaning is related to economic domination
with the potentials of political domination as well. In Marxist version of imperialism
political domination may or may not follow economic domination. Without economic
domination the notion of imperialism cannot be conceived in Marxist usage of the term.
First usage of the term does not necessarily imply critical connotation whereas second sense of the term is fully loaded with derogatory meaning associated with the practice of imperialism. French imperialism of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is the perfect example of the first kind of imperialism. American imperialism of twentieth century exemplifies the second category.

As an ideology imperialism and freedom movements of the former colonies emerged simultaneously in the modern world history. In fact, more intense the former more vocal was the latter. Initially, it was defense mechanism of the imperial ruling class vis-à-vis freedom movements. Despite this, the ideology of imperialism faced serious attacks from liberal and Marxist critics both in the East and the West. Demonization of imperialism is usually accredited to Marxism that has targeted all of its theoretical cannons against imperialism. Lenin was the principal force behind the Marxist theorization of imperialism whose *Imperialism: The Highest State of Capitalism* remains the bible of Marxist scholars struggling to reflect on imperialism. Lenin’s thesis on imperialism had five main postulates regarding the economic domination of the West over former colonies.

1. "A high degree of concentration of production and capital leading towards creation of monopolies that play a decisive role in economic life.
2. The merging of bank capital with industrial capital and emergence of finance capital of financial oligarchies’.
3. The export of capital as distinguished from export of commodities acquiring exceptional importance.
4. The formation of industrial monopolist capitalist association which share the world among themselves.
5. Completion of the territorial division of the entire world among the biggest capitalist powers" (Harshe, 1997: 25).

It needs, however, to be mentioned that colonies were more interested in the self determination and the end of their colonial status than imperialism as such. Colonial rule of newly independent states had to face local resistances all over the world that was growing stiffer day by day. These people were preoccupied with their freedom and for this purpose they focused rather narrowly on institutional and military dimension of imperial rule. Imperialism, until the formation of Commintern in 1919 was never the direct target of anti-colonial struggle. Establishment of Commintern provided the
platform where people of diversified political communities can coalesce and forge an alliance against their colonial masters. It enabled them to garner the public support of different political constituencies to strengthen anti-imperial politics and coordinate their policies to bring the pressure on their respective imperial rulers to vacate the territories they long occupied and exploited. This situation, by and large, prevailed until the Second World War.

Vivisection of the post war world into two antagonistic groups and the emergence of rival power blocs intensified the ideological rivalry between capitalism and communism. Capitalism as well as imperialism resultantly, became the prime target of Marxist cannons. This time, however, the centre of gravity shifted from Europe to the United States which emerged as the leader of the free world from the ashes the Second World War. Anti-imperial political agenda along with expansionist capitalist economy of the United States brought critical changes in the thematic contours of imperialism.

Neocolonialism: There are least three goods reasons why an imperial era came to an end after the Second World War. Firstly, the Second World War exhausted all energies of imperial powers of the day. They were militarily and economically unable to control their colonies after the war. Moreover, anti-colonial struggles were intensifying day by day in the former colonies. These people were increasingly asserting their right to self-determination and were no longer willing to accept imperial domination. Direct political domination supported by military was not longer sustainable option for imperial powers. Secondly, freedom movements in former colonies received enormous support (though mostly moral and political) form Soviet Union, China and India on international plane. Thirdly, the United States regarded imperial domination as an obstruction to its own economic expansion. It required the international space for itself and consequently supported anti-imperial politics. It definitely hastened the process of decolonization of most of Asia and Africa.

An abrupt end of imperial era did not result in the decline of domination of all sorts. If colonialism and imperialism best characterize European expansion and its rule over former colonies, neocolonialism is definitely the term that clearly insinuates the economic domination of post colonial world. As pointed out by Robert J.C. Young,
“Neocolonialism denotes a continuing economic hegemony that means that the post-colonial state remains in a situation of dependence on its former masters, and that the former masters continue to act in a colonialist manner towards formerly colonized world” (Young, 2001: 45). Freedom movement in former colonies proceeded with the assumption that independence from colonial rule would enable the colonized people to realize the idea of self-determination. It was widely held belief that their freedom from imperial rule would provide them with opportunity to achieve much needed economic development so that their liberty will have substance of some sort. The social realities of the post-colonial world mercilessly broke the myth. The ruling elite of these countries increasingly realized that their freedom is a sham. Most of economic policies were largely influenced by forces far beyond their control. It is this reality that has been theorized by Ghanian leader Kwame Nkrumah in the book Neocolonialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism that remains defining statement of neocolonial thesis. According to Nkrumah, “Neocolonialism is ... the worst form of imperialism. For those who practice it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from it, it means exploitation without redress” (Nkrumah, 1965: XI). He further argued that ‘the essence of neocolonialism is that the state which is subject to it is, in theory independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus political policy is directed from outside” (Ibid: IX). He argued quite forcefully that neocolonialism would internationalize the class conflict leading to international division of labour as the defining feature of global economy. Thus defined economic hegemony of the United States over the world will probably be the best example of Nkrumah’s thesis. Though not trained as an economist, details of economic analysis of Nkrumah’s book are quite fascinating. More striking is his assertion that neo-colonialism operates as a detriment not only to exploited states but also to exploiting countries. In his words “Neocolonialism is a milestone around the necks of the developed countries which practice it. Unless they can rid themselves of it, it will drown them”. He further comments that “neo-colonialism is not a sign imperialism’s strength but rather of its last hideous gasp” (Nkrumah quoted in Young, 2001: 47).

Much of Nkrumah’s thesis has been validated by the subsequent developments in international political economy. Major findings of his thesis such as that trade
agreements, foreign aid, the impact of U.S. controlled international organizations over economies of developing countries have been validated by the post war international political economy. International division of labour has taken deep roots in global economy. It requires political stability, skilled and literate work force and well-established industrial infrastructure. International economy provides ample evidence for it. Lastly, his thesis maintained important distinction between the development and neocolonial model of development. Whereas former is desirable as such as the latter, he recommended, should be resisted by all available means. He, in fact, regarded ‘Pan Africanism’ as the economic salvation of Africa. He overoptimistically asserted that “the monopolists will come face to face with their own working class in their own countries, and new struggle will arise within which the liquidation and collapse of imperialism will be complete” (Nkrumah quoted in Young, 2001: 46).

Controversial in liberal academia and societies, however, thesis of Lenin and Nkrumah offer interesting insights regarding the international character of capitalism depicting imperialism and neo-colonialism as the logical outcomes of monopoly capitalism prevalent in their times. The critique of the main postulates of these thesis is not required here. It is sufficient to comment that whatever merits they may have for explaining and understanding the predominantly expansionist nature of capitalism of their times they do not provide any clue whatsoever pertaining to the influence of global culture on weak states. Lenin, in fact, like other contemporary Marxist leader of his time was preoccupied with the communist revolution in Russia. Likewise Nkrumah too was engaged with the economic development of Ghana. Fully aware of cultural consequences of Western hegemony their theses, however, ironically do not respond to it.

Postcolonialism: In contrast to previous theories, postcolonialism comes closer for purposes of this research. Its explicit focus on culture as a factor in political lives of nations brings it nearer to the main thirst of this research project. Related to postcolonialism are the terms like postcolonial and postcoloniality. Some clarity is required on these terms.

According to R.J.C. Young, “postcolonial is defined as coming after colonialism and imperialism, in their original meaning of direct-rule domination, but still positioned
within imperialism in its later sense of the global system of hegemonic economic power” (Young, 2001: 57). It indicates important historical changes that have been stemmed from decolonization of Asia and Africa. It is principally engaged with the social and political realities of the Third World. It is aware of the fact that decolonization does not necessarily end the domination and political and economic subordination of developing countries goes unhindered through several institutional mechanisms despite their hardly gained sovereignty. It takes note of the cultural politics and radical changes in the very ethos and ideologies of former colonies. It is sensitive to the transformation of cultures in developing countries caused by the new political circumstances of the world.

The notion of postcoloniality has somewhat different connotations. It stresses the material and cultural milieu in which postcolonial states are to survive. Political sociology of post war international system has primarily dominated by the interests of the West in general and G8 countries in particular. That structural properties of international system pose tremendous pressure on its constitutive units that, in turn, leads to resistance from postcolonial states is the main contention of postcoloniality. Postcoloniality captures the tussle between postcolonial states and political and economic domination inherent in the international system (Ibid: 57).

The essence of postcolonialism is more radical than the two similar terms mentioned so far. “Postcolonialism ... names a theoretical and political positions which embodies an active concept of intervention within such oppressive circumstances. It combines the epistemological cultural innovations of the postcolonial moment with a political critique of the conditions of postcoloniality” (Ibid: 57). Through its focus on culture, postcolonialism attempts to balance the overemphasized economic dimension of domination. It brings the whole issue of culture and transnational social justice to the very centre of International Relations Theory. It readily targets its cannons on inherently status quoist cultural imperialism of the west. It takes keen interest in the formation of new political identities and tries to bring otherwise marginalized voices and people to the forefront of international politics. Its heavy dependence on feminism and non Western Marxism enables it to analyze the different trajectories of imperialism and colonialism and the adverse consequences they left in their target states. Postcolonialism is deeply committed to expose the cultural domination postcolonial states are suffering from and
demonstrates possible avenues through which cultural predicaments of postcolonial states can be solved in a more or less satisfactory manner.

Having acquired some clarity on somewhat interrelated concepts the contours of much suspected encounter between postcolonialism and mainstream I.R. have to be discerned. It raises several issues out of which two will be dealt with here. Firstly, origins of International Relations as a discipline and postcolonialism along with their current direction need to be spelled out. Secondly, main areas of interreferentiality of these discourses have to be highlighted. It is equally necessary to demonstrate their main point of departure.

In its historicized version and present position East/West divide of the world has been properly documented. This predominantly power driven divide has been principally responsible for flourishing of realist theory of international politics. The North/South divide of the world has always been either problematic or at the margins of the International Relations. This divide, markedly characterized by cultural overtones, does not lend easy credence to the dominant realist orthodoxy of the discipline. Having been marginalized during the Cold War, the North/South divide has come to the front of international politics after the collapse of Soviet Union. Nowhere the deficiency of realism was so apparent than in its failure to explain this divide that was increasingly assuming new forms. If the entry of postcolonialism into the discipline of I. R. is to be accredited the North/South divide and narrow mindedness of realist scholars will definitely be its principal claims. The cultural politics of developing countries, in other words, offer very fertile land where the intellectual concerns of postcolonialism and I. R. theory more readily converge (Darby and Paolini, 1994: 372-373).

International Relations has been in isolation from other disciplines since the time of its inception. It, with few exceptions of dependency school, psychological and anthropological borrowings by behavioural scholars, has not been prone to its own critical evaluation vis-à-vis other social science disciplines. As pointed out by Darby and Paolini that much of the marginalization of international relations can be attributed to the dominant role played by the so-called realist school in the discipline. Realism emphasizes issues like state, power, order and security and obscures the open intellectual inquiry of other equally important issues such as culture, resistance and hegemony. Having
successfully planted the idea of anarchical nature of international politics realist school of though has largely determined (read closed) the disciplinary boundaries of I. R. Coupled with the prevalent lack of self reflexivity realist closure, however, recently came under serious attack from postpositivist mode of thinking in I. R. The so called ‘third debate’ of I. R. has been largely inspired by the poststructural thinking and swept much of the intellectual spectrum of the discipline.

As an approach postmodernism was developed in post war France by those philosophers who were not satisfied with the existentialism which was the dominant theory of the time. Entry of postmodernism into I. R. theory can be traced back to early and mid 1980s. Richard Ashley was the main figure in this enterprise whose earlier writings were more in the lines of critical theory. By the end of 1990s more and more scholars started taking interest in exploring I. R. theory from postpositivist standpoint. R.B.J. Walker, James Der Derian, Michael Shapiro, Jim George and David Campbell were some of the prominent scholars who tried to redefine the agenda of I. R. theory particularly after the end of the Cold War. These scholars increasingly questioned the epistemological parameters of I. R. and brought issues of representation, discourse, textual narratives and culture. The so called ‘third debate’ characterized as discipline defining, in fact, shook the very foundations on which discipline of I. R. was developed.

Genealogy of postcolonialism is more difficult to trace for the simple reason that it traverses many streams. Broadly speaking, postcolonialism originated in the literature of Commonwealth countries. The usage of prefix ‘post’ signifies that the relations between colonizers and colonized persists despite the end of direct political domination (Ibid: 375).

The importance of literature is declining in postcolonialism despite the former being mother of the latter. The development of postcolonialism has come to signify the series of certain practices that continue to impinge on the relationship between colonizers and colonized. Western presentation of postcolonial identities sustains cultural domination of the latter though for all political and juridical purposes they are free from external control. Reinterpretation of colonial experience has been quite central to postcolonialism. It challenges the cultural subordination of colonial identities due to their presumed inferiority vis-à-vis European or more generally Western ones. Subaltern
Studies in Indian historiography, for instance, resists the tendency of western scholars in general and Cambridge historians in particular to easily ignore the phenomenon of resistance. Without giving proper thought to subalterns they present power relations in a distorted manner. The revisionist proclivities of Subaltern Studies reflect burning postcolonial desire to change and in certain cases subvert altogether the very concepts and categories deployed by Eurocentric scholarship for writing non European histories. It is the main ambition of postcolonial authors to unravel the Eurocentrism that informs much of the representation of the postcolonial world and to write more authentic indigenous local history (Ibid: 375-376).

Hybridity has recently come to acquire more prominent place in postcolonialism than in its previous incarnations primarily revolving around recovery and resistance. The inherent ambivalence of the encounter between colonized subject and West is at the heart of works produced by G.C. Spivak and Homi Bhabha. Bhabha maintains that hybridity and syncreticity of postcolonial societies render the categories of difference and otherness ambivalent for explanation. Gayatri Spivak also confirms that “I am critical of the binary opposition of colonizer/colonized. I try to examine the heterogeneity of ‘colonial power’ and to disclose the complicity of two poles of that opposition as it constitutes the disciplinary enclave of the critique of imperialism” (Spivak quoted in Darby and Paolini, 1994: 378). The main focus of Gayatri Spivak is gender whereas Bhabha’s central concern is broader in the sense that he introduces the notion of heterogeneity in cultural discourse.

What about the areas of intersection between postcolonialism and International Relations theory? Imperialism and culture are generally viewed as the main areas ripe for the cross fertilization of two discourses.

Imperialism is seen as a thing of past in the literature of International Relations theory. It is usually referred to in the introductory paragraphs of scholarly writings just to trace the origin of a given phenomenon from some unchangeable past going back to almost classical times. It is regarded as the mechanism for the augmentation of power. Some nuanced accounts pay some attention to relationship between the politics and economics of imperialism. No sustained effort has been made to draw cultural consequences of imperialism. The reason for this is that European powers regarded their
colonies outside the civilized world. Imperial relations were not seen as international relations. The location of cultural issues in the domestic sphere of the state further reduces the chances that issue will capture the attention of scholars usually trained in Inside/Outside divide.

If I. R. owes its origin to war then postcolonialism is definitely the product of imperialism. The phenomenon of imperialism and the consequences it left on postcolonial societies are central concerns of postcolonialism. Postcolonialism, being the child of Commonwealth literature heavily focused on the imperial experience of colonial countries and the way this experience was reflected in the literature of those states. Imperialism, in this sense, was the bedrock against which postcolonialism as an approach started its journey from the time of its inception (Ibid: 379-380).

Same thing happened to culture as well. Origins of I. R. in the immediate aftermath of First World War and its consequent preoccupation with war and peace pushed the issue of culture to the margins of the discipline. From the very outset disciplinary parameters of I. R. were defined in terms of power, state and order. It is hardly surprising that culture took the back seat in such an intellectual setting. One more thing added to the marginalization of culture in I. R. The very complexity of the term and several meaning associated with culture render the whole concept inappropriate for explanatory purposes. In the absence of well articulated meaning or set of meanings scholars of the discipline habitual of thinking in hard and concrete terms showed disregard for such an intangible and confusing term as culture. The end of the Cold War changed all this. Cultural globalization of the world, the emergence of identity politics, Islamic fundamentalism, ethnic cleaning and so forth clearly and conclusively highlighted the role of culture in world politics. Even the mainstream positivist scholar of I. R. conceded that marginalization of culture is neither possible nor desirable (Ibid: 382-383).

Principal concerns of postcolonialism make the issue of culture its linchpin. In parallel to the development of postcolonialism the meaning of culture has also undergone profound transformation. The issue of culture was grounded in the literature and later in literacy criticism. It was used for explaining the clash of different value systems in former colonies. Cultural contours underwent tremendous thematic expansion and
scholars began to employ the concept for explaining general North/South divide. As pointed out by Darby and Paolini, "it has come to encapsulate the very site of struggle and resistance between the so-called margin and center; the pivot upon which an emergent postcolonial identity develops." Having identified main areas of convergence the main point of departure between postcolonialism and I. R. theory needs to be mentioned.

The notion of power is the area of divergence. Though both discourses heavily rely on power, they conceptualize it in a radically different terms. Power has been fixation in I. R. It has been defined in terms of military might, economic wealth and an ability to change the behaviour of other in conventional I. R. This notion of power is neither acceptable to nor useful for the purposes of postcolonialism. Postcolonialism relies on Foucault’s power/knowledge nexus and uses it to expose the cultural domination of postcolonial subjects. It invokes the Foucaultian nexus to expose the presentation of colonial culture in inferior terms. Power/knowledge nexus enables postcolonialism to unravel the structure of representation that favour the West and results in self apprehension in developing countries. To sum up, if ability to change the behaviour of other is the realist notion of power then ability to change or distort the image of other is the postcolonial notion of power (Ibid: 383-386). Prior to the discussion of several images involved in the issue of global culture and weak states one thing has to be discussed. What is meant by southern culture? It leads to liberal-rational dilemma.

**Liberal-Rational Dilemma:** Liberal-rational dilemma, as written in the introduction of this research, has overshadowed the political-cultural life of weak states. It needs elaboration.

