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1.1 Prelude:

Globalisation – which refers to the growing integration of societies, economies and cultures around the world; has become one of the most hotly-debated topics and key area of research among the policy makers, statesmen, corporate, politicians and academia respectively over the past few years. Globalisation literally means the process of transformation of local/regional phenomena into global ones. It is described as a process by which people of different societies around the world are amalgamated and unified to form a single global society. It is a process that combines socio-cultural, economic, technological, and political spheres. Rapid economic growth and poverty reduction in China, India, and other developing countries that were poor
two decades ago, has proposed profound prospects for globalisation. But at the same time increased inequality, exploitation and environmental degradation, most particularly the now much hyped and alarming ‘global warming’ along with others that have been resulted in due to the process of globalisation have also generated significant national and international opposition to the very process of globalisation.

Scholars in Social Science disciplines who have long been associated with globalisation studies have made several serious attempts to define the very concept and make an all-encompassing definition of the term globalisation. However, Held and McGrew have mentioned, an authoritative survey of recent debates says that there is not a single universally accepted definitions of globalisation (2000:3, Also see in Modelski et.al 2008:2). Similarly, looking at the widespread debate over the issue of globalisation and multiple view points on it, Manfred B. Steger has written that one of the reasons why the concept remains a contested concept is because there exists no scholarly consensus on what kinds of social processes constitutes its essence. Not only scholars hold different viewpoints with regard to proper definitions of globalisation, they also disagree on its scale, causation, chronology, impact, trajectories and policy outcomes. (2009:10-11) However, this fact hardly surprises, looking at the innumerable debates that are associated with it and when it is known that people world over are affected very differently and in numerous ways by the socio-economic transformations that the globalisation process exhibits. Nevertheless, here an attempt has been made to make an understanding of globalisation better through different definitions and analyses.

1.2 DEFINITIONAL ANALYSIS:

According to The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [SEP] (2006), in popular discourse, the term globalisation is understood as a little more than a synonym for one or more of the following phenomena/processes: the pursuit of classical liberal policies (or ‘free market’) in the world economy (or what is called as ‘economic liberalisation’), the growing dominance of western (or even American) polity, economy, and culture (which can be called as ‘westernisation’ or ‘Americanisation’), the proliferation of new information technologies (or the ‘Internet Revolution’), as
well as the notion that humanity stands at the threshold of realising one single unified community in which major sources of social conflict have vanished (something that many address as 'global integration')

Although several recent social theories have tried to give precise and well-formulated conceptual understanding of globalisation, the sharp differences and disagreements still persist in globalisation literature both on its meaning and implications. As said in The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy [SEP] (2006), most contemporary social theorists view globalisation as 'fundamental changes in the spatial and temporal contours of social existence, according to which the significance of space or territory undergoes shifts in the face of a no less dramatic acceleration in the temporal structure of crucial forms of human activity.' As said above geographical distance or space is measured in time. But with the advancement of transport and information/communication technology, an important feature of globalisation process, the time necessary to connect distinct geographical localities is drastically reduced; devaluing the concept of territory altogether (something that’s called as deterritorialisation) therefore making distance/space compressed or annihilated. Hence, Anthony Giddens (1990) rightly remarks that we are at the same 'space' but not necessarily in same 'local'. Much before the arrival of the term 'globalisation' in the academic writings, which is believed to have come only in the seventies of the twentieth century, the advancement of communication technology had already begun leading to extensive debate on the issues of time and space and their compression. For example way back in 1839, an English journalist had commented on the implications of rail travel by anxiously postulating that as distance was “annihilated, the surface of our country would, as it were, shrivel or shrink in size until it became not much bigger than one immense city” (Harvey, 1996: 242)

Philosopher and theorist Karl Marx (1848) formulated the fascinating theoretical explanation on territorial compression. In his account, 'the imperatives of capitalist production inevitably drove the capitalist class or the bourgeoisie to nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, and establish connections everywhere. The juggernaut of industrial capitalism constituted the most basic source of technologies resulting in the annihilation of space, helping to pave the way for intercourse in every direction,
universal interdependence of nations, in contrast to a narrow-minded provincialism that had plagued humanity for untold eons.' (Marx, 1979 [1848]: 476).

Some contemporary and refined analysis of globalisation has described it with deterritorialisation. It is a process which shows a growing variety of social activities that take place around the world irrespective of the geographical location of participants. As Jan Aart Scholte observes, 'global events can - via telecommunication, digital computers, audiovisual media, rocketry and the like - occur almost simultaneously anywhere and everywhere in the world' (1996: 45. Quoted in SEP, 2006). The argument puts forward the view that even though national borders and geographical location still remain crucial for many activities, deterritorialisation manifests itself in many spheres, be it the brokers engaged in electronic transaction in stock market around the world or internet communication making possible instantaneous interaction among people notwithstanding their vast geographical separation or the short-messaging-service (SMS) through the mobile communication technology that makes people send instant messages in matters of less than a second to distant localities, therefore making us to rethink the traditional notion of geography.