Nationalism, by definition, is a cultural phenomenon. As pointed out by John Plamenatz “nationalism is the desire to preserve or enhance a people’s national or cultural identity when that identity is threatened, or the desire to transform or even create it where it is felt to be inadequate or lacking ... thus nationalism is primarily a cultural phenomenon, though it can, and often does, take a political form” (Plamenatz, 1989:45). John Plamentaz further specifies conditions under which nationalism is likely to flourish. Nationalism, according to him, is the weapon of culturally disadvantaged. It grows where
the people somehow become convinced that their values and cultures are being threatened either by another superior culture or by some other political threat. Of course political sociology of international politics provides background condition for nationalism to flourish. Since family of nation is moving or aspires to move in the same worldly direction of material progress, some are in more advantageous position than others. The disparity among the nation of the world is the condition of primary importance for nationalism to emerge.

Plamenatz classifies nationalism into two types: Western and Eastern. In the case of the West nationalism emerged from the feeling of some scarcity. Scarcity lied in the standards that were likely to and did prevail all over the world in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But West was culturally equipped to overcome those deficiencies. As pointed out by Plamenatz “the Germans and the Italians, when they first became strongly nationalist, were already, by reference to standards they shared with the nation with whom they compared themselves, well equipped culturally ... Their most urgent need, so it seemed to them, was to acquire national states of their own, rather than to acquire the ideas and skills needed to run such a state, for they possessed them already in large measure” (Plamenatz, 1989:50)

Eastern nationalism is fundamentally different in character. It is drawn through the process of diffusion into the civilization that is alien to it. Eastern nationalisms are to survive in a world, whose models and standards have already been shaped by the West Europeans. There is growing awareness along the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America that their cultures are not well equipped to meet to standards of civilizations they are drawn in. Therefore, they have to revitalize their cultures in order to survive, excel and flourish in that civilization. In his words “We have also the nationalism of peoples recently drawn into civilization hitherto alien to them, and whose ancestral cultures are not adapted to success and excellence by these cosmopolitan and increasingly dominant standards. This is the nationalism of people who feel the need to transform themselves, and in doing so to raise themselves; of people’s who come to be called backward and who would not be nationalist of this kind unless they both recognized this backwardness and wanted to overcome it” (Ibid : 53). Besides the desire to meet or
surpass those standards there is a feeling that these standards have come from alien
culture. It leads to a baffling paradox.

This predicament unfolds itself firstly in the need to create new identities that is in
consonance with cosmopolitan standards. Due to the awareness of the fact that their
ancient cultural heritage obstructs their development they have to change it or transcend
it. At the same time same cultural legacy is seen necessary to retain their distinct national
character. They are faced with two choices: imitation and hostility. Imitation is necessary
to meet the standards of progress set by the alien culture. Hostility is required to prove
their own equality or in some cases superiority over the dominant standards. “The attempt
is deeply contradictory. It is both imitative and hostile to the models it imitates. It is
imitative in that it accepts the value of the standards set by the alien culture. It has
involved two rejections, both the of them ambivalent: rejection of the alien intruder and
dominator who is never the less to be imitated and surpassed by his own standards, and
rejection of ancestral ways which are seen as obstacles to progress and yet also cherished
as marks of identity” (Plamenatz, 1989:54).

If culture is the schematic image of social order, the conflict between two or more
cultures cannot remain unaffected by the images that are created in the course of cultural
wars. The tension between global culture and weak states involves certain images that are
invoked in the encounter between North and South. Each side tries to project other in a
certain well designed manner. Enemy has to be demonized and friends have to be
glorified. Neutrals are seen with suspicious eyes. Out of several images that are evoked in
the struggle between global culture and national identities of weak states, following are
used more frequently.

**Diabolical Enemy:**- The image of Diabolical enemy is created when the threatened and
threatener are roughly equal in terms of their capacity and cultural strength. As pointed out
by Cottam and Cottam “the diabolical enemy image incorporates the following view of
the threatener: it is simply and ineluctably aggressive in motivation, monolithic in
decisional structure, highly rational in decision making to the point of being able to
generate and orchestrate multiple complex conspiracies, and owes its power advantage to
a greater will and determination than the threatened public can muster” (Cottam and
Cottam, 2001: 106). People who do not share this image are seen as traitors and dupes of the enemy. Even those who share the view of the larger public that there is a threat but somehow refuse to accept the popular perception of the diabolical enemy are seen with suspicious eyes. The very fact these people have more complex picture of the enemy than one prevailing in popular parlance is enough to make them sidelined. As pointed out by Cottam and Cottam “their ability to view the threatener in more complex terms makes possible the identification of a broader range of policy options, some of which might be adopted, have the potential to stave off a crisis or atleast allow for a more complex strategic response (Ibid: 106). So only the claim is frequently made that cultural issues are less susceptible to amicable solutions than political ones.

The Barbarian Image:- The image of a barbarian enemy is invoked when the enemy is seen equal in terms of material capabilities but inferior in cultural terms. As noted by Cottam and Cottam “in the extreme, the threatened community will view the threatener as follows: it is simply and ineluctably aggressive in motivation, monolithic in decisional structure, cunning in decisional style and willing to resort to unspeakable brutality including genocide, and determined to take full advantage of its superiority” (Cottam and Cottam, 2001: 108). Emotional response commensurate with this image will be one of disgust, anger and fear. He is feared because he is superior in terms of material capabilities. He is disgusting because he is culturally inferior. Anger is justified because he threatens our culture. Fellow citizens will be seen as coward and traitor if they do not share the widely held perception of the barbarian enemy. Strategic response to deal with barbarian enemy will involve “a search for allies who can be persuaded of the probability that a failure to deal with this threat will affect seriously and adversely their own national interests” (Ibid: 109). More ambitiously, threatened will seek to completely eliminate the threat if possible. Given their inferior capability base it will be unlikely to succeed. More plausible strategic response will involve “creativity options, such as changing the basis of comparison from one-on-one to an alliance against one. Thus, perceivers must build coalitions to overcome their weakness and improve their ability to at least contain the barbarian (Ibid: 109).
The Imperial Image:-- Imperial image operates "when the people of a polity perceive threat from another polity viewed as superior in terms of both capability and culture. That is a situation that was fairly commonplace in the era of robust imperial expansionism. It reflected the unevenness of the movement toward mass politics, a movement only now approaching the point of universality" (Cottam and Cottam, 2001: 111). Imperial masters are perceived as primarily driven by the economic motives. They exploit the resources of colonies to their own benefit leading to political and economic subservience of colonial people. In a postcolonial world this image is increasingly seen and invoked in its neocolonial variant. Postcolonial states are juridically free and legally equal of all other states in the international system. Their economic and to considerable extent political system is controlled, judged and penetrated by the great powers of the day. Nkrumah's thesis of neocolonialism is the classic example which has already been discussed. It is sufficient here to point out that "a high percentage of these new states, recently emerged from imperial control continue to be judged by nationalistic and progressive elements internally as formally independent but still under de facto imperial control" (Cottam and Cottam, 2001: 112). Emotional response in this image varies from simple jealousy to violent rebellion. The subjugated group will demand autonomy, liberty, freedom to express, choose and the most importantly right to self determination. Dominant group will refuse or delay these demands in the name of their cultural inferiority and political mismanagement and so forth.

Rogue Image:-- Compared to barbarian and imperial image rogue image is a recent vintage. As noted by Cottam and Cottam "during the Cold War they held an image of the dependent of the enemy wherein a country was viewed as inferior in capability and culture but controlled by and supported by the enemy. That image disappeared with the end of the Cold War. Nevertheless, former allies of the Soviet Union, along with some other countries, continued to pose threats and were perceived as both inferior and threatening" (Cottam and Cottam, 2001:116). Rogue image is applied on those countries in the post Cold War world that oppose the discursive hegemony of the West. It is increasingly declared by top government officials (including heads of the states), epistemic community and media persons that certain states are not prone to the ideas and
ideology embraced by Western countries. These states such as Iran, Iraq, Cuba, Libya and North Korea are against of contemporary Western hegemony in the international system. For variety of reasons, values they hold and beliefs they practice are not in consonance with Western liberalism, and globalization being its latest incarnation. As pointed out the former national security adviser of the US Anthony Lake “our policy must face the reality of recalcitrant and outlaw states that not only choose to remain outside the family (of nations) but also assault its basic values. There are few “backlash” states: Cuba, North Korea, Iran, Iraq and Libya. For now they lack the resources of a superpower, which would enable them to seriously threaten the democratic order being created around them. Nevertheless, their behaviour is often aggressive and defiant ...

These backlash states have some common characteristics. Ruled by cliques that control power through coercion ... These nations exhibit a chronic inability to engage constructively with the outside world, and they do not function effectively in alliances ...

Finally, they share siege mentality. Accordingly, they are embarked on ambitious and costly military programs” (Cottam and Cottam, 2001: 116).

The Degenerate Image:-The image of degenerate enemy (or culture) is the most frequently used in the context of global culture and national identities. “It occurs when there is an intensely perceived opportunity to achieve a value at the expense of a polity that is viewed as relatively equal or even greater in capability and culture. The values most commonly of concern are those relating to national grandeur and an enhanced exercise of influence in world affairs” (Cottam and Cottam, 2001: 117). The problem with this kind of formulation of degenerate image is its narrow focus on politics. This image can be and has been invoked in the cultural crisis as well. If invoked in cultural realm this image concerns itself most with the national identities of states that are perceived to be at stake vis-à-vis global culture. Thus conceived the question becomes not the national grandeur (though it will always be there as the long term goal) but preservation of the national cultures with which people associate themselves. After all this image offers the most plausible psychological asylum to the adherents of national cultures. How dehumanizing is the Western Culture? What messages do Madonas and Jacksons give to the rest of the world? How materialist is it to be a consumer of Western
products? How lusty are their men? How open are their women? How free is their society? How inhuman is their science? How war-prone is their politics? How exploitative is their economy? How alienating is capitalism? How torturous is modernity? How morally bankrupt are they? These are not the questions. Nor is it the lament of the East. They are assertions on which large part of the identity of the global South hinges. It goes without saying that “the emotions that associate with the image are disgust, contempt, scorn, and anger that may ultimately turn to hatred. This combination leads to a desire to eliminate the offensive group and can lead to dangerous underestimation of an adversary’s abilities, ... contempt and disgust combine with anger and scorn in the case of degenerate, which can lead to dehumanization and then to genocidal violence” (Cottam and Cottam, 2001: 118).

Besides images, the issue of global culture and weak states inevitably implies enormous exploitation of global South in variety of forms. That South has been and is still exploited by the developed Western countries of the world, is the usual complaint made by developing countries on international plane. Some forms of exploitation are worth mentioning.

**Exploitation**: The notion of exploitation is generally but by no means exclusively associated with Karl Marx. According to Iris Marion Young “the central function of Marx’s theory of exploitation is to explain how class structure can exist in the absence of legally and normatively sanctioned class distinctions ... Capitalist society removes traditional juridically enforced class distinctions and promotes a belief in the legal freedom of persons. Workers freely contract with employers and receive a wage; no formal mechanisms of law or custom force them to work for that employer or any employer (Young, 1990: 48). It raises an interesting question. How can there be class exploitation in a society which is legally and formally free? Why do class differences exist between rich and poor or between capitalists and workers? Theory of exploitation helps answer these two important questions.

Marx answered this question with the help of labour theory of value based on profit as leitmotif of capitalist society and industrial mode of production. According to this theory “every commodity’s value is a function of the labour time necessary for its
production. Labour power is the one commodity which in the process of being consumed produces new value. Profit comes from the difference between the value of the labour performed and the value of the capacity to labour which the capitalist purchases. Profit is possible only because the owner of capital appropriates any realized surplus value” (Young, 1990: 49).

Marx normatively justified his theory of value or for that matter whatever he wrote in the name of alienation of people.

“Man is essentially looked upon as a producer, and because the social organization in which he is carrying on his role is so vast and complicated personal relations have lost all meanings. Society is relatively affluent. The output of goods is enormous, but the capitalist continues to exploit the situation in his own interest and the common man is engaged all the time in nothing but the exacting task of trying to, or worrying in order to, improve his economic status. The individual has to remain so busy in the pursuit of his vocation that he hardly gets time to look within himself and think of quality of his own life … He finds himself more and more isolated and alienated from society, an alienation which is not only from his work, but alienation from society, alienation from the state, alienation from those with whom he is working and alienation even from himself” (Varma, 1998:299).

It shouldn’t be deciphered from the theory of alienation that it is confined to within capitalist societies of global North. With capitalism flourishing more than ever, globalization abounding and global culture emerging alienation of man (women too as feminists would argue) has become globalized. It is indeed one of the major criticisms of globalization that it is uneven process harming many and benefiting few. Marxist theory of value now applies on global plane. Lenin’s thesis of imperialism was an earlier attempt to explore the international character of capitalism. In 1990s theory of surplus value can be applied and in Marxist writing it is applied in the context of globalization. It is not required (nor am I competent) to discuss the economic details of this theory. It would suffice to point out that capitalist “oppression occurs through a steady process of the transfer of the results of the labour of one social group to benefit another. The injustice of class division does not consist only in the distributive fact that some people have great wealth while most people have little. Exploitation enacts a structural relation between social groups” (Young, 1990: 49-50). Same thing applies in the case of global capitalism.
So only terms like core and periphery, developed and developing countries and so forth are very much in currency even now.

**Marginalization:** Proposition that global culture marginalizes national culture has almost become an adage in recent times. As pointed out by Iris Marion Young “marginalization is perhaps the most dangerous form of oppression. A whole category of people is expelled from useful participation in social life and this potentially subjected to severe material deprivation and even extermination. The material deprivation marginalization often causes is certainly unjust, especially in a society where other have plenty ... Not only in the Third World capitalist countries, but also in most Western capitalist societies, there is a growing underclass of people permanently confined to lives of social marginality, most of whom are racially marked” (Young, 1990: 53). Social, political and economic marginalization caused by globalization raises some basic issues related to justice. It involves whole range of questions that cannot the discussed in length here. It is enough to raise them only. Globalization for instance, inevitably raises the question of cultural rights. On what grounds right to one’s culture can be asserted? Who participates in the formation of global culture? Is everyone included? Is cultural exclusion deliberate or a chance phenomenon? How can marginalized cultures be brought into the so called mainstream of global culture? Will it not be seen an imposition of alien values on local and national cultures? Is mainstreaming of all national cultures into emerging cosmopolitanism feasible? If so, is it morally justified? These are thorny issues that the struggle between global culture and national identities inextricably implies.

**Powerlessness:** Oppression takes many subtle forms. Powerlessness is one of them. It will be a mistake to attribute powerlessness to modernity or postmodernity. It very much existed in premodern times. Here the focus is on the current conditions of globality. Contemporary globality has its own discontents. As mentioned earlier globalization is profoundly asymmetrical in nature. Very asymmetry and its operation on such a vast canvass causes enormous social injustice. As pointed out by Iris Marion Young “the powerless are those who lack authority or power even in this mediated sense, those over whom power is exercised without their exercising it; the powerless are situated so that
they must take orders and rarely have the right to give them. Powerlessness also designates a position in the division of labour and the concomitant social position that allows persons little opportunity to develop and exercise skills. The powerless have little or no work autonomy, exercise little creativity or judgement in their work, have no technical expertise or authority, express themselves awkwardly, especially in public or bureaucratic settings, and do not command respect" (Young, 1990:57). Young specifies three aspects of powerlessness. They are following.

Firstly, professionals are powerful. Professionalism requires “a college education and the acquisition of a specialized knowledge that entails working with symbols and concepts. Professionals experience progress first in acquiring the experience, and then in the course of professional advancement and rise in status” (Young, 1990: 57). Powerless lead opposite life. They lack “orientation toward the progressive development of capacities and avenues for recognition (Ibid: 57).

Secondly, powerful have considerable autonomy and authority over others. As Young observes “while many professionals have supervisors and cannot directly influence many decisions or the actions of many people, most nevertheless have considerable day-to-day work autonomy. Professionals usually have some authority over others” (Ibid: 57). In contrast, powerless lack work autonomy. They have little or no authority. They usually work under the supervision of professionals. Moreover, both belong to different cultures. It almost goes without saying that the culture of professionals is usually elite and powerless share the culture of working class. As pointed out by Young “the two groups tend to live in segregated neighborhoods or even different towns, a process itself mediated by planners zoning officials, and real estate people. The groups tend to have different tastes in food, décor, clothes, music and vacations, and often different health and educational needs. Members of each group socialize for the most part with others in the same status group. While there is some inter group mobility between generations, for the most part the children of professionals become professionals and the children of non professionals do not” (Ibid: 57).

Thirdly, professionals are treated with respect. They lead life with dignity. They have more say in daily routine life outside their work place as well. “To treat people with respect is to be prepared to listen to what they have to say or to do what they request
because they have some authority, expertise, or influence. The norms of respectability are associated specifically with professional culture. Professional dress, speech, tastes, demeanor, all connote respectability. Generally professionals expect and receive respect from others” (Ibid: 57).

**Violence:** Violence is worst of all oppression. Despite all advancements humanity has made so far human nature or more specifically human vices have not changed much. People and groups both are seen perpetrating violence over others. As pointed out by Young “many groups suffer the oppression of systematic violence. Members of some group live with the knowledge that they must fear random, unprovoked attacks on their persons or property, which have no motive but to damage, humiliate or destroy the person ... While the frequency of physical attack on members of these and other racially or sexually marked groups is very disturbing. I also include in this category less severe incidents of harassment, intimidation, or ridicule simply for the purpose of degrading, humiliating, or stigmatizing group members” (Young, 1990: 61).

Several factors are responsible for violence in society; cultural imperialism being the significant one. People facing the challenge from superior culture refuse to accept its presumed superiority. They tend to assert or defend their culture that comes under attack due to cultural domination. It leads many times to cultural conflicts that are violent in nature. As pointed out by Young “cultural imperialism ... intersects with violence. The culturally imperialized may reject the dominant meanings and the attempt to assert their own subjectivity, or the fact of their cultural difference may put the lie to the dominant culture’s implicit claim to universality. The dissonance generated by such a challenge to the hegemonic cultural meanings can also be a source of irrational violence” (Young, 1990: 63).

Global culture undermines the national identities of weak states. It directly leads to several critical questions. How are identities formed? How can identities be securitized? A brief answer to these two extremely important questions is in order.