Others disagree with the view that territory has really lost its relevance, although they believe that, deterritorialisation is an important component of globalisation process. As said by Tomlinson, since a majority of human activities is still tied to a concrete geographical locality or territory, the more decisive facet of globalisation concerns the manner in which distant events and forces impact on local and regional endeavors. (1999: 9, Quoted in SEP). So, globalisation refers to those processes whereby geographically distant events, happening in faraway places impact to a growing degree on local day to day life. For example, 'the insistence by powerful political leaders in the First World that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) should require that Latin and South American countries commit themselves to a particular set of economic policies might result in poorly paid teachers and researchers as well as large, understaffed lecture classes in San Paolo or Lima; the latest innovations in information technology from a computer research laboratory in India could quickly change the classroom experience of students in British Columbia or Tokyo.' (SEP, 2006) Therefore, Anthony Giddens, defines globalisation as 'the intensification of
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world-wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanciated relations that shape them. A local transformation is as much a part of globalisation as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space.’ (1990:64) Similarly, Held et.al define globalisation as ‘the processes of change which underpin a transformation in the organisation of human affairs by linking together and expanding human activity across regions and continents’. (1999:15). As to Thomas Friedman, ‘globalisation is the integration of markets, finance and technologies in a way that is shrinking the world from a size medium to size small and enabling each of us to reach around the world farther, faster, and cheaper than ever before’. (1999:110) Further, Fredric Jameson defines globalisation ‘as something that reflects the sense of an immense enlargement of world communication, as well as of the horizon of a world market, both of which seem far more tangible and immediate than in earlier stages of modernity’ (Quoted in Stager, 2009:13). Similarly, to David Held, ‘globalisation may be thought of as a process or a set of processes which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions-assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact-generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction and the exercise of power’. (Quoted in Stager, 2009:13) Way back in 1841, the French writer and diplomat Francois-Rene de Chateaubriand had envisioned the future society to be shaped by science and by new technologies of transport and communication, when steam power will be preferred, when together with telegraphy and railways, it will have made distance disappear, it will not only be commodities which travel, but also ideas which will have wings’ (Quoted in Rothschild, 1999:107)

Further, to Arrighi, ‘globalization may be a term to denote the shift from a global financial system controlled by a hierarchy of government agencies headed by the US to an equally global financial system in which governments have little control over their finances and compete fiercely with one another for the favor and assistance of privately controlled capital’ (2000: 119). As he remarks, the formation of a capitalist world system, has been based upon the construction of territorial organizations capable of regulating social and economic life. These territorial organizations are the
states whose sovereignty is getting undermined by the present wave of financial expansion. (Also see Arrighi, 1994)

However, the last wave/phase of globalisation as Anand Kumar rightly observes, has primarily been an economic phenomenon for it was market mediated, finance oriented, commodity based and consumption related (2009:43). But with much analysis on trade and commerce, globalisation is largely misunderstood as purely an economic phenomenon. While the economic model cannot be ignored (after all trade/commerce led to the initiation of other facets of globalisation, say socio-cultural); apart from trade, people to people movement, cultural contact, that results in acculturation to, assimilations and sometimes diffusion of food habits, dress patters, living style and above all- the way of life, make globalisation as an all inclusive process. There is a growing significance of political, cultural, ideological and civilizational aspects of globalisation (Ibid: 44) during the current phase. So, in that sense globalisation is a composite term which includes not only economic but also social, cultural, political and even ecological dimensions. It is worthwhile to mention that, globalisation brings different meaning to different people. Different ideologies, way of thinking and perceptions interpret the process of globalisation differently. In a positive sense, globalisation is a process associated with increasing economic openness, growing economic interdependence and deepening economic integration in the global economy and in a negative sense it is seen as domination of developed nations over the developing nations. (Mishra, 2004:5)