**How are Identities Formed:** Cultural globalization of the world instigated the prominence of identity on the agenda of international politics. Identity plays a crucial role
in the maintenance of state as an institution within its jurisdiction. It is not surprising; therefore, more and more focus has been placed on ideational and intangible dimension of the state apparatus. Identity of an individual or a group is important because people behave according to them. How I act depends on who I am or how I perceive myself vis-à-vis others. According to Huntington “identity is an individual’s or a group’s sense of self. It is product of self consciousness, that I or we possess distinct qualities as an entity that differentiates me from you and us from them” (Huntington, 2004:21).

Secondly, identity formation is other dependent process. Barry Buzan comments on the relational aspect of identity that “the debates about identity display a remarkable degree of agreement around the idea that any identity of ‘self’ can only be defined in relation to an ‘other’” (Buzan, 2004: 17). Formation of identity inevitably requires the presence of other or significant others vis-à-vis whom the person tries to answer who he is. Identity is developed in constant interaction (real or imagined) with significant others. How others perceive has a significant bearing upon the individual or group’s sense of self. As pointed out by Charles Taylor “crucial feature of human life is its fundamentally dialogical character. .... We define our identity always in dialogue with, sometimes in struggle against, the things out significant others want to see in us... My own identity doesn’t mean that I work it our in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, perhaps overt, partly internal, with others... my own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others” (Taylor, 1992:32-34). It requires not only others but also consciousness of oneself. One has to be aware of who he/she is vis-à-vis others. As pointed out by Huntington “a new baby may have elements of an identity at birth in terms of a name, sex, parentage, and citizenship. These do not, however, become part of his or her identity until the baby becomes conscious of them and defines itself in terms of them” (Huntington, 2004:21).

Third and the most important is that individuals and groups both have identities. The difference between the two is that group’s identity is more fixed than that of individual. It is the case because groups survive for more duration than a person. An individual can randomly shift his identity or become the part of many groups. His identity is more fungible than one of the group. Groups acquire their identities over a period of time. Their identities too can change but they take more time than individual. In some
cases groups change their identities overnight that is rare. It happens only after some major incident or more often an accident. Suffering makes man wiser is the conventional wisdom in this regard. As noted by Huntington “if the basis for defining characteristic of a group disappears, perhaps because it achieves the goal it was created to achieve, the existence of the group is threatened, unless it can find another cause to motivate its members” (Huntington, 2004:21)

Finally, identities are socially constructed Naturalist theory of identity has come under serious attack in recent times. Recent scholarship on identity puts forward the thesis that identity, formation is essentially a matter of social construction rather than that of genetic reproduction. Huntington remarks “people make their identity, under varying degrees of pressure, inducements, and freedom... Identities are imagined selves: they are what we think we are and what we want to be. Apart from ancestry ... Gender... and age people are relatively free to define their identities as they wish...” (Huntington, 2004:22-23).

**Securitization of Identities:** Security content of the state, as mentioned earlier, has undergone remarkable expansion in the twentieth century. Security Studies an important branch of International Relations started taking note of this fact. By the early 1980s a group of scholars was emerging that was not satisfied with the narrow focus of security of the state in military terms. They fiercely argued in favour of expanding the research agenda of security. Classical notion of security defined in terms of absence of threat to physical survival and core values underwent serious and rigorous disciplinary inquiry. More dimensions were found necessary to be added in the discourse of Security Studies if the exact nature of state’s survival is to be understood. Besides political and military aspects, economic, societal and environmental dimensions in the security content of the state were appended as a result. As pointed out by Barry Buzan that “generally speaking, military security concerns the two-level interplay of the armed offensive and defensive capabilities of states, and states’ perceptions of each other’s intentions. Political security concerns the organizational stability of states, systems of government and the ideologies that give them legitimacy (Buzan et al., 1998:8)
Political and military dimensions of security have already been discussed under the section of the physical base of the state. It needs to be mentioned, however, the ability of political and military security to explicate identity politics of recent times is seriously limited. It is truer is the case of national identity more particularly when it faces a threat from global culture. Societal dimension of security is more useful in this regard because it demonstrates how identity of a given society can be securitized.

According to Barry Buzan, “societal security concerns the sustainability, within acceptable conditions for evolution, of traditional patterns of language, culture and religions and national identity and custom” (Buzan et al., 1998:8). In this scheme of things “the organizing concept in the societal sector is identity. Societal insecurity exists when communities of whatever kind define a development or potentiality as a threat to their survival as a community” (Ibid: 119). At other point Ole Waever aptly defines the notion of societal security. According to him, “societal security concerns the ability of a society to persist in its essential character under changing conditions and possible or actual threats” (Waever quoted in McSweeney, 1999:70). Implicit in the societal dimension of security is an objectivist notion of society and social identity that renders society as “a clustering of institutions combined with a feeling of common identity” (Waever quoted in McSweeney, 1999:70). Society and identity are coterminous in this scheme of things. As pointed out by Weaver and others “the key to society is that set of ideas and practices that identify individuals as members of a social group. Society is about identity, about the self conception of communities and those individuals who identify themselves a members of a particular community” (Waever, 1995:66-67). The proponents of this school however have given two caveats. Firstly, societal security should not to be conflated with social security. They are two different things operating in two different ontological and epistemological universe. As pointed out by Barry Buzan and others “societal security is not the same as social security. Social security is about individuals and is largely economic. Societal security is about collectivities and their identities” (Buzan et al., 1998: 120). Authors are aware of the overlap between the two but they insist that despite their intersection analytical separation is essential in order to avoid semantic confusion over the terms. They point out rather convincingly “empirical links will often exist when the social conditions for individual life influence processes of
collective identification. The concept of societal security, however, refers not to this individual level and to mainly economic phenomena but to the level of collective identities and action taken to defend such 'we' identities” (Buzan et al., 1998:120). In this conceptualization society has to be understood as having a “reality of its own” that cannot “be reduced to the individual level.” Secondly, caution has to be applied while using the terms societal and the population of the state. This is especially relevant for multicultural states where state population and different identity groups are not the same things. As pointed out by Barry Buzan and others “a problem with societal is that the related terms society is often used to designate the wider, more vague state population, which may refer to a group that does not always carry an identity.... This is not our use of societal; we use societal for communities with which one identifies” (Buzan et al., 1998:120).

Having acquired the conceptual clarity for the explication of societal security it needs to be mentioned that this conceptualization provides useful insights into the tussle between global culture and national identities of weak states. It is the case because” it is societies that are the cultural focus of this new security problematique…it is the issues of identity and migration that drive the underlying perception of threats and vulnerabilities. Societies are fundamentally about identity” (Waever quoted in McSweeney, 1999:70). Any account of the tension between global culture and national identities of weak states will fare better if it is imbued by the notion of societal security. This approach “recognizes that social processes are already underway whereby societies have begun to thematize themselves as security agents that are under threat. This process of social construction can be studied and the security quality of the phenomenon understood” (Waever, 1995:66). It enables one to appreciate the fact that society has an ontological status worthy of study in its own right. This approach throws light sufficient to illuminate society and its identity as a referent object of security like the state and its sovereignty in political and military dimensions of security analysis. It takes note of the fact that “state security has sovereignty as its ultimate criterion, and societal security has identity. Both usages imply survival. A state that loses its sovereignty does not survive as a state; a society that loses its identity fears that it will no longer be able to live as itself” (Waever, 1995:67). This conceptualization is cognizant of the multiplicity of threats. It
enables one to comprehend the “increasing salience of societal insecurity that is, situations in which significant groups within a society feel threatened, feel their identity is endangered by immigration, integration, or cultural imperialism, and they try to defend themselves” (Ibid:67). Finally, this approach has succeeded in shifting the focus of “security analysis in the field of cultural identity” (Sheeshan, 2005:84).

Security Actors and Referent Objects of Societal Security: Culture has been the important content of discursive dimension of the state. It has been defined as a system of symbols and meanings. Religion, custom, language, art, architecture, literature, beliefs and practices are some of the essential ingredients of culture. All of them can be easily identified as the referent objects of identity security analysis. Besides these cultural components, there are self sustaining identity groups that perceive a stake in the reproduction of their identity. As pointed out by Barry Buzan and others “in the present world system, the most important referent objects in the societal sector are tribes, clans, nations (and nation like ethnic units, which others call minorities), civilizations, religions, and race” (Buzan et al., 1998:123). They write further that “societal identity can be threatened in ways ranging form the suppression of its expression to interference with its ability to reproduce... The reproduction of a society can be threatened by sustained application of repressive measures against the expression of its identity. If the institutions that reproduce language and culture are forbidden to operate, the identity cannot be transmitted effectively from generation to the next” (Buzan quoted in Collins, 2003:24).

The so-called Copenhagen School of security is aware of the variations in the intensity of threats to societal security defined in terms of the identity of a given society. Scholars associated with this school are aware of the differences that lie in military and political security on the one hand and societal security on the other. Barry Buzan for instance, writes at one place “at lower levels of intensity, even the interplay of ideas and communication can produce politically significant societal and cultural threats, as illustrated by the reaction of Islamic fundamentalists to the penetration of Western ideas. Matters of language, religion and local cultural tradition all play their part in the idea of the state, and may need to be defended or protected against seductive or overbearing cultural imports” (Buzan, 1991:122-123). It is not that the school is unaware of the...
furore created by the global culture and the so-called cultural imperialism of the powerful countries of the world. In words of Barry Buzan “if the local culture is weak or small, even the unintended side-effects of casual contact could prove disruptive and politically charged. Even so strong a nation as the French fear the impact of American fast-food on their culinary heritage, and the erosion of their language by the incorporation of English words” (Buzan, 1991:123).

An important issue involved in the societal security is one of securitizing actors. Who speaks for the society is the critical question in this regard. Given the fact that societies are presumably less cohesive and concrete than the state, the question of speaking on behalf of society acquires significance. Scholars of Copenhagen School raise this question themselves. As pointed out by Ole Weaver “the concept of societal security ... is not, however, unproblematic. Analytically, as well as politically, it raises several thorny questions. One is that of voice. How does a society speak? Society is different from the state in that it does not have institutions of formal representation. Anyone can speak on behalf of society and claim that a security problem has appeared. Under what circumstances should such claims be taken seriously?” (Waever, 1995:69). They are aware of the handicap society faces in raising its concerns pertaining to threats to its identity. Given the inability of society to represent itself authentically, this seemingly small theoretical problem is loaded with enormous political as well as practical salience. This dilemma is reflected in the writing of these scholars. Ole Weaver captures this predicament by saying that “the notion of societal security might strongly imply that ... homogenous, amorphous society now speaks on its own behalf. But societies are, of course, highly differentiated, full of hierarchies and institutions, with some better placed than others to speak on behalf of their societies. But society never speaks, it is only there to be spoken for” (Waever, 1995:70). This dilemma, however, does not prevent societies from raising concerns about their identities. Legitimacy of the societal security's actor will depend on its ability to garner the support of the society. Waever shows the way out of this dilemma and comments that “we cannot predict who will voice societal security concerns; we can only see, with hindsight, how much legitimacy an actor did possess when s/he tried to speak on behalf of society. Various actors try this all the time, but the
attempt becomes consequential on a different scale when society more or less actively backs up the groups speaking” (Waever, 1995:70).

Different societies display different logic of threats and vulnerabilities. The logic of threats and vulnerabilities depend on how societies have acquired their distinct identity. Over a period of time, identities become crystallized and sedimented to the extent that people start identifying themselves with these cultural attributes. It is necessary to keep the nature of these sedimented structures in mind while analyzing the sources of threat to them. It is the case because different structures are vulnerable to different risks. “If one’s identity is based on separateness, on being remote and alone, even a very small admixture of foreigners will be seen as problematic... If national identity is tied to specific cultural habits, a homogenizing global culture, such as the U.S.-Western Coca-Cola (or, more recently, McDonalds) imperialism, will be threatening... If language is central to national identity, the contemporary global victory of English combined with an increasing interpenetration of societies will be problematic...If a nation is built on the integration of a number of ethnic groups with mobilizable histories of distinct national lives, a general spread of nationalism and ideas of self-determination can be fatal..... if a nation is built on a melting-pot ideology of different groups blending into one new groups, the existing national identity will be vulnerable to reassertion of racial and cultural distinctiveness and incommensurability...” (Buzan et al., 1998:124).

The discussion pertaining to societal security can be concluded by saying that “in many countries, citizens have become fearful that they are now being invaded not by armies and tanks, but by ... who speak other languages, worship other gods, belong to other cultures, and, they fear, will take their jobs, occupy their land, live off their welfare system and threaten their way of life” (Weiner quoted in Sheeshan, 2005:92).

Having reviewed major theoretical insights related to imperialism of the West along with their inherent lacunias it is the time to move on to the central question of the present work. The plethora of formal and informal and tangible and intangible processes and practices involved in the cultural globalization of the world broadens the agenda of the research to unmanageable extent. Some analytical tool is required to avoid such discrepancies. Theory of structuration offers promising intellectual handle to deal with
this seemingly insurmountable theoretical enterprise. Reasons for the vote of confidence in favour of structuration theory need to be specified.

Consequences of the cultural globalization of the world for weak states have traditionally been interpreted in binary terms. In the haste of depicting the West as culturally imperialist no thought has been given to the limitations, in the want of a better term, methodological binarism. Human nature to arrive at quick conclusions, to which social scientists are no exception, often leads to the prevalence of the law of excluded middle. Location of global culture and weak states in extreme polar terms obstructs the thematisation of strategies such as inroads, sidesteps, intrusion, skipping, intermingling and so forth. Dialectical nature of structuration theory saves from falling in dualsit trap that has coloured most of thinking available on the subject.

Like Waltzian account of international political system cultural sociology of global system has been thematized in a parsimonious manner. Without undermining the utility of parsimony for theoretical undertakings it is equally necessary to keep the mind open for, once again in the absence of a more suitable term, methodological glasnost. What has been done so far in the theoretical literature on the subject is that cultural globalization of the world has been explained in a way markets are in micro economic theory or international system is in Waltzian neorealism. In parallel to the emergence of international system through the interaction of its constitutive units, it has been argued that globalization has been spontaneously flowing from the technological development of mankind since 1990 onwards. Weak states have no choice but to either surrender to it or resist it as much as they can. Given their limited ability to manipulate the international system surrender is more plausible than resistance. Emergence of global culture, in this perspective, has been identified as exogenously given fixity to be unconditionally succumbed to by weak states. No account of globalization whatsoever has provided the satisfactory explanation of how agents, to use Waltzian phraseology, shape shove, contain and dispose, or principally can, the system. They miserably fail to portray global culture and weak stakes in dialectical and dialogical terms. Nowhere the poverty of their thought is more visible than in their failure to realize that global culture like any other social collectivity is equally and in some ways more susceptible to social reproduction of social formations. That is where explanatory potentials of structuration theory are clearly
evident. It is sensitive to the constraints system poses on its constitutive units and simultaneously cognizant of agent’s ability to reproduce and transform the system. Structuration theory helps bridge the gap that exists between available explanations and the phenomenon to be explained.

Exploration of the global culture in more of a transformational rather than positional terms has been the principal aim behind the deployment of structuration theory for the explication of the influence of global culture on weak states. Main components of structuration theory particularly the duality of structure enables on to reduce the dilemma weak state face while confronting global culture. Without being overambitious in terms of policy prescription it can be reasonably assumed that any analysis informed by theory of structuration would offer less pessimistic account than most of the available recommendation on the subject. The main tenets of the theory need to be identified.

Like most of social science theories structuration theory is not a cohesive whole. It is diversified terrain of thought flowing from several thinkers mainly P. Bourdieu, Bhaskar Roy, Derek Layder, Burger and Luckman and Anthony Giddens. Out of sparse and vast literature an attempt can be made to delineate some of its main postulates. Alexander Wendt has mentioned excellent summary of theory of structuration.

1. “In opposition to individualist, they accept the reality and explanatory importance of irreducible and potentially unobservable social structures that generate agents.
2. In opposition to structuralist, they oppose functionalism and stress “the need for a theory of practical reasons and consciousness that can account for human intentionality and motivation”.
3. These oppositions are reconciled by joining agents and structures in a “dialectical synthesis” that overcomes the subordination of one to the other which is characteristic of both individualism and structuralism.
4. Finally, they argue that social structure are inseparable from spatial and temporal structures, and that time and space must therefore be incorporated directly and explicitly into theoretical and concrete social research” (Wendt, 1987: 356).

**Constructivist Critique of Identity Securitization:** Securitization of identity has not remained challenged in I.R. theory. In fact “the work of the Copenhagen School (hereafter C.S.) has sparked considerable debate (Smith, 2005: 35). One of the most devastating critique of the idea of identity securitization comes from Bill Mc Sweeney.
His is constructivist notion of identity with which he proceeds and exposes the major
fallacies of the securitization of identity. In the opinion of Mc Sweeney C.S.'s notion of
society and identity is objectivist and positivist. Authors of C.S. treat identity as a given
fixity to be identified with. Their view about society also suffers from positivist fallacy. It
is also seen as an exogenously given structure rather than potent of further development.
As pointed out by McSweeney "it is clear that the term society is not meant to connote a
process of negotiation, affirmation and reproduction or even to embrace the system of
interrelationships which connects together the individuals who share a common culture in
a more traditional sociological formula" (Mc Sweeney, 1990:70). The positivist bias of
this body of literature by commenting "both society and identity are here projected as
objective realities, out there to be discovered and analyzed ... It is an objectivist,
Durkheimian conception ... their concept of society loses all touch with fluidity and
process resulting in a near positivist conception of identity" Ibid: 70). Similarly C.S.'s
views pertaining to who speaks for society can also be problematized. C.S. tries to
answer it by saying anyone can speak on the behalf of society. It will be taken seriously
only when society backs the securitization of its identity. They take society and its
identity as an independent variable. Had they been really interested in exploring the
question of social construction of identity they could not have defined and reified society
"as a social agent which has an independent reality as they do ... they would have to
conduct the analysis at the sub societal level ... They do in fact view society as an
independent variable, a social fact immune to process inquiry whose values and
vulnerabilities are as objective as these of the state" (Ibid:71).

The views of C.S. on the issue of society and identity have also been questioned
by Mc Sweeney. He raises following question: "why the authors choose identity from
among the countless values which people are concerned about and which can be
attributed to the collectivity of society thus coming under the umbrella of societal
security?" (Ibid:72). Why is society fundamentally about identity? It can easily be about
ecology, economy, polity, finance and so forth, McSweeney unravels the clear trick
played by the authors of C.S. Intrinsic in the notion of societal security is the fact that it
"is the object of an assumption about its referent, not the object of enquiry. That would
entail an inquiry into which of the indeterminate values susceptible to threat -including
identity -may be vulnerable and require security. A society's survival is a matter of identity....No evidence or argument is offered in support other than the comment that this is the way a society talks about existential threats. If this happens, we will no longer be able to live as "us". This observation is made analytically true, of course, if we accept the definition of society in terms of individuals identifying themselves as members of a community. But that is to reduce our conception of society to its most ephemeral and empirically contentious component and to ignore other elements" (Ibid:72).

No thought has been given by the scholars of C.S. that identity is susceptible to evolution. In the haste of depicting identity as a social given no attempt has been undertaken to demonstrate how identities come into being. Formation of social identity is a dynamic process. It is the result of several variables interplaying with each other. As pointed out by Mc Sweeney "identity is not a fact of society: it is a process of negotiation among people and interest groups, and it is that process, not the label which symbolizes it, which constitutes reality which needs explication. We can not decide the status, or even the relevance, of identity apriori" (Ibid:73). It needs to be emphasized that contrary to the predictions of C.S. social identity is not necessarily the cause of security problem. Identity may very will be the effect of security. "Which is the chicken and which is the egg can only be explicated by deconstructing the process of identity-formation at the sub-societal level but the authors reject this approach as leading inevitability to individualism ... contrary to the authors' claim, identity is not to be taken as an independent variable, tout courts; it is often the outcome of a labeling process which reflects a conflict of interests at the political level" (Ibid:73).

Socially given nature of identity precludes the possibility of moral judgment and human choice. The identity of society "emerges from the peculiar interactions of people and institutions in each society, fixed and incorrigible like the computer out put of a complex arithmetic. Identity describes the society and society is constituted by identity. Since its computation or construction does not crucially depend on human decisions, it makes no sense to speak of correcting it. Societal identity just is. We are stuck with it" (Ibid:74). It is fixed the extent that "there is no way we can replace it, except by adopting multiple identities, each of which is, in principle, as inviolable as the next" (Ibid: 74). Not only human choice but also moral judgment is also ruled out in the objectivist view of
identity. Since every society has its own way of perceiving itself, no one else is competent to make judgment on it. It clearly transforms social identity into a self-containing whole, which can not be transcended. It has to be lived with willingly or reluctantly. In the case of security of the state from military threats there is at least some criteria to differentiate between paranoia and complacency. In the case of identity there is no criteria on the basis of which paranoia can be differentiated from complacency. It clearly creates room for demagogues. Mc Sweeney emphatically refutes the given nature of identity. For him identities are evolved over a period of time through deliberate choices people make in the process. Neither personal nor collective or group identities are given in the sense that they lie beyond the reach of human choice and moral judgement. Question pertaining to individual identity, according to him, cannot be answered on the basis of empirical evidence and subjective perception alone. In his words “we routinely correct identity claims, not only of others, but of ourselves. It rests also on the contrast and balance between a normative view of human nature and the facts of personal biography. It entails an element of moral judgment as well as self-observation” (Ibid:76). Something applies to the issue of group identity as well. Who are we is the central question in the case of group identity. This question is generally answered by referring to group history, myth tradition, culture and religion. All these elements do have bearing on the formation of group identity. The fact remains, nevertheless, groups do choose and change and adapt these so-called shared histories according to the needs and demands of the time. He remarks some what passionately “it too entails a decision based on a theory which relate some of the countless biographical facts of our collective past and present to a view of who we want to be we are who we choose to be ... it makes the point forcefully that collective identity, is a choice made by people, not a property of society which transcends their agency” (Ibid:77).

The claim of C.S. that identities are the property of society does not withstand rigorous sociological scrutiny. Mc Sweeney concedes the element of truth in this claim that identities are not randomly chosen. Certain sociological milieu will always be there within which certain choices are made and other options are ignored. Equal attention has to be paid to the human agency. It needs to be problemalized why and under what circumstances human agency chooses to be what it comes to be in course of time. It
leaves the room open for variety of possible options leading to their corresponding identity claims. He comments that there are several “moral choices which go into the melting-pot of the process of identity-formation … individual and group choices come to cohere in a societal identity … only by the virtue of higher-level moral decisions about what counts and what is not to count in the image we want to have of ourselves and the correlative image we want to construct of others” (Ibid:77). Collective identity like the individual one is equally prone to the social construction. It must not be taken apriori. Political discourse over the issue of collective identity too is not immune to the process of social construction with the intrinsic operation of human agency and moral judgement. Even in crisis situations ruling elite of the state weighs and chooses among several options. Images that are projected and identities that are formed and defended in crisis times are also fluid and dynamic. As remarked by him “collective identity is not out there, waiting to be discovered. What is out there is identity discourse on the part of political leaders, intellectuals, and countless others, who engage … in the process of constructing, negotiating, manipulating or affirming a response to the demand … for a collective image” (Ibid: 78)

The post positivist understanding of identity formation renders identity susceptible to constant evolution. Mc Sweeny’s bold critique of C.S. on the subject of identity securitization goes to the extent of almost universality in the sense that it is equally applicable in premodern, modern and postmodern societies. In his words “whether we live in a culture of fluid identities-a feature of modernity or, as some would say, of post modernity-or in one of traditional ascription of self and community, identity is an idea in search of a person. It has no content, no fixed dimensions which we can customize and which exist independently of human choice” (Ibid:162). The following claim is usually made in the context of identity formation: identities do have some basic characteristics that are product of history such as religion, culture, language, place, of birth and so forth. This claim, according to Mc Sweeney is not tenable beyond the point. Language and customs and even birth of place may be important factors in the formation of identity. There is however no reason to assume that they obstruct human agency. “Collective identity is no more than an organizational idea in search of a community to embody it (Ibid:163). Having critiqued the notion of identity securitization C.S. Mc
Sweeney puts forward his notion of identity which is worth mentioning. According to him “collective identity can be considered as a theory or, more to the point as a story or narrative. Its capacity to stand as an object of inquiry or a fact of politics depends entirely on the capacity of the groups to sustain the story of belonging and which defines it in space and time. In that sense, identity is a project ... Like social action, the project of identity is a continuous stream of experience monitored by the actor as a reflexive endeavour. The task to sustain the narrative through time and across space, to keep it going in the face of countless events and experiences which challenge its coherence” (Ibid: 163). This post positivist notion of identity with its emphasis on reflexive endeavour along with inherent fluidity and multiplicity is extremely relevant for casting the whole question of global culture and national identities in the new light. The debate between the scholars of C.S. and Mc Sweeney, however, can be summed up by saying that “the core of their disagreement concern the objectivist nature of identity, with Buzan and Waever, arguing that their approach to identity was pragmatic, not objectivist. Nonetheless, they claimed that overtime certain characteristics remain unchanged and thus these become socially sedimented and can be taken as given. Mc Sweeney fundamentally disagrees with this and claims that identity can only be understood as a process—it does not sediment and cannot be taken as a given” (Smith, 2005:36). We are now in a position to move on the central question of this research; the issue of cultural imperialism of the West over the rest of the world.

According to Iris Marion Young “cultural imperialism involves the universalization of a dominant groups experience and culture, and its establishment as the norm, some groups have exclusive or primary access to ... the means of interpretation and communication in a society. As a consequence, the dominant cultural products of the society, that is, those most widely disseminated, express the experience, values, goals, and achievements of the groups. Often without noticing they do so, the dominant groups project their own experience as representative of humanity” (Young 1990: 59).

Another useful definition of cultural imperialism has been provided by John Tomlinson. In this articulation cultural imperialism is “the use of political and economic power to exalt and spread the values and habits of a foreign culture at the expense of a native culture (Tomlinson 2003: 27).
Cultural domination is the sine-qua-non of cultural imperialism. It has been used (and sometimes misused) in variety of ways with several serious stakes on each side. John Tomlinson, for instance, points out that “the issue of language dominance and the threat to linguistic diversity opens out to the broader issue of cultural imperialism, the idea that a global culture is in one way or another liable to be a hegemonic culture. This pessimistic construction of the idea of a global culture has been the more prominent one in the late twentieth century” (Tomlinson 1999: 79). There is another school of thought that associate it with the growing consumerism of Western and more particularly American products. Jonathan Friedman’s writings are clearly on these lines. As noted by him cultural imperialism is “an aspect of the hierarchical nature of imperialism, that is the increasing hegemony of particular central cultures, the diffusion of American values, consumer goods and lifestyles (Friedman 1994: 195). Next in the list are those who openly praise cultural imperialism. David Rothkopf and M. Waters are the names, who are most associated with this school. In Rothkopf’s words “American culture is an amalgam of influences and approaches from around the world ... The United States should not hesitate to promote its values. In an effort to be polite or politic Americans should not deny the fact that of all the nations in the history of the world, theirs is the most just, the most tolerant, the most willing to constantly reassess and improve itself, and the best model for the future ... If Americans now live in a world in which ideas can be effectively exported and media delivery systems are powerful, they must recognize that the nature of those ideas and the control of those systems are matters with which they should be deeply concerned” (Rothkopf, 1997: 48-49).

Culture imperialism has become an umbrella term in the late twentieth and early twenty first centuries. It covers variety of meanings and it is definitely used by proponents as well as opponents including political leaders, businessmen, scholars, political and social activists. Sheer enormity of the phenomenon that is referred to under the rubric of cultural imperialism defies a coherent articulation of the term. It is therefore necessary to identify various meanings associated with the term. John Tonlinson, a leading scholar of cultural globalization has identified four ways in which the term is generally used. They are following.
Cultural Imperialism as Media Imperialism:- Global culture is by definition a media driven construct. Media that propels the formation of global culture is controlled by the powerful cultural centers of the world. It is not surprising, therefore, that the dominance of Western media is largely implicated in the discourse of cultural imperialism. As pointed out by Tomlinson “the great majority of published discussions of cultural imperialism place the media – television, film radio, print journalism, advertising-at the centre of things” (Tomlinson, 2003: 106). It is noteworthy that cultural imperialism in this rendition has been used by Neo Marxist and non Marxist scholars. Neo Marxists portray a far more broad picture of all kinds of domination in which the issue of the dominance of Western media over the rest of the world is cast. Non Marxist on the other hand paint rather narrow picture of media imperialism. “They do not accept, a priori, the implied broader context of domination, nor media imperialism’s situation within it. The non-Marxist preference is for ... a more specific range of phenomenon that lends itself more easily to a rigorous examination” (Tomlinson, 2003:106). Even the non Marxist usage of the term media imperialism involves several issues. First relates to the structural and institutional aspects of global media. It is frequently asserted that the cheap western culture is being dumped down by television, movies, news agencies and print and electronic media. Global media market is dominated by Western news agencies. Western images, cultural, practices, lifestyles are polluting otherwise pure and authentic local cultures. It is assumed that imported and to a considerable extent imposed cultural artifacts such as television serials and other programmes, comics, advertisement, music, movies and so forth have enormous cultural effect on the rest of the world.

Implied in this version of cultural imperialism is central role media plays in the cultural affairs of mankind. It assumes that “media have an overwhelming importance in the processes referred to as cultural imperialism” (Tomlinson, 2003:108). Stakes in the discourse of cultural imperialism defined in terms of media imperialism need to be identified. Firstly, it has to be acknowledged that the role of media is constantly expanding. Today’s media is far more powerful and technologically superior than one of previous times. Media’s capacity to penetrate even into the remote areas of the globe is really tremendous. It represents much wider social and personal life of people under capitalism. The sheer enormity of issues covered by the media stands as a testimony to
the fact that the role of media in cultural affairs of humanity cannot be underestimated. It makes it "tempting to see the media as the central cultural reference point of modern Western capitalism" (Ibid: 108). Second stake is related to the culture that is being created by the media. The issue involved here is one of mass-mediated global culture. Stakes are higher here for the simple reason it highlights quite clearly the capacity of media to create certain culture; promote certain cultural values; and to attract, allure or even encourage people to adhere to certain culture. It draws attention to the fact that other modes of cultural formation particularly old ones are either increasingly becoming obsolete or even if they retain some power to produce and reproduce their respective cultures their ability to do so either depends on or seriously curtailed by the media. As pointed out by John Tomlinson "cultural imperialism might be seen to centre on the media in two ways: either as the dominance of one culture media (texts, practices) over another; or as the global spread of mass-mediated culture as such. These two understandings have quite different dimension of implication, the second being much the wider. But both involve the idea that media are at the crux of modern culture (Ibid: 108).

As mentioned in the first chapter the picture of the so called cultural imperialism of Western media is far more complex than usually understood. Reasons for this are threefold. They are following. Firstly, cultural globalization of the world has to be placed in the proper historical and theoretical context. In the haste of depicting U.S. as cultural imperialist history of globalization has been presented in the distorted fashion. History of media globalization can be traced back to ancient times detailed examination of which is unwarranted here. But the essential point to be made is that the globalization of media (as it is understood today) started roughly parallel with modernity in fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and it gained momentum only after the invention of the printing press. U.S. was nowhere in the picture at that time. Even the very existence of the U.S. remained inconceivable in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the time that witnessed enormous growth in the global exchange of messages (Thompson, 1995: 151-152).

Thesis of cultural imperialism inspired by the work of neo-Marxist Herbert Schiller fails to portray complete and satisfactory picture of cultural globalization of the world. Globalization is the process that manifests itself in all walks of life; symbolic, economic political, coercive and cultural. Like most of Marxist accounts thesis of cultural
imperialism “neglects the interplay between these various forms of power: the shortcoming is that it offers an impoverished and ultimately reductionist account of this interplay. Like many arguments influenced by Marxism, the cultural imperialism thesis prioritized economic power and regarded symbolic power largely a tool of commercial interests … but the interplay between these forms of power was always more complex and conflict ridden than such an account would suggest” (Ibid:173).

Secondly, local conditions under which global messages are decoded need to be factored in the analysis of cultural imperialism. Sociology of local conditions, in other words, play a crucial role in understanding global messages. People do not take things as they come. All sorts of factors and social divisions like class, age, gender, caste, religion, occupations and so forth play their part in the way global messages are received and interpreted by local people. Globalization of media, however, strong and powerful in itself it might be, has so far not been able to make people think similarly all over the world. As pointed out by John Thompson “while communication and information are increasingly diffused on a global scale, these symbolic materials are always received by individuals who are situated in spatial-temporal locales. The appropriation of media products is always a localized phenomenon, in the sense that it always involves specific individuals who are situated in particular social-historical contexts, and who draw on the resources available to them in order to make sense of media messages and incorporate them into their lives. And messages are transformed in the process of appropriation as individuals adapt them to the practical contexts of everyday life … the circulation of information and communication has become increasingly global while, at the same time, the process of appropriation remains inherently contextual and hermeneutic” (Ibid:174).

Localized appropriation of globalized diffusion has a direct bearing upon the general awareness of the people. That global media has made the public better informed is a truisim to assert. It makes people aware of what is happening in other parts of the world; comprehending the world in a better way; how others perceive them; how their own perceptions about others are; and most importantly of comparison. John Thompson also argues that localized appropriation of globalized media leads to “the accentuation of symbolic distancing from the spatial-temporal contexts of everyday life. The appropriation of symbolic materials enables individuals to take some distance from the
conditions of their day to day lives—not literally but symbolically, imaginatively, vicariously. Individuals are able to gain some conceptions of ways of life and life conditions which differ significantly from their own ... some conceptions of regions of the world which are far removed from their own locales” (Thompson, 1995:175).

Thirdly, diffusion of global media can be a potent source of tensions and conflict. Media sometimes convey the message or messages that are not commensurate with the way local people think. Messages may clash with the traditions and values local people fondly adhere to. This discordance sometimes can create special appeal for global media but more often than not it frequently fuels social tension (Ibid:177). Social conditioning of local people does not permit them to digest what is served by the global media. Old habits die hard is a conventional wisdom in this regard. Moreover, media products can lead to the self conflict; the very manner in which identities are formed. Global messages and local conditioning pull individuals particularly youngsters in opposite direction. It, in extreme cases, leads to mental abnormality and brain diseases.

A few empirical data are in order to demonstrate the shaky grounds on which the thesis of cultural imperialism defined in terms of media rests. Five issues will be covered here. Firstly, it is increasingly asserted that “few big companies are taking over the world’s media” (Compaine, 2002:20). An empirical examination of this issue provides negative answer. According to Benjamin Compaine, a research consultant at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “much of the debate on media structure is too black-and-white. A merger of Time Inc, with Warner Communication and then with America Online dominates headlines, but the incremental growth of smaller companies from the bottom does not. Breakups and divestitures do not generally receive front-page treatment, nor do the arrival and rapid growth of new players or the shrinkage of once influential players” (Compaine, 2002:20). Revealing if not stunning are the assertions and facts on the basis of which Compaine answered negatively to issue of the take over of world media by big companies working in the same field. It is sufficient here to quote eschewing the factual details, some of his assertions based on data. Worth considering is his following claim. “The notion of the rise of a handful of all-powerful transnational media giants is vastly overstated. Some media companies own properties internationally or provide some content across borders (for example, Vivendie’s Canal+distributes
movies internationally), but no large media conglomerate owns newspapers, book publishes, radio stations, cable companies, or television licenses in all the major world markets. News Corp comes closest to being a global media enterprise in both content and distribution, but on a global scale it is still a minor presence—that is, minor as a percentage of global media revenue, global audience, and in the number of markets it covers” ((Ibid:21)

Second issue is related to the dominance of U.S. companies in the global media. In this sense globalization of media is understood as Americanization to the extent that scholars as perceptive as Johan Galtung crafted the formula to gauge the globalization that reads Globalization = Americanization (at least so far) ... computer and telecommunications technologies radically lowered transaction costs while increasing the speed and precision with which finance capitalists could transfer money and manipulate currencies on a global scale. The managers who controlled these funds began to encourage investment anywhere on earth under the rubric of globalization, an esoteric term for what in the nineteenth century was simply called imperialism (Galtung, 2001:277).