1.3 Interpreting Globalisation:

As there are different interpretations and views on globalisation, literatures on it are bound to carry both positive and negative comments. Those sceptical to the process of globalisation, see it as a 'calculated imperialist design of hegemonisation in economic, political, ecological and cultural terrains, threatening loss of economic, self-reliance and political sovereignty, erosion of democratic structure and damaging of plural cultural identities.'(Mishra, 2004:8) It is argued that globalisation process leaves the poor countries with little capabilities to compete with developed and rich countries and the motto of the multi-nationals is to grab power and profit rather than
the welfare of the masses. Globalisation is as the critics view, like hegemonisation and extends American version of European colonial/imperial ambitions of domination, expropriating and transforming the world in its own image and ideologically also it is a derivative of the earlier conceptualisations of 'progress' and 'modernisation' premised on the west-centric view of civilisation, materialism and economies, glorification of the 'invisible hand' of the market, growth observed industrialism, objectification of nature and an instrumental treatment of humanity. (Mishra, 2004:9) Contrary to what has been said and promised as the free-market mantra, liberalisation policies have wrongly and unjustly bestowed all economic power on big corporate houses, like the Transnational Corporations (TNCs) which benefit from global trade. Poor farmers from impoverished countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America fail to compete in the global economy and live in most disadvantaged conditions. Adding to it, Ritzer and Ryan point out that, in the globalisation era there is a fear that indigenous culture is being undermined and overwhelmed by either a global culture or one associated with another nation especially America (2004:298), something that is called as Americanisation. According to Kelvin Robins, the development of the world market has far reaching consequences for cultures, identities and life styles where there is focus upon a single commodity world and where local cultures and identities are uprooted and replaced with symbols from the publicity and image departments of multinational corporations (Quoted in Malik, 2004:41). Samir Amin (1997) in similar vein argues that, the global capitalist system has proved to be exploitative and destructive for the Third World countries. This creates underdevelopment, marginalization, disintegration, exclusion, polarization, inequality, etc. of income and wealth. Therefore, rejecting the apparent inevitability of globalization in its present form he advocates that underdeveloped countries in the Third World need a new strategy of development and asserts the need for each society to negotiate the terms of its inter-dependence with the rest of the global economy.

The 'magic of the market' or the so called *leisnez-Faire* economic policy that the globalisation stalwarts advocate is not a new ideology/concept. The father of modern economics Adam Smith in his seminal work *The Wealth of Nations* had talked of the free-market issues centuries ago. But Smith’s concept of the market was a far cry
from the one now advocated by the globalisation supporters. To Smith, markets work efficiently when there is equality between the buyers and sellers and when neither of them is large enough to influence the market price (See Ellowood, 2005:17). So, the present day market economy is in many respects different from what Smith advocated for.

On the other hand there are scholars, who argue in favour of the globalisation process as well saying that, it opens up the geographical borders to transnational trade leading to global competition. As they say, developments linked with globalisation have opened up boundless possibilities for human development, enormous new opportunities and enhanced the quality of life for many people in the third world countries. (Sinha, 2004:192) Globalisation, as Stiglitz has pointed out in the form of export-led growth has helped pull the East Asian countries out of massive poverty. Due to globalisation and through providing access to international markets and access to technology which enabled vast increases in productivity, the countries in the region managed its poverty situation well. Citing the World Bank data, he says, ‘Poverty fell dramatically in Indonesia, for example, the poverty rate (at the $1-a-day standard) fell from 28 percent to 8 percent between 1987 and 2002, while health and life expectancy improved and literacy became close to universal. In 1960, Malaysia’s per capita income was $784 (in 2000 U.S. dollars), slightly lower than that of Haiti at the time. Today, it is over $4,000.’ (Stiglitz, 2006:31) The similar source also reveals that ‘the average level of education in South Korea in 1960 was less than four years; today, South Korea leads in high-tech industries such as chip production, and its income has increased six-ten fold in the past forty years. Similarly, China began its journey later, but its achievements have in some way been even more remarkable. Incomes have increased more than eightfold since 1978; poverty at the $1-a-day standard has fallen by three-quarters (Stiglitz, 2006:31).

Jagdish Bhagwati while advocating for free trade and globalisation observes that ‘freer trade is associated with higher growth and that higher growth is associated with reduced poverty, therefore, growth reduces poverty’. (2004:64) Citing the case of India and China, he argues that, ‘according to World Bank estimates, real income (gross domestic product) grew at an annual average rate of 10 percent in China and 6
percent in India during the two decades ending in 2000 and the Asian Development Bank data show, poverty declined from an estimated 28 percent in 1978 to 9 percent in 1998 in China and poverty fell from 51 percent in 1977–78 to 26 percent in 1999–2000 in India according to an official Indian estimates. He says this is in contrast to what happened in India during the quarter of a century prior to the economic reforms and the abysmally low annual growth rate of 3.5 percent. During that period, the poverty rate remained stagnant, fluctuating around 55 percent' (Bhagwati, 2004:65).

1.4 UNDERSTANDING GLOBALISATION AND ITS HISTORY:

As mentioned above, globalisation as a term may have been invented in the seventies of the last century but globalisation as a process as the 'isation' itself implies, is much older than the term/concept. As a matter of fact, several authors especially economists don't see globalisation as having so long historical precedent. Most particularly the focus of the liberal economists has been on recent developments in the world economy, with some viewing globalisation as a phenomenon without a past (See Rothschild, 1999). But theorists like Wallerstein (1974) view that globalisation is dated back to several centuries, some even say few millennia (see Frank & Gills, 1993) emphasizing on the widespread migration in early times of people, religion, and of course trade. Authors like Anthony Hopkins (2002) describe the globalisation process in phased manner in the dawn of history. According to him there are different variants of globalisation according to different times in the history of human civilisation. As he says in these lines there can be the Archaic-globalisation (prior to 1600 AD), Proto-globalisation (1600-1800 AD), Modern-globalisation (1800-1950 AD) and Post-colonial globalisation (1950s onwards). As evident from many historical literatures, people