Compaine empirically rejects this wisdom as well. In his words, “No ... in most of the world, decision of what programming to buy traditionally lay in the hands of manager who worked for government-owned or government controlled broadcasters As the market becomes more competitive ... it is even more important that media enterprises offer programming that people want to watch” (Compaine, 2002: 21). He further reveals that “while Viacom, Disney, and AOL Time Warner are U.S. owned, many non –US-owned companies dominate the roster of the largest media groups: News corp (Australia), Bertelsmann (Germany), Reed Elsevier (Britain/Netherlands), Vivendi and Hagadere-Hachette (France), and Sony Corp (Japan)” (Ibid:21). He cites Human Development Report 2002 to substantiate his case on the issue of media ownership across the countries of the world. He found out that “the pervasiveness of a handful of media companies looks even less when one looks at media ownerships across countries ... 29 percent of the world’s largest newspapers are state owned and another 57 percent are family owned. Only 8 percent are owned by employed or the public. For radio stations, 72 percent are state owned, and 24 percent family owned. For television stations, 60 percent are state
owned, and 34 percent family owned. These data suggest there is little foreign direct investment in the media sector of most countries” (Ibid:21).

Third question pertains to the dumping down of Western culture. Company’s findings on this issue are in negative. In his words,

“absolutely not. Most media like politics-are inherently local. Global firms peddle wholly homogenous content across market at their peril. Thus, MTV in Brazil plays a mix of music videos and other programming determined by local producers, even though it shares a recognizable format with MTV stations elsewhere. News Corp’s news papers in the United Kingdom look and read different from those in the United States. When Star TV, an Asian subsidiary of News Corp; began broadcasting satellite television into India, few tuned in to Dallas and The Bold and the Beautiful dubbed in Hindi. The network only succeeded in India once it hired an executive with experience in Indian programming to create Indian soap operas and when an Indian production house took over news and current affairs programming” (Ibid:22).

Fourth question is as follows. Has internet leveled the playing field? Company responds to this question in affirmative manner. According to him, “Yes. Or more accurately, it’s helping to level the terrain because it is a relatively low-cost conduit for all content providers … Worldwide, an estimated 581 million people were on line by 2002, more than one third of whom lived outside North America and Europe. Yet the Internet is in its infancy. The number of users is still growing and will continue to expand to the literate population as access costs decrease … in countries where government strictly control print and broadcast media, government also can try to restrict Internet access, as China does. But some may chose not to do so …” (Ibid:24)

Finally, Company takes up the issue of media regulation. The question examined reads is the restrict regular of media in public interest? His findings are once again in negative. In his worlds

“Just the opposite. Beware when someone claims to be speaking for the public interests.” In most cases, those who invoke the term really mean “interested publics.” For example, advertisers’ sense of which policies on media ownership are in their interest may differ from that of regular newspaper readers or that of satellite TV subscribers. Media concentration may be in the public interest if it provides a publisher with greater profit margins and the wherewithal to spend some of that on editorial content, and research in fact shows this is the case. Licensing acts as an entry barrier to new players and antitrust laws often lag behind reality. In the market for video program distribution, for instance terrestrial broadcast
licenses compete with satellite providers. Regulation and policy limits will always be necessary, but having different regulatory frameworks for each media segment makes less sense today” (Ibid:26).

The discussion pertaining to cultural imperialism as media imperialism can be summed up by saying that “culture simply does not transfer in ... unilinear way. Movement between cultural/geographical areas always involves interpretation, translation, mutation, adaptation, and indigenization as the receiving culture brings its own cultural resources to bear, in dialectical fashion, upon cultural imports ... active, adaptive, cultural appropriation is most usually made in relation to media texts ...” (Tomlinson, 1999: 84).

**Cultural Imperialism as a Discourse of Nationality:-** The tension between globalization and national cultures is eloquently captured by this notion of cultural imperialism. As pointed out by John Tomlinson “for discussions of cultural imperialism, the idea of the invasion of an indigenous culture by a foreign one is the commonest way of articulating the process involved. Nearly everyone who talks about cultural imperialism talks in this way at some point. (Tomlinson, 2003: 109). This rendition of cultural imperialism puts at the heart national identities and cultures of different states that are being threatened by the emergence of highly commodified, homogenous global culture.

The frequency with which this notion of cultural imperialism is invoked in the discourse of cultural globalization can be attributed to the ambiguity so deeply complicit in the meaning of terms like local and indigenous and national cultures. As observed by Tomlinson “indigenous may be taken uncontroversially as a synonym for native meaning belonging to a geographical are. But how does a culture belong to an area? A subsidiary sense of indigenous is that of belonging naturally, and ... this may offer a sort of answer to how a culture belongs ... (Ibid: 109). Tomlinson is by no means convinced by natural belonging of culture to certain geographical area. He sensibly invokes the nature/culture divide and comments “if one can take anything for granted about culture, it is that it is not a natural phenomenon. Culture is entirely -even definitely -the work of human beings. So it is not merely implausible that a culture may belong to a region in the sense that flora
and fauna are natural to it; it is theoretically incoherent to juxtapose culture and nature in this way” (Ibid: 109).

Another way through which the sense of belonging can be approached is through history. Cultures are historical constructions in this sensibility. This notion of culture also is not without problems. It involves thorny questions. “How is a cultural practice established through time? How long does the process take? Is it merely length of time that produces authenticity? Is the process of cultural establishment ever finished? The answers … to these questions will be heavy with implications for judgements of cultural imperialism” (Ibid: 109).

Threat to local cultures is another connotation that is associated with cultural imperialism as a discourse of nationality. Here ‘local’ replaces the ‘indigenous’. It is also shaky on several grounds. What is meant by local? How localized is local? Is it a village, city, province, region, nation or continent that is referred to as local? Tomlinson replies by saying that “in fact … the talk is mostly of nations … This being so, the arguments … cluster around the idea of a national cultural identity and the threats posed to this by cultural imperialism” (Ibid: 109).

An important issue involved here pertains to cultural autonomy. As pointed out by Tomlinson “we shall have to decide, first, what this could mean and, second whether indeed it provides any stable basis for a critique of cultural imperialism. This problem of critical grounds is a major one for all discourses of cultural imperialism (Ibid: 110). That the cultural autonomy of local, indigenous and national cultures face serious and sometimes insurmountable challenge from cultural imperialism is what is at stake in the tussle between the two. Natives and globalists both invoke cultural autonomy in the discourse of cultural globalization. Both use the term in their own way. Natives think that cultural autonomy is best exercised when it helps preserving their tradition and culture. Globalists, on the other hand, believe that cultural autonomy or cultural liberty lies in increasing cultural choice. How this divide can be transcended will be shown in the following section of this chapter.

**Localization** - As pointed out by James Rosenau “localization involves processes wherein connections within countries are either reduced to, preserved by, or confined to
existing or smaller jurisdictions, preferably within subnational or even sub-provincial spaces but not excluding national spaces” (Rosenau, 2003:85). Local people are those whose existence primarily depend on or are tied to territory. Their politics, economics and most importantly their identity are heavily shaped by local territorial conditions. As Rosenau observes “for them place and rootedness are as important as ever. Their very identity is tied to place, and they cannot conceive of living anywhere else, for they are dependent on a piece of ground for their livelihood and on a particular culture and language for their sense of well-being” (Rosenau, 2003: 87). Caution, however, needs to maintained while thinking about the local people. Local worlds are dynamic entities even if pace of change is relatively slow there. They cannot be treated as constant. “They do undergo transformations. Variations occur is the way gloablizing dynamics impinge upon their processes and structures” (Ibid: 87). Despite all magnitude, intensity, velocity and penetration capacity of globalization, large part of humanity still resides in local world. It is too vast to be adequately captured. For the sake of convenience and at the risk of over simplification an attempt can be made to classify the local word under following headings.

**Insular Locals:** The world of Insular locals is largely unaffected by if not completely isolated from the dynamics of globalization. They are found in rural and semi urban areas where the impact of globalization is yet to be felt. The world of Insular Locals in some way clearly highlights the limitations of globalization. They are mired in the remote areas of the world that are yet to be properly connected with the rest of the globalized world. It, however, needs to be mentioned that the space occupied by Insular Locals is substantially shrinking day by day and the day is not far when their space may evaporate completely. As pointed by James Rosenau “with the possible exception of peasants in remote rural areas of the developing world-and even these exceptions are increasingly rare-the ranks of the Insular Locals are diminishing … Some people are still much less affected by global forces-still much more authentically local-than others and it is these less globally touched who are treated here as Insular Locals (Rosenau, 2005:92).

Face-to-face community life with extremely limited geographical mobility characterizes the life of Insular Locals. Neighbourhood is their society; family is their
centre; nearby temple, mosque or church is their heaven; local schools is the place of their learning; job in a proximate area is their livelihood; and small market is the place of their shopping and socialization. They are easily located and often directly contacted. Their addresses are fixed or show little mobility. Life is simple. Culture is relatively “pure.” Social bonds are tight. Families and even joint families are intact. People usually recognize each other by face. Horizons are limited. Mobility is infrequent. Outside global influences are irrelevant. Eating, clothing and living patterns are old. They are perfect or near so example of old form of community life. Community means in most cases face-to-face small community occupying a relatively short piece of land.

Insular Locals are largely immune from the influences of global culture. Main attributes of global culture like pop music, internet, Mc Donalds, global standardization, global sport and so forth are alien things for Insular Locals. The only thing that keeps them informed about the outside world is either radio or TV, percentage of which is increasing even in remote areas of the world. It is true that their lives are little more complicated than depicted here, but it is far simpler than that of those who either have become or are increasingly becoming globlized. As pointed by Rosenau “for Insular Locals the immediate community traces the limits of their horizons. Beyond the horizons little is considered salient. Their lives are inextricably tied up with and fully sustained by events and trends in the community, and their orientations towards developments elsewhere in the world are minimal, if they exist at all” (Rosenau, 2003:93).

The World of Resistant Locals: Globalization has not remained unchallenged in contemporary world history. It causes lot of discontent and faces lot of resistance ranging from non violent to violent. Resistant Locals are those who resist globalization. Unlike Insular Locals, Resistant Locals are aware of globalizing dynamics operating in the world. Nor are they isolated from the process of the globalization. Its influence is also familiar to them. But they are somehow dissatisfied with the consequences of globalization and perceive that resistance is where their interests lie. Who are Resistant locals? According to James Rosenau “diverse types of people reside in this world. Workers threatened by a loss of their jobs to foreign competitors; citizens convinced that local cultures are being overwhelmed by westernization and its corollary,
Americanization and thus fearful that globalizing dynamics are generating an undesirable degree of homogeneity, environmentalists who worry that rapid industrialization in the developing world will undermine the ecobalance of their small regiment of the developed world, arch conservatives who decry the movement of immigrants into their community; intellectuals preoccupied with the negative effects of communication technologies for social and political life; and social democrats concerned that neoclassical economic policies underlying globalization are widening the gap between the rich and the poor—these are among the more conspicuous individuals who seek to preserve the meaning of local space by resisting the encroachment of global forces. Whatever their particular concerns, however, they tend to share a conviction that globalization has led to a life in which the nearby is treated with contempt” (Rosenau, 2003:98).

Resistant Locals exhibit strong adherence to local values and affiliations. Though fully aware of the dynamics of globalization (due to which they tend to resist it) they are not very keen to participate in it or to become vehicle of it. On the contrary they view globalization in general and consequent emergence of global culture in particular with suspicious eyes. Values and ideas, glamour and phantasmagoria associated with global culture are things to be disdained by the Resistant Locals. Their attachment with local traditions and distinct way of life does not permit them to get swayed by the enormous attraction of global culture. Their resistance to globalization takes variety of forms. Two are worth mentioning. Firstly, Resistant Locals particularly from modest economic background tend to organize their resistance to globalization at the local level. They confine their activities and express their worries at the local level. Signing petitions, participating in protest march, attending rallies and in some extreme cases damaging multinationals owned property are some of their favourite tricks. Secondly, there are those who oppose globalization at the global level. Elites, activists and politically and socially aware people actually take keen interest in organizing their resistance to the dynamics of globalization at the global level. They tend to contact like-minded people all over the world and try to bear pressure on the dynamics of globalization (or at least parts of) which they find unacceptable. Internet is the main tool of Resistant Locals. It is through internet dense networking is undertaken among the like minded people all over the world. Several nongovernmental organizations also play their role in resisting
globalization. Many NGOs, working in environmental, social and financial sectors, highlight unevenness of globalizing dynamics. They actively keep their respective constituencies informed about the harms and other undesirable or unacceptable social effects of globalization. "Thus it is not far-fetched to describe the world of Resistant Locals as crisscrossed by a vast array of transnational networks that are functionally equivalent to the conferences and airport gatherings where those in the global world converge to frame their strategies, strike their bargains and implement their policies" (Rosenau, 2003:104). Rosenau further comments "for some people the inclination to resist stems not so much from opposition to the consequences of globalizing dynamics as from a valuing of the diversity embedded in cultural differences. Such persons are likely to favour localizing processes because they serve the goal of warding off uniformities fostered by the distant proximities and thereby sustain the aesthetic and intellechal pleasures to be derived from the preservation of differences among communities and cultures" (Rosenau, 2003:100).

**Exclusionary Locals**: Exclusionary locals are more hostile to globalization than their Resistant counterparts. Exclusionary Locals are different from Insular Locals in the sense that they are ware of the dynamics of globalization and their world is penetrated by globalization. Nor they act like Resistant Locals who try to minimize the perceived bad consequences of globalization. Exclusionary Locals prefer to take firmer stand against globalization. As observed by James Rosenau "the Exclusionary locals are characterized by an inclination to retreat from the globalizing tide as the latter becomes more encroaching and to do so by withdrawing to their own intellectual haven or emotional (usually ethnic) heritage. Those who retreat ... tend to see themselves as members of a countercultures in which localism is viewed as solution to multifaceted challenges, as a place where anti-globalization, anti-development, ant-modernity, anti-science, only small-is-beautiful come together in an island politics-seeking liberated zones outside the system, enclaves that provide shelter from the storm, usually in the hope that the system will somehow atrophy or collapse' (Rosenau, 2003: 105-106). Large part of Exclusionary Locals oppose globalization for emotional reasons. They are so touchy about their identity that they perceive globalization and more particularly global culture as a threat to
it. So only they tend to take asylum in ethnicity, nationality, language, religion or other
heritage that can provide emotional and psychological security to them. It is not an
exaggeration to comment that most of ethnic revival witnessed during the post Cold War
world is stemming from this psychic tendency of these people. There are others who are
equally loyal to their traditional way of living. But they are not in favour of isolating
themselves from the rest of the world. Exclusionary locals however take different line of
thinking and prefer to take different course of action vis-à-vis globalizing dynamics of
the world. They seem to believe that their traditional culture is not a counter attack on
globalization. Their sheer attachment with their traditional way of living is enough to
make them feel and feel with conviction that theirs is the only culture that can save them
from ever intruding globalizing dynamics. As pointed out by Mark Juergensmeyer

"in the contemporary political climate therefore, religious and ethnic
nationalism provide a solution to the problem of Western style secular
politics in a non-Western and multicultural world. As secular ties have
begun to unravel in the post-Soviet and postcolonial era, local leaders have
searched for new anchors to ground their social identities and political
loyalties. Many have turned to ethnicity and religion ... Although many of
the framers of the new nationalism have reached back in history for
ancient images and concepts that will give them credibility, theirs are not
simply efforts to resuscitate old ideas from the past. These are
contemporary ideologies that meet present-day social and political
needs" (Jurergensmeyer, 2002:8-9).

Traditional culture of Exclusionary Locals is much more than the way of living. It
is a source of comfort and perpetuates their identity that is being increasingly perceived
as threatened. It is not that Exclusionary Locals were always immune from external
influences or they exemplified the notion of culture as a self containing whole. In fact,
most if not al of them did display quite openness to the external world in earlier times.
Present world as uncertain and unpredictable as it is (to which, globalization is no
exception) causes much of their sudden closeness towards outside world. It is worth
mentioning that most of Exclusionary Locals reside in post colonial states that are
struggling with all sorts of problems (which have already been discussed in previous
chapter) within their domestic jurisdiction. It is this already precarious situation that
globalization exacerbates that causes if not justifies their effort to immunize themselves
from the cultural influences of the outside world. "Tamil of Sri Lanka, the Basques of
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Spain, the Kurds of Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, the Chechnians of Russia, the Hawaiians of Hawaii, the Serbs, Croats, or Muslim of Bosnia, and the Albanians of Kosovo ... find wisdom in the aphorism that it is never too late to revive your origins and have thus aspired to create or maintain, even to fight for, their own ethnic homes” (Rosenau, 2003:106).

Exclusionary Locals oppose globalization on ethnic lines. Ethnicity is taken in the broadest possible sense of the term. It refers to the “deeply felt bonds of kinship with unknown others of the same background and history ... ethnic, linguistic, religious, national, cultural, tribal, and other historical bonds, some of which are occasionally posited as primordial but all of which are seen as linking people to an idea of who they are and with whom they share deep commonalities” (Ibid:106). This vast and sometimes contradictory notion of ethnicity is deployed just to make the point that nationalism can cause as exclusionary localism as much tribal orientations of people does. Ethnic ties of Exclusionary Locals serve as the safeguard through which perceived assault of cultural globalization is sought to be countered, resisted, minimized and if possible by passed.

Nationalism has been rendered local phenomenon by the dynamics of globalization. Nationalism or more specifically culture was the great source of social integration and state formation in earlier times. Even today it serves the same purpose to some extent in many parts of the world. Nationalism has undergone significant transformation in recent times besides buttressing state formation; nationalism serves other important purpose in recent times. As pointed out by James Rosenau “today it emphasizes boundaries and the distinction between us and them .... Viewed in this fragmentative context, nationalism becomes a form of localism and or a fragmenting than an integrative dimension. Wherever nations aspire to being states, exclusionary localism can be readily discerned ...” (Ibid:107)

Nationalist resistance to globalization traverses through several trajectories. For them globalization is so intruding phenomenon that it is to be always contested. They arbitrarily draw ethnic and other social boundaries in order to generate we feeling so necessary for contesting globalization. Religion is used for this purpose. Religious values and the threat stemming from the emergence of global culture to them are invoked. Muslim Jihadis and right wing nationalist in different parts of the world are the most
glaring illustrations. Primordial identities are invigorated to resist global culture. Networking with like-minded people is undertaken. Cultural purity is evoked. History is glorified. Present is disdained. Future is depicted as bleak. Enormous effort is devoted to convince the masses that global culture is threatening to their long cherished traditions and values. Things are caricatured in binary terms. Nationalist sentiments are overemphasized. “Aliens” are demonized. Research is undertaken to demonstrate the consequences of globalization. Despite being aware of the fact that costs of isolation are high in interdependent world, connection with the rest of the world is discouraged. Even if the fellow citizens of Exclusionary Locals are tempted to exploit the fruits of globalization they are constantly reminded of their traditional values. This is how gigantic resistance to globalization is undertaken,

As indicated in the previous chapter global culture undermines the confidence of weak states. It increases inferiority complex among them. It disturbs the normative system of the state. Global culture attacks on “high-intensity values that are salient at a particular moment in time” (Cottan and Cottan, 2001:130). Mention must be made of the fact that “nationalism is best viewed as important component of the over all socio political normative system that characterizes a society at a particular moment in time. Nationalism is not the entirety of country’s political values, but it is linked with a variety of ideologies or broader value system. The policy process reflects a balancing and reconciliation of those norms, with their varying intensities, that constitute the normative system ... those elements that relate directly to a concern for the independence, the welfare, the security, the dignity, the prestige, and the grandeur of national community ... an effort to look at nationalism in the context of an overall normative and value system operative in dealing with challenges is necessary to understand the specifics of a country” (Cotam and Cottam, 2001:130-131). It is normative system of the state that one refers to when one speaks about the threat posed by global culture to national identity of weak states. To put it more directly, normative system constitutes national identity of the state.

**Affirmative Locals:** Affirmative Locals welcome globalization. They substantially differ from their Insular, Resistant and Exclusionary counterparts. They neither resist nor retreat from the process of globalization. They perceive globalization as welcome development
in its own right. They tend to participate actively in the dynamics of globalization. They want to exploit the benefits of globalization. They tend to travel frequently. They are not opposed to consumption patterns brought to their home by globalization. They are not hesitant to work in Multinational Corporation for their livelihood. They watch foreign T.V. programmes particularly American and European ones. They can be seen working on the internet. They are not opposed to speak in English. Without questioning their fundamental values and orientation they facilitate the dynamics of globalization. As pointed out by James Rosenau “in other words, Affirmative Locals are not inclined to contest the consequences of globalization. Other things being equal, they simply accept that the world has shrunk, and in so doing, they see this shrinkage as offering opportunities to enrich their own local ways without undue compromises.” (Rosenau, 2003: 110).

Affirmative locals display openness to global culture. They are not opposed to what Benjamin Barber referred to McWorld. They tend to spend their leisure time in McDonalds, Disney Parks and watching global sports. Their life style resembles with that of global elite. In fact, most of them particularly their children aspire for global elite status. They tend to ape the lifestyle associated with global elite. In fact, some parts of this lifestyle have already become the daily routine of Affirmative Locals. For example, visiting Mc Donald is the status symbol for many Affirmative Locals. Another illustration of this will be the popularity of cricket in India or South Asia. Cricket means different things to different people. It came to India from England during colonial times. Since then the game has become so popular in the country as to justify being labeled as the national game (although it has not been declared officially). Soccer, T-shirts, Tenis, Olympic, Jeans and so forth are some of the cultural attributes of the West that have been readily accepted by Affirmative Locals throughout the world. Elites of Affirmative Locals deliberately facilitate the percolation of global culture down to the masses in their constituencies. Elites of this section try to bring their insular counterparts in the mainstream of globalization. They pay attention to the legitimate concerns of Insular Local and tend to undertake the politics of reform so that benefits of globalization can reach to these communities without undermining the fundamental texture of their traditional life they fondly cherish. They tend to “harness globalization on behalf of local
citizens movements and alternative institutions (that) are springing of all over the world to meet basic economic needs, to preserve local traditions, religious, life, cultural life, biological species and other treasures of the natural world, and to struggle for human dignity” (Rosenau, 2003:115).

Thus conceived the issue of nationalism and global culture dissolves into the famous debate of universalism versus particularism, cosmopolitanism versus communitarianism, absolutism versus relativism, integration versus disintegration, globalization versus fragmentation, subjectivism versus objectivism or localism versus globalism. Detailed critical examination of this debate is unwarranted here. So the main points pertaining to this debate will be mentioned, and it will be attempted how they bear upon the issue of national versus global culture.

According to Richard Bernstein “by objectivism, I mean the basic conviction that there is or must be some permanent, a historical matrix or framework to which we can ultimately appeal in determining the nature of rationality, knowledge, truth, reality goodness, or rightness ... Objectivism is closely related to foundationalism and the search for an Archimedean point. The objectivist maintains that unless we can ground philosophy, knowledge, or language in a rigorous manner we cannot avoid radical skepticism” (Bernstein, 1983: 8). Ever since the time of Plato and Aristotle, Western philosophical thinking has been preoccupied with the relentless quest for some universal standards that can command respect and adherence beyond spatial and temporal concerns. Some elements of universalism can be summarized as follows.

At the heart of universalism is the idea of some fundamental and unchangeable human nature that characterize humans as humans. “That human nature consists of stable and predictable passions and dispositions, instincts and emotions, all of which can be studied” is how it is being understood in the circle of philosophers and political theorists (Benhabib, 2002:26). This view is emblematic of modernity and found its most systematic articulation in the works of none other them the father of modern philosophy Rene Descartes. He sought to establish philosophy on the firm foundation of reason and rationality. His task in his words was to seek an “Archimedes in order that he might draw the terrestrial globe out of its place and transport it elsewhere; demanded only that one point should be fixed and immovable; in the same way I shall have the right to conceive
high hopes if I am happy enough to discover one thing only which is certain and indubitable” (Descartes quoted in Bernstein, 1983: 16). His quest for some universally applicable reason and standards led to the principle “that we should not rely on unfounded opinions, prejudices, tradition, or external authority, but only authority of reason itself” (Bernstein, 1983:17). No doubt, many of Cartesian philosophical assertions have been invalidated since the time they were postulated but Cartesian Anxiety for firm and universal base of knowledge continue to haunt Western philosophical thinking till the present times.

Universalism serves as justificatory strategy in contemporary philosophical debates. Normative content of rationality is often justified in the name of universalism. As noted by Seyla Benhabib “impartiality, objectivity, intersubjective verification of results, and data, consistency of belief, and self-reflexivity minimally define this normative content” (Benhabib, 2002: 27). Universalism in this scheme of things postulates that rationality is universally applicable. Social phenomenon if approached rationally will yield similar conclusions. Entire social universe can be and should be explicated in terms of reason. Rational methods should be deployed in order to comprehend social world. Humans are guided by the single universally applicable reason irrespective of their difference. Same rational principles provide guidelines for human action. All people behave in a similar manner under same conditions. As pointed out by Ernest Gellner “the inherently idiosyncratic has no place in a corpus of knowledge, Unsymmetrical idiosyncratic explanations are worthless-they are not explanations ... Ungeneralizable explanations are useless for a practical and cumulative body of knowledge. If like conditions did not produce like effects, then the experimental accumulation of knowledge would have no point and would not be feasible” (Gellner, 1982: 189). It is generally referred to as epistemological universalism.

Then there is moral universalism. Moral equality of individual is the bedrock postulate of moral universalism. It is associated “with the principle that all human beings, regardless of race, gender, sexual preference, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, and religious background, are to be considered moral equals and are therefore to be treated as equally entitled to moral respect” (Benhabib, 2002: 27). It clearly follows from this definition
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that moral standards are universally applicable and they should be applied on all people irrespective of their aforementioned differences.

Universalization of certain legal principles is the essence of legal universalism. Legal universalism connotes that “following norms and principle must be accorded universal respect by all legal systems: all human beings are entitled to certain basic rights, including minimally, the rights to life, liberty, security, due process before the law, and freedom of speech and association, including freedom of religion and conscience” (Benhabib, 2002: 27). Legal equality of all individuals is the linchpin of legal universalism.

Finally, there is social and cultural universalism. As noted by Ernest Gellner “in our actual and shared world, diverse cultures, though not sharing their beliefs, nevertheless seem to have little trouble in communicating with each other. The world contains many communities, but they visibly in habit the same world and compete within it. Some are cognitively stagnant, and a few are even regressive, some, on the other hand, possess enormous and indeed growing cognitive wealth ... its implementation leads to a very powerful technology. There is a near-universal consensus about this ... those who do not possess this knowledge and technology endeavour to emulate and acquire it” (Gellner, 1984: 190). It indicates at least two things that are relevant for the purposes of this research. Firstly, it connotes that certain norms and cultural standards are operating on global plane. Though they might have originated in Western and developed countries of the world, they, by now, have become or becoming increasingly universal in the sense that adherence to them has become almost necessary. Any deviance from them leads either to isolation or premodern status. These so called universal standards are seen as the models to be emulated. Secondly, there is a whole lot of world that finds it increasingly difficult to emulate them. They either do not have necessary technology (in the broader sense of the term) to emulate them or even if emulated they present a threat to certain way of life of many communities. It is in this sense humanity is deeply divided among haves and have-nots. Ali Mazrui confirms this point that there is the gap in ... power between North and South and the cultural foundations that underlie it” (Mazrui, 1990:8). He conceives “power as a cultural reality” and tries to expose a hidden cultural agenda in international power struggles (Ibid: 250). Huntington also takes this line and comments
“as people with different civilizations interact with one another and learn and adopt things from each other, they also become very conscious of their differences. Societies with different cultures develop over time, they then tend to re-emphasize their indigenous values and cultures and also try to claim that culture (rather than the West) is the basis for their success. Hence, they all try to distinguish between technology, which they seek to import from the West, while also seeking to maintain their own distinct values and traditions. The two (technology and culture) are obviously related” (Huntington, 2002: 61).

It is in this sense there is something that can be characterized as Southern culture clearly distinguishable from Western culture. It is this cultural divide between North and South that causes most of problems confronted by the contemporary world.

Relativist thinking operates in opposite direction. “In its strongest form, relativism is the basic conviction that when we turn to the examination of those concepts that philosophers have taken to be the most fundamental whether it is the concept of rationality, truth, reality, right, the good, or norms we are forced to recognize that in the final analysis all such concepts must be understood as relative to a specific conceptual scheme, theoretical framework, paradigm, form of life, society, or culture” (Bernstien, 1983: 8). While relativism stems from variety of sources like romantic, scientific and anti-epistemological, and takes variety of forms such as moral, conceptual, perceptual, relativism of truth and reason, here the focus will be on moral and cultural relativism.

As pointed out by Rom Harre and Michael Krausz “moral absolutists hold that there are some universal principles mandatory independently of the wishes of human beings, which must be the foundation of all normative systems that purport to be moralities” (Harre and Krausz, 1996:149).

Moral relativism as the term suggests is related to context specific morality of human beings. “Moral relativists believe … that there are no universal moral standards to which all tribal moralities and tribal legal systems must be subject … According to moral relativism, what counts as a morally good or bad person, what counts as a virtuous or vicious action, what counts as a good or bad character, is relative to the particular culture in which that distinction is made” (Harre and Krausz, 1996: 149-152). Moral relativism proceeds from the assumption that each society or community has its own moral and ethical standards and normative systems. These ethical standards and normative systems are the product of the history of their respective societies. They depend for their existence
on historical experience, present conditions and future aspirations of the community. These systems not only reflect their religious dogmas, cultural attributes and social organization but also in some ways constitute and sustain them. No two or more communities can have completely identical moral standards. To judge one community or to apply the moral standards of one community to another leads to ethnocentric, prejudiced assessments. Morality and normative system of a given society have to assessed and judged on their own terms. No universal moral criteria on exists on the basis of which normative system of a community can be passed judgment over. As pointed out by Harre and Krausz “each tribe has its own local morality, which is not assessable from the point of view of any other tribe, is suggested by the fact that there appear to be diverse moral orders ...” (Ibid: 155).

Closely connected with moral relativism is the notion of cultural relativism. Cultural relativism rejects the idea that “all people at all times and in all cultures could be brought to agree on assessment of meaningfullness, existence, goodness (moral worth) and beauty (aesthetic value) of relevant entities” (Ibid: 24). Cultural relativist argue that “no such agreement is possible” and different cultures do no lend easy credence to some universal evaluative standards. They are to be judged in their own terms. To put it more affirmatively cultural “relativism is often defined for a popular audience in the thesis that meaning, truth and value are relative to culture, that is each culture has its own unique system of meaning, repertoire of truth and criteria of value” (Ibid: 11). Cultural relativism relies on the assumption that various elements constitute the culture of a community. These elements differ significantly from one culture to another. They mean different things to different people. Spoken languages, sense of right and wrong, identities and affiliations, customs and rituals, aspiration and practices, values and morals, emotions and their expression, rationality and wisdom, behavioural norms and ideas: all these are culturally filtered. No two cultures overlap on these issues beyond the point. They are culturally specific. It is an error to apply elements of one culture to another. As pointed out by Harre and Krausz cultural “relativism depends heavily on the thesis of the radical diversity of cultures ... There are various elements that go to make up a culture. Each element, which might be alleged to vary from culture to culture, is tied in with certain
aspects of everyday life ... there are diverse ways of experiencing the world, and many
diverse symbolic systems ... on which so much emphasis has been placed” (Ibid: 11-15).

What implications does the issue of universalism and particularism have in the
context of global culture and national identities of weak states? Nation state is a local unit
in the context of globalization and globalization is a master narrative operating on the
global scale bringing with it attendant global ethics and morality. In fact, national
cultures and global culture stand or they are perceived to stand in direct contradiction
with each other. As pointed out by Mike Featherstone “one of the problems in attempting
to formulate a theory of globalization is of adopting a totalizing logic and assuming some
master process of global integration is underway which is making the world more unified
and homogenous. From this perspective ... the power of the flows of information, finance
and commodities, means that local cultures inevitably give way” (Featherstone, 2003:
342). That global culture is a threat to local national cultures of the world is what is at
stake in the debate between universalism (represented by the global culture) and
particularism (represented by national cultures). The very usage of the term culture in
singular in the context of globalization and plural in reference to national; indicates the
direction of homogenization caused by the former leading to the evaporation of the latter.
Of relevance for the purposes of this research is the fact that the notion of locality
inherently involves some kind of nostalgia and mythical security. It begins with some
“good old days” one has left behind or in the sense of some integrated organic
community of perfect coherence and order that provided some sort of mythical security in
the early days. Past in this sense is inherently virtuous, more moral and emotionally
fulfilling. Present, on the other hand, does not promise to deliver which past provided in
amplitude. Since homelessness has increased in modern times because more and more
people work and live far away from the place of their parentage, this feeling is more
permanent in modernity. As pointed out by Featherstone “nostalgia, or the loss of a sense
of home, is a potent sentiment in the modern world, particularly for those groups who are
ambivalent about modernity and retain the strong image of the alleged greater integration
and simplicity of a more integrated culture in the past” (Featherstone, 2003: 345). It is
therefore necessary to maintain some caution while speaking or listening to some
glorified version of locality of perfect social and moral order which is being threatened
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by the emergence of global culture. “There are problems with establishing the extent to which localities were integrated in the past. We have to be aware of ... those who make such pronouncements and that they might be painting a nostalgic and over-unified picture. It is also important that we do not operate with the view that localities are able to change only through the working out of a one way modernization process entailing the eclipse of community and the local culture” (Ibid: 345). Implied in the notion of locality is the imagination of some sort of integrated moral community based on face-to-face interaction supposedly unpolluted by external influences. It is fondly believed that in such a small face-to-face social settings the social and emotional bonds between individuals will be more intense and daily interaction will generate some sort of common knowledge reducing the chance of misunderstanding. It is also believed that “the regularity and frequency of contacts with a group of significant others ... are held to sustain a common culture” (Ibid: 345). These kind of communities, as mentioned in the first chapter, either never existed or even if they existed deep back in history, their decline cannot be attributed to globalization. To defend globalization more vociferously, globalization, as it is understood today (or in the sense it has been used in this research) is far more recent vintage. It cannot be held responsible beyond the point for destroying which either existed long time back in history or was empirically non existent. Even if fairy tales of pure moral communities hold some water in recent times their decline is caused by modernization, a process clearly different from globalization.

It is here the main thirst of this research lies. If theory of structuration is to be applied the debate between universalist globalization and particularist national cultures is the ideal site. If this divide is to be transcended structuration theory offers a very promising tool. It enables to see how both universalism and particularism have become intertwined with each other in late modern times. National identities were developed in the context of state insisting or demanding thinking beyond primordial ties. Global identities are being developed in the context of globalization impelling one to think beyond national project. There is no direct trade off between the two. Primordial ties did not cease to exist under national projects. Likewise it can be argued that national identities will persist in the global age as well. There is no reason to think that agents will have to surrender their autonomy before structural compulsions. What the present world
is witnessing is “the twofold process involving the inter penetration of the universalization of particularism and the particularization of universalism” (Robertson, 1992:100). Technology has become so diffused and globalization has percolated down to the remote areas of the world so much that it is increasingly becoming impossible to ignore its consequences. Likewise local forces are strong enough to register their presence felt in the so called global power circles. However strong might be the globalization it has to take local forces into account and local forces too have to use globalization for their own benefit if they are to survive and survive with decency in an interconnected world. As pointed out by Ronald Robertson

“in more recent world history the universalism particularism issue has come to constitute something like a global cultural form, a major axis of the structuration of the world as a whole. Rather than simply viewing the theme of universalism as having to do with principles which can and should be applied to all and that of particularism as referring to that which can and should be applied only locally, I suggest that the two have become tied together as part of a globe wide nexus. They have become united in terms of the universality of the experience and increasingly, the expectation of particularity on the one hand, and the experience and increasingly, the expectation of universality on the other. The latter-the particularization of universalism-involves the idea of the universal being given global human concreteness; while the former-the universalization of particularism involves the extensive diffusion of the idea that there is virtually no limit to particularity, to uniqueness, to difference, and to otherness” (Robertson, 1992: 102).

Cultural Imperialism as the Critique of Global Capitalism:- This fact of cultural imperialism takes inspiration from neo-Marxists. A noted neo-Marxist media critique Herbert Schiller is the main figure behind this approach. According to him “cultural homogenization that has been underway for years threatens to overtake the globe. The new cultural-ideological structures of an emergent nation ... are no less vulnerable to the glittering socio cultural products of the already developed world than the new industries of the aspiring states are to the established giant corporations of the industrialized West. Concerned specially with the development of global media, he advocated a kind of electronic de-linking for the sake of preventing effacement of vulnerable cultures. His sense of urgency was fueled by the conviction that mistakes and failures in agriculture and industry, if momentarily disastrous are still remediable. Cultural patterns, once
established, are endlessly persistent (Buell, 1994: 1). He remarks on the role of transnational corporations “they provide in their imagery and massagery, the beliefs and perspectives that create and reinforce their audiences’ attachments to the way things are in the system overall … What is argued here is not just that capitalism defines and structures the global political economy, but that in the process it determines global culture: in the distribution of commercialized media products containing the ethos and values of corporate capitalism and consumerism” (Tomlinson, 1999: 81-82).

Global capitalism has been challenged by non Marxists as well. It is fiercely argued that “capitalism is an homogenizing cultural force. The perception here is that everywhere in the world is beginning to look and to feel the same Cities in any part of the world display uniform features …” (Tomlinson, 2003: 111). It implies global convergence of cultural goods. The critique of global capitalism presumes that “this economic system has organized and structured much of cultural life within certain rather narrow commercial parameters … that the tendency towards commodification of cultural experience in modern societies is a highly significant one (Tomlinson, 1999: 83).

The critique of global capitalism makes a reasonably fair assessment of cultural convergence occurring around the planet. Global standardization programme and other cultural icons of the West as discussed in the first chapter have taken practically the entire world within their ambit. As pointed out by John Tomlinson “take any index, from clothes to food to music to film and television to architecture … there is no ignoring the fact that certain styles, brands, tastes and practices now have global currency and can be encountered virtually anywhere in the world … Examples of global brands and mass-cultural icons have indeed become clichés –Coke, McDonalds, Calvin Klein, Microsoft, Levi's, Dallas, IBM, Michael Jackson, Nike, CNN, Marlboro, Schartzenegger- some even becoming synonyms for western cultural hegemony itself: Mc World, Coca-colonization, Mc Donaldization and even Mc Disneyization (Tomlinson, 1999: 83). It is not surprising that these brand names are frequently invoked in the discourse of cultural imperialism. This section can be summed up by saying “this sort of argument, together with the readiness with which the threat of cultural imperialism is invoked in cultural policy debates conducted at the level of the nation-state, attests to an abiding sensitivity towards
these issues in the cultural discourses of the late twentieth century societies” (Tomlinson, 1999: 80).

Recent boom of capitalism has faced tremendous criticism from all quarters. It has been criticized on economic, political and cultural grounds. Ecruing the political critique of capitalism the focus of this research will be on economic and cultural critiques of capitalism. In recent times capitalism has been criticized on economic grounds by what Rosenau calls Resistant Globals. It is noteworthy that recent criticism of capitalism has not come from Marxist scholars, leaders and activists (though they continue to criticize capitalism). Here the focus will be on those critical voices of capitalism that are found in capitalist civilization itself. These voices do not oppose capitalism from Marxist vantage point. Nor they advocate the return to locality. Nor do they favour violent resistance to global expansion of capitalism. They merely want to reform it in the desire of giving it a more human face. They believe that global capitalism has gone out of control and it desperately needs reform. They also point out the subversion of local economies and cultures caused by the recent expansion of capitalism. As pointed out by Rosenau “activists and elites among the Resistant Globals seek to reform those features of globalization they view as creating undesirable equilibria. Most of them oppose the globalizing processes not in the hope of reverting to a form of localism but in an effort to bring them more fully under the jurisdiction of national governments, thereby rendering them more transparent and democratic” (Rosenau, 2003: 137).

Their resistance grew out of local issues in the beginning and it was diversified in terms of its concerns and focus. It somehow converges on common grounds to oppose global capitalism. It quickly became global resistance to globalization. As noted by Rosenau “it is only relatively recently, perhaps in the last five or ten years, that activists around the world have begun to put their local struggles against-environmental damage, social decay, the destruction of local economies and cultures, the exploitation of labour and so forth into a global context. Only in the 1990s has resistance, like capital itself, begun to become truly globalized ... activists have globalized faster than the firms they target” (Rosenau, 2003: 137).

Resistant Globals are trying to institutionalize their resistance. The resistance of Resistant globals is much more than vocal. For example, approximately sixty non profit
US organization established a coalition demanding “democratic, localized, ecologically sound alternatives to current practices and policies” (Ibid: 138). In another case some twenty NGOs working in environmental sector highlighted the devastating impact of globalization on ecological balance of the world. They published their reports in major US newspaper. Most importantly, in parallel to World Economic Forum, Resistant Global has formed World Social Forum. WSF plans to hold annual meeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil at the same time when global business elite meet in World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland. World Social Forum is committed to provide “a space for building economic alternatives, exchanging experiences, and strengthening North/South alliances between NGOs, unions, and social movements” (Ibid: 139). Its first meeting was held in 2001 and was attended by thousand participants. Forty thousand participants attended the second meeting. It clearly indicates that the institutionalization of Resistant Global is intensifying day by day.

Resistant Globals target leading capitalist institutions like IMF and WTO. They vehemently oppose the neo liberal economic policies of global business community. They perceive these policies harming the poor and benefiting the rich. These policies, in their opinion, is the cause of the problems that beset many states and regions of the world. Moreover, these financial institutions are seen as the agents of major developed countries of world that are deliberately pursuing these policies for their own benefit. These institutions govern the world economy in which developing countries are still at receiving end of the spectrum. Resistant globals want these institutions to be more democratic and want to provide human face to globalization.

Resistant Globals have been reasonably successful in their efforts to reform the process of globalization. At least, they have put globalists on defensive. It is because of enormous efforts of Resistant Globals that globalists are becoming more responsive to public concerns. They have begun to realize that globalization requires a certain kind of atmosphere to flourish. People must be aware of the fact that globalization is in their interest. They have realized that public relations is crucial for global economy Globalists have come to recognize that “if we do not succeed in making clear to citizens that globalization is to their benefit, we run a big political risk. There’s a feeling in the
population that nobody’s incharge. People are afraid of losing jobs to the whims of multinationals. We need to bring Wall Street to Main Street” (Rosenau, 2003: 141).

It will be grave error to assume that consequences of global capitalism are confined to economics only. Then clearly penetrate into the sociology of contemporary world. As pointed out by Oliver Bennett “the reason for the association of the new capitalism with decline arose from the social disruption which came in its wake. The unpredictable nature of capitalism, with its crisis tendencies and its propensity for ‘creative destruction’, had of course, been long understood” … (Bennett, 2001: 160). With the expansion of capitalism on global plane came the attendant and in some ways complementary policies. Principle of laissez faire was adopted and Keynesianism was abandoned. There was a flood of instances in which firms, companies and factories were merged, closed down, shifted and so forth. Workers in these firms began to realize (quite correctly) that their livelihood is in danger. They were not alone who faced the consequences of capitalism. People of middle class, who earlier enjoyed the fruits of secure jobs, had to compete with workers to find jobs wherever they could. These people formed a new proletariat class that was deeply discontented with global capitalism. This class heavily depended on uncertain jobs. With this began the downward mobility of middle class which reversed the process of embourgeoisement. It went contrary to the tall claims and promises made by the supporters of global capitalism. Global capitalism in some ways created the atmosphere of uncertainty and intense competition and consequent insecurity. It had direct bearings upon the family ties, kinship bonds and community feeling. Much of the distress and strain that characterize twenty first century has been fueled by this exigency of social life. It is not surprising that this class provided new recruits to mafias, underworld, terrorists, criminals, social disintegrationist, deviant and in extreme cases religious fundamentalist. As pointed out by Bannett “the link between these changes in the economy and social life was not something that could be conclusively proved, it was difficult to believe that they were not intimately connected” (Bannett, 2001: 161).

Global capitalism and its attendant market values deeply penetrated into the texture of social life in the late modern times. Though the benefits of capitalism could not percolate down to the lower strata of the society, its market values spread soon. Working
class of the global capitalist society began to realize that social responsibilities and other altruistic concerns are hindrance in their own advancement. It created the atmosphere in which every aspect of social and personal life has been subordinated to the dictates of market. It is a kind of “market fundamentalism as George Soros puts it. Relentless pursuit of individual profit is the main principle of global capitalism. Its manifestations and glimpses can easily be seen in share markets, stock exchanges and even in ordinary markets. It transformed communities into transactional societies in which short term market interest subordinated long term cooperative relationship among individuals. The only moral principle that characterize these societies is self interest. Acquisition and augmentation of material prosperity and comforts became the guiding principle for people in such societies. Despise, disregard and denigration that altruistic values face are propelled by these tendencies of capitalist society. In connection with this came the decline of state’s attention on non profit issues like education, health care and so forth. Scholars like George Soros warned that “the spread of market values into all areas of life poses a prime threat to our open and democratic society that an uninhibited pursuit of laissez faire ideology can lead to a slighter, of education and other pillars of civilized society that do not provide a quick return on investment, and that being obsessed with competitiveness leads to an unwillingness to make any sacrifices for the common good” (Soros quoted in Rosenau, 2003: 138). It will render very goods and ideals of human civilization subordinate to the vulgar social Darwinism. It will lead to the formation of transaction market society that “had not existed in its purest form nor … could it without tearing itself apart. But … we are closer to it than at any time in history” (Bennett, 2001: 162).

Finally, consumption became the hall mark of capitalist society. People stripped off their religious mooring, cultural tradition and family ties seek salvation and tend to fill the gap by the consumption of material goods. As pointed out by Bennett “the new capitalism mobilized all its resources to promote in the individual a profound sense of insufficiency, which could only be relieved, and then only temporarily, in the act of consumption” (Bennett, 2001: 162). There are two aspects of consumption: economic and cultural. Massive production of goods and commodities can not be sustained without
amount of consumption and how it is done has been covered in the first chapter. A few words are in order on cultural aspects of consumption.

A Harvard based sociologist Daniel Bell has provided an incisive analysis of the disjunction between the culture that created capitalism and those cultural principles that perpetuates modern capitalist economy. He proceeds from the well known position of Max Weber and demonstrates the linkages between Protestant values and the emergence of capitalist economy. In his words “what was unique about the Puritan temper was the devotion of this worldly asceticism to an occupational calling and to work and accumulation. Yet the end of the Puritan’s being was not primarily wealth ... the Puritan got nothing out of his wealth for himself but the proof of his own salvation. And it was this furious energy that built an industrial civilization” (Bell, 1976: 82). Protestant values that created capitalist civilization was a major check on the inherently expansionist logic of capitalism. These values however were undermined by capitalism itself particularly in the later phase of its development. “The greatest single engine in the destruction of the Protestant ethic was the invention of the installment plan, or instant credit. Previously one had to save in order to buy. But with credit cards one could indulge in instant gratification. The system was transformed by mass production and mass consumption, by the creation of new wants and new means of gratifying those wants” (Bell, 1976: 21). Without Puritan ethic capitalism lost it anchor and due to this capitalism dissolved in endless accumulation and consumption. “The Protestant ethic had served to limit sumptuary (though not capital) accumulation. When the Protestant ethic was sundered from bourgeois society, only the hedonism remained, and the capitalist system lost its transcendental ethic. The cultural, if not moral, justification of capitalism has become hedonism, the idea of pleasure as a way of life”. (Bell, 1976: 21-22) He further writes “the real problem of modernity is the problem of belief. To use an unfashionable term, it is a spiritual crisis, since the new anchorages have proved illusory and the old ones have become submerged. It is a situation which brings us back to nihilism, lacking a past or a future, there is only a void” (Ibid: 28-29). If this is the crisis of Western civilization then temptation is difficult to resist commenting that East offers some remedy. “Modern civilization with its scientific temper, humanistic sprit, and secular view of life is uprooting the world over the customs of long centuries and creating a ferment of
restlessness. The new world cannot remain a confused mass of needs and impulses, ambitions and activities, without any control or guidance of the sprint. The void created by abandoned superstitions and uprooted beliefs calls for a spiritual filling .... For this we require a human consciousness of community, a sense of personal relationships among men" (Radhakrishman, 1975:vii). It requires a worldwide revolution in human consciousness otherwise we will neither be able to make the earth better place for posteriority to live in nor can we protect the world from the greatest crisis of human history towards which it is proceeding fast.

The discussion pertaining to cultural imperialism as critique of capitalism can he concluded by saying “in effect the contemporary global situation is creating real confrontations between cultures, languages, and nations, and if the unintended results of such real confrontations is to impinge upon the lives of others, then we have a pragmatic imperative to understand each other and to enter into a cross-culture dialogue” (Benhabib, 2002:36).

**Cultural Imperialism as the Critique of Modernity:** - Criticism of Western modernity is the final route to approach cultural imperialism. According to John Tomlinson "modernity as we shall understand it, refers to the main cultural direction of global development. Thus the drift towards a sort of global cultural homogeneity that is recognized ... is seen in this discourse to derive from the dominance of a particular-modern way of life which has multiple determinants. These include capitalism (seen as a set of productive and consumerist practices) but also urbanism, mass communication, a technical-scientific-rationalist dominant ideology, a system of (mainly secular) nation-states, a particular way of organizing individual self awareness. Cultural imperialism as a critique of modernity implies a critique of the dominance of these global cultural determinants" (Tomlinson, 2003: 113).

Critique of modernity involves certain slippery ideas that need to be avoided. Firstly, it can be viewed as the usual complaint against the cultural homogenization propelled by capitalist modernity and its latest incarnation; globalization. Secondly, the critique of modernity can be seen as able to sustain cultural diversity so fondly cherished throughout the world. Another risk involved in the critique of modernity is conflating it
with the capitalist society or societies of industrialized north. This temptation is difficult to resist particularly when capitalism is caricatured as the natural child of modernity (Marxism and other ideologies are being the step children of modernity). Finally, critique of modernity is often misdirected at the dominant trajectory of global development. Implicit in this rendition is some odd and mystified notion of telos inexorably operating at the level of contemporary world history depicting the West as the culmination of all cultural development; an enviable reality in its own either to be emulated and aspired for or to be labeled as primitive, underdeveloped, undeveloped, backward, periphery, marginalized and Third World in the exact sense of the terms.

Another important or perhaps the central state in the cultural critique of modernity is to what has been referred to as ‘cultural contradictions of capitalism with which I will deal later. It is sufficient here to point out that the cultural imperialism defined in terms of critique of modernity presents a gigantic paradox people are rare who will prefer to sacrifice the fruits and comforts brought about by modernity. On the other hand discontents of modernity are too great to be easily ignored. As pointed out by Tomlinson “the problem for the critique of modernity is how to criticize its discontents whilst recognizing its comfort, thus to avoid to self-indulgence involved in romanticizing tradition” (Tomlinson, 2003: 113). Having listed several meanings associated with the notion of cultural imperialism it is necessary to spell out how cultural domination takes place. Cultural domination, in other words, takes variety of forms under different times and conditions. Some of them are mentioned below.

The question of the imperial modernity inevitably involves the issue of Eurocentricity. In this perspective Europe is seen as the original home of modernity and epitome of all that can be identified as constitutive of a civilized society. If modernity involves “the growth of scientific consciousness, the development of a secular outlook, the doctrine of progress, the primacy of instrumental rationality, the fact-value split, individualists understanding of the self, contractualist understanding of society” and so on, then this legacy can be and has clearly been identified as European (Gaonkar, 2001:2). This rendition perceives “European/Western culture as a synonym for cultural arrogance and conceit. The label most frequently employed in this context is that of “Eurocentrism” denoting a policy of global domination or hegemony” (Dallmayr,
Eurocentrism has been caricatured “basically a culturalist phenomenon, a doctrine that, though parochial and ethnocentric, parades itself as a universal model whose imitation by all people is the only solution to the problems they face ... From a strictly Eurocentric perspective this emergence is portrayed as entirely indigenous or “exclusively European” process with no indebtedness to external factors, a process that originated in the European Middle ages and later diffused itself throughout the entire world. According to this paradigm, Europe or European culture carried within itself “exceptional internal characteristics that allows it to supersede through its rationality all other cultures” (Dussel, 2001:3). This paradigm has provided much of the coherence West claims to embody in itself as an entity. It claims “that Europe is the cradle of the expanding West including the US. According to this ideology that West is considered synonymous with the most dynamic, developed and progressive civilization. It assumes .... that there is only one scenario for social development and only one road leading to modernity and beyond, which all societies have to follow .... The geopolitical consequence, of such a theory has been European imperial expansion and colonialism” (Sztompka, 2005:533). What are the foundations of European culture? Various scholars have tried to answers this question in different manner. They converge on following grounds. First pillar of European civilization is “ancient Greece, with its tradition of art, philosophy, science, cultivation of the body and first delineation of democracy” (Sztompka, 2005:532). The second main foundation of contemporary European identity comes from ancient Rome with its tradition of law and a legal culture, as well as an efficient administration of the state” (Sztompka, 2005:532). Third source of Eurocentricity comes from “Judiasm and Christianity with their concept of human dignity and their idea of freedom, liberation, emancipation, as well as of linear progress” (Sztompka, 2005:532). What European tend to forget that despite their socalled intrinsic coherence and the cohesion of identity history of Europe for all practical purposes has been history of the most bloodiest warfare. This fact, however, compels Europeans to think and think seriously about international stability and order. As a pointed out by Sztompka “the political project of a European Community, and later of a European Union is legitimised precisely by the effort to escape from a conflict-permeated and war ridden past (Sztompka, 2005:532). Finally and most importantly, Europe and associated with it
Eurocentrism is primarily a cultural phenomenon. “Europe is a domain of ... Common thoughts, values and ideals ... Religious tolerance, human rights, democratic government, the rule of law, the scientific tradition, social modernization, cultural pluralism a free market economy and the supreme Christian virtues such as compassion, charity, and respect for the individual” are some of the identity defining values that most of European cherish (Sztompka, 2005:532).

All foundations of Eurocentrism can be easily challenged. According to Šamir Amin the Greek ancestry of Eurocentrism is a myth. But it performs a vital function for Eurocentrism. It highlights the fact that “Greek heritage predisposed Europe to rationality. In this myth, Greece was the mother of rational philosophy while the “Orient” never succeeded in going beyond metaphysics” (Amin, 2000: 1675). In most of the books on the history of Western philosophy it is caricatured that human reason started working in ancient Greece. Though variety of philosophical schools and the conflict between them is usually mentioned, “emphasis is placed on the ... development of thought free from religious constrains, humanism, and the triumph of reason – all without any reference to the “Orient” whose contribution to Hellenic thought in considered to be non existent” (Ibid: 1675). Since then these traits of Ancient Greece have unproblematically come down to the present times and have been taken over and developed further by Europeans at the time of Enlightenment. The period of fifteen hundred years or so that separates Greek antiquity and European Renianssance is treated as a transition phase during which no other philosopher or school of thought transcended the genius of the Greek thought.

The rupture of fifteen centuries between ancient Greece and modern Europe created the problem of demonstrating the continuity between the two. In nineteenth century racist hypothesis was introduced for this purpose. “By borrowing the methods of classification of animal species and of Darwinism ... human races were said to inherit innate characteristics that transcend social evolutions. These psychological predispositions were presented as more or less the major source of divergent social evolutions” (Ibid: 1677). But after the Second World War racism lots its prestige in intellectual circles of the world which it previously enjoyed. There was a widely felt need for constructing the collective identity of Europe on the basis of some other principle. Christianity was used for this purpose. “Europe’s predominantly Christian character
offered a way out of ... crisis of European nationalism and racism ... the Christian revival of our period is, at least in part, an unconscious response to this situation” (Ibid: 1679).

Orientalism is an important dimension of Eurocentrism. It “refers to the ideological constructions of a mythical “Orient”, whose characteristics are treated as immutable traits defined in simple opposition to the characteristics of the Occidental world. The image of this opposite is an essential element of Eurocentrism” (Ibid: 1681). After becoming modern, developed, capitalist and imperial master Europe required some justification for the process of colonization. It had to exonerate its right to rule, represent and judge others. “The Orient” was incapable of representing itself with the same force that European armed with bourgeois thought, could” was the reason cited for justifying colonialism (Ibid: 1681). Moreover the representation of others and the development of capitalism went hand-in-hand. “It transformed Europe ... into the centers of the system and reduced other regions to the status of peripheries. European representation of others remains marked by this polarization, and in fact serve as a means of justifying it” (Ibid: 1681). Representation, comparison and judgement of other culture always run the risk of misunderstanding and distortion. It always involves the danger of representing others as inferior in the haste and burning desire of claiming oneself superior. Chances will always be there of some being appeased and many remaining dissatisfied. If the possibility of cosmopolitanism is to take roots this risk has to be confronted. It is the imperative in other words, to analyse and interpret texts of different faiths and to explore whatever analogies and differences can be drawn from such interpretations. “No one’s faith will be shaken as result. By definition, faith answers needs to which science cannot respond” (Ibid: 1682).

Another aspect of Eurocentrism relates to the material prosperity and the power of the West. Associated with this are other virtues of modernity such as “the triumph of scientific spirit, rationality and practical efficiency ... the world of tolerance, diversity of opinions, respect for human rights and democracy” (Ibid: 1685). These gifts of modernity marked Europe as the center of the modern world. Since much of this is of undeniably European provenance, it has set the precedent for the rest of the world. Non Western societies are required to follow the European trajectory if they want to progress that in
any case they are doing sometimes gradually and sometimes imperfectly because of the resistance coming either from Marxism or religious fundamentalism. What is significant under these circumstances is that there is no hope and future for humanity except imitating the West. "Europeanization, which is simply the diffusion of a superior model, functions as a necessary law, imposed by the force of circumstances. The conquest of the planet is thus justified" (Ibid: 1685). Others have no choice but either to emulate which will usher in an era of their progress or isolate that will push them to the vicious circle of decline. In this rendition "the progressive Westernization of the world is nothing more than the expression of the triumph of the humanist universalism invented by Europe" (Ibid: 1685).

Two facts of modern world history need to be mentioned in order to expose the myth of Eurocentrism. First is emigration. Europeans tend to ignore the fact that capitalism caused demographic explosion in Europe like it did in other parts of the world. This demographic explosion would have posed insurmountable challenge for industrial revolution in the absence of massive emigration of Europeans from Europe to America and other regions of the world. "Without this massive emigration, Europe would have had to undertake its agricultural and industrial revolutions in conditions of demographic pressure analogous to those in Third World today" (Ibid: 1688). It must be kept in mind that the people of European origins living outside their country are double from the population of their home country. It clearly indicates how difficult the development of Europe would have been without the large scale migration.

Secondly, the critical role played by colonialism in the progress of Europe cannot be denied. Even the chief proponents of colonialism will not dispute the fact that colonialism destroyed local economies in favour of capitalist West. Nor can the brutalities of slave trade and the extermination of American indigenous people be denied without the substantial distortion of the world history. No one can seriously dispute that the domination of colonial territories was in the best interests of colonial masters. It not only hegemonized the colonial world politically but also extracted colonies' natural resources and other economic assets that were necessary for the capitalism to flourish.

The discussion pertaining to Eurocentrism can be safely concluded by saying that "Eurocentricity is a ... world view ... which ... is pursued at the expense of other while
justifying this world view by paradigms or ethical norms that proclaim universal benefits for all” (Mehmet, 1995: 8).

The notion of European modernity and its hegemony over the rest of the world has increasingly come under serious attack from non Western perspectives on the subject. The main thesis regarding the critique of the Western modernity has been developed by S.N. Eisenstadt and other scholars either inspired by his work or thinking on the same lines on their own. According to Eisenstadt “the idea of multiple modernities ... is to see it as a story of continual constitution and reconstitution of a multiplicity of cultural programs. These ongoing reconstruction ... are carried forward by specific social actors ... holding very different views on what makes societies modern” (Eisenstadt, 2000:2).

Eisenstadt is fully aware of the distinction between the modernization and Westernization. Though these two processes and terms have been used interchangeably by the scholars, Eisenstadt prefers to maintain the distinction between the two. According to him “one of the most important implications of the term multiple modernities is that modernity and Westernization are not identical; Western patterns of modernity are not the only “authentic” modernities, though they enjoy historical precedence and continue to be a basic reference point for others” (Ibid: 3). Different shades of opinion persist and all sorts of interpretations are available on what constitutes modernity. But they converge on certain elements that can be characterized as the core of modernity. One of the most central attribute of modernity is its emphasis on human agency and disregard for the divinely preordained cosmological order. Modernity presumes that social order is man made and can be changed, developed and transformed and even destroyed. Nothing has been fixed and made permanent by some impersonal transcendental entity; people sometimes refer to as God. Another noteworthy characteristic of modernity is the “break down of all traditional legitimations of the political order, and with it the opening up of different possibilities in the construction of a new order” (Ibid: 5). It is this feature of modernity that enable mankind to organize political life differently. Different polities along with their attendant political institutions came into being by the political logic of modernity. Even state, which is the most central referent object of contemporary human condition, is the product of modernity. Nationalism, democracy and freedom of press and so forth all are fruits modernity brought with it. Having defined quite briefly the political
and cultural programme of modernity it is equally necessary to demonstrate how these ideas were received by the rest of the world.

Technological and scientific development of mankind accelerated the diffusion of these distinct European ideas in other parts of the world. As observed by Eisenstadt “the attraction of many of modernity’s themes and institutional forms ... was caused by the fact that it was the European (later the Western) pattern developed and spread throughout the world by Western economic, technological and military expansion” (Ibid: 14). These ideas stemming from the West undermined many of the social political and cultural premises prevailing in colonies. Further more these ideas either imposed or transplanted were not taken verbatim. Diffusion of cultural and political ideas and institutions never takes place in their pristine pure form. They are appropriated and adapted according to the needs and social settings of the recipient society. As noted by him the appropriation by non-Western societies of specific themes and institutional patterns of the original western modern civilization societies entailed the continuous selection, reinterpretation and reformulation of these imported ideas” (Ibid: 15).

Modernity has been challenged by several forces in recent times. As mentioned earlier state faces multiple challenges from inside as well as outside of its jurisdiction. Moreover globalization has created conditions under which inside/ outside divide is difficult to sustain. Transnational flows of people, money and ideas occur irrespective of state boundaries. State, the political logic of modernity, lost much of its control over many areas of its activity in recent times. Spread of diseases, organized crime, youth violence, prostitution, AIDS, environmental pollution and so forth are some of the problems over which state does not have much control. “All this has served to reduce the control of the nation state over its own economic and political affairs, despite continuing efforts to strengthen technocratic, rational secular policies in various arenas” (Ibid: 16). Religious fundamentalism, terrorism and secessionist tendencies undermine state’s ability to control its affairs significantly. Religious fundamentalism particularly gave a big blow the secular outlook so emblematic of modernity. Ethnic revival, in recent times undermines state’s legitimacy in significant manner. So modernity particularly its political logic has faced several challenges in recent times. Caricature of cultural modernity in singular terms is a far fetched imagination.
The discussion pertaining to the cultural imperialism defined in terms of imperialism of modernity can be summed up by saying that "under the impact of modernity, all societies will undergo certain changes in both outlook and institutional arrangements. Some of these changes may be similar, but that does not amount to convergence ... In short, modernity is not one, but many" (Gaonkar, 2001: 17).

One more question is left. How do national identities respond to global culture? Out of several responses four are identified more relevant for the purposes of this research. They are following.

**Homogenization:** Cultural homogenization is an old process whose origins can be traced back to the period of colonial and imperial period. Revolution in transportation and communication fostered cultural homogenization all over the world. Many ideas of the West were transplanted in other parts of the world that brought and is still bringing cultural homogeneity. The process of homogenization, with the emergence of global culture, is reaching new heights. As Oommen observes "while modernization accelerated this process, homogenization seems to be climaxing with the on-set of globalization. The more visible aspects of homogenization mainfest in the cultural context through common life style and consumption pattern – dress (e.g. jeans), food (e.g. McDonalds), music (e.g. popularity of Michael Jackson)" (Oommen, 2005:163-164). The thesis of cultural homogenization, however, must be applied cautiously. It is true that cultural homogenization has taken most of the world within its ambit; it is equally true that it is far from being universal. It is confined primarily to the middle and upper class of different societies by virtue of their ability to afford these expansive cultural items. Most of the population of this class usually resides in the urban and metropolitan areas of the world and it constitutes a thin minority in comparison to the overall world population. This affluent minority and its life styles, however, do leave deep social and cultural impacts, on the rest of the majority population of the world. They aspire to become like them.

Cultural homogenization manifests itself in other areas of life as well. Its signs are more visible in the context of nuclear family, monogamous marriages, parliamentary democracy, private property and western technology" (Oommen, 2005:165).
Endorsement of these elements also varies in many parts of the world. Elements like democracy and private property clearly have more adherents than monogamy. Joint families have not ceased to exist in many parts of Asia and Africa. Individualist tendencies are still discarded in many parts of the world. Monogamy is yet to take root as a normal behavioural pattern in Muslim societies where polygamy is preferred. Another noteworthy tendency of homogenization is the presumed displacement of old with the new. It is widely held that new cultural forms are rendering old patterns obsolete and filling the void created by the destruction of the old culture. It is partially true. “It is true that some of the old elements aspects are displaced but some others are retained and new elements are added to the existing stock of the old” (Oommen, 2005:164).

**Pluralization:** It will be a grave error to assume that cultural diversity of the world has disappeared altogether from the surface of the earth. “The majority of world’s population is still untouched by the process of homogenization, culture heterogeneity obstinately persists” (Oommen, 2005:164). Plurality of the world’s different cultures has shown no signs of surrender before the powerful global forces operating on the world. They vehemently and many times violently assert their independent existence. As pointed out by T.K. Oomen “pluralization concedes and commends the co-existence of a variety of consumption and institutional patterns ... several of the old pattern in food, dress and music persists with vehemence; cultural revivals are indeed common in contemporary world. This partial change and partial persistence gives birth to ... pluralisation (Oommen, 2005:165). Manifestations of pluralisation are evident in the contemporary world, from democracy to private property, from consumption to sports, from family life to corporate life. These supposedly Western ideas and institutions operate in entirely different cultural settings. They inevitably go through the process of cultural filtering and thereby change their form and content from their original position. Even democracy so emblematic of Western wisdom tables variety of form in different countries ranging from parliamentary to presidential, from two party to multiparty, republican to non republican. The principle of private property is differently applied under different conditions raging from “exclusive private ownership, to joint stock companies to co-operatives, and collective enterprises” (Oommen, 2005:165). This is how global trends are applied
locally to which the term glocalization aptly refers. It is not contention of the thesis of pluralization that it is the direct result of globalization. World’s cultural diversity has been persisting since time immemorial and there is no reason to assume that globalization is the engine of it. What is avowed by the pluralization thesis is “that because of the process of accretion and retention pluralization comes about as globalization proceeds” (Oommen, 2005:165). The tenacity of globalization despite its all hyperbolic depictions is seriously limited. Pluralization as witnessed in contemporary times does not “reject a cultural item or an institutional device based on the locals of its origin, because it recognizes and respects other cultures. But generally speaking the non-west accepts many more of the western cultural items and west reluctantly takes to things non-Western” (Oommen, 2005:165).

**Traditionalization:** Cultural homogenization does not have smooth sailing in present world. It faces all kinds of resistance. As pointed out by Oommen “the hegemonizing tendency of modernization gives birth to a loss of meaning and an erosion of identity to the non-west. This leads to the revivalist syndrome, the resurrection of roots, a search for identity, a process of traditionalisation” (Oomen, 2005:165). It is noteworthy that the tendency to resist globalization is not confined to non Western areas of the world. Americanization is resisted by French. As different societies modernize and globalize they increasingly become aware of and willing to maintain their distinct national heritages. Response to global modernity sometimes takes the form of ethnic-cultural revival so neatly embodies in religious fundamentalism and reform. “If fundamentalism is invariably a literal interpretation of texts ignoring the changing contexts, reform is a creative reinterpretation of the text taking into account the change in the context” (Oommen, 2005: 166). Traditionalisation takes the form of cultural relativism particularly when it is a quest for so called cultural purity. Cultural relativism is a belief that one’s culture is the purest and it needs to be maintained in its pristine purity” (Oommen, 2005:116).

Mention must be made of the fact that the conflict between traditionlization and globality is the tussle between the hegemony of the tradition and homogenizing proclivities of globality. Since tradition has never been monolith hegemonization of one
tradition by another has been the norm in history. If globalization is to flourish in all parts of the world it will have to sideline, marginalize and even in some cases destroy the hegemonic traditions in different societies. If it succeeds in this project, homogenization will occur. "But this is unlikely to happen in all parts of the world with equal intensity as hegemonic traditions and their strength vary across the globe. This is evident from the persistence of fundamentalism/revivalism-religious, political, economic and/or cultural – in different parts of the world" (Oommen, 2005:166).

Globalization has succeeded subordinating only those traditions that have already seen dominated by the Great traditions within their respective societies. People belonging to little tradition seek their salvation in connecting themselves with the present globality. In fact, much of the resistance to globalization comes from the Great traditions and civilizations like Islam. Same process sometimes provides an excellent opportunity for multinational states to connect their local identities with global culture and thereby retaining the longevity of their regime intact. State in multinational societies tends to add a layer of national identities on local that sometimes lead to resistance to state. State leaders sometimes respond to this situation by allowing these local identities to connect with globality, and thereby serving twin purpose at the same time. After being connected with global culture the attention of local cultures is diverted to what has been the most attractive and appealing culture so far. It decreases the resistance of local people. It gives the sense of identification they will fondly relish. This strategy at the same time enables ruling elites to keep these people within the state jurisdiction who otherwise threatened by the formation of the national identify can always make demands of secession. Global culture acts as a buffer between local and national cultures. It saves local identity from the so called risk of extermination by national one. It saves the state, at the same time, from secessionist tendencies of local cultures.

Global culture has fostered community life in recent times in many ways. Due to mass media people of the world are more aware than ever before in history. News spread in fraction of seconds all over the world. Natural disaster, genocidal policies of some state, terrorist activities and other undesirable occurrences hit the mind of people all over the world. Much of the humanitarian work that is being undertaken by governmental and NGOs is the direct result of the globalized media. Not only that. Situation is far deeper.
Anomie and alienation became the part of social life in a globalized world. People bored with their routine work tend to feel void in their lives. Most of the time family is unable to provide the emotional and psychological security for the simple reason people reside far away from their families. Therefore they participate in other kind of associational life like friendship associations, clubs, picnics, eating jaunts, tours and forth. In this sense globalization can be seen as fostering community life.

**Hybridization:** Another response to global culture is one of hybridization. Though it resembles with glocalization and pluralization, it is neither of them. As Oommen observes “the cross breeding of the traditional and the modern, the local and the global, gives birth to hybridity. Hybridization creates new cultural elements and social patterns which are neither traditional nor modern, neither local nor global ... It is an effort to innovate, to break out of cultural and social dead ends. It is a product of the mutation syndrome. It is simultaneous engagement with both tradition and modernity and local and global” (Oommen, 2005: 167). This kind of mutation is clearly evident in the sphere of music, art forms, cuisine, movies and so forth. In words of Oommen “vegetarian hamburger, Indian rap music, European curry, Japanese Pasta and numerous other examples suggest the relentless march of hybridization” (Oommen, 2005: 168). Cultural hybridity, it needs to be mentioned is not immune from hierarchy. Lifestyle of affluent sections of the society and developed countries dominates the lifestyles of weak states and lower strata of societies. There is a question of asymmetry as well. The amount of cultural artifacts stemming unity from the West to rest is much more than that of one that flows from the rest of the world to the West. This asymmetry of global flows renders globalization as uneven process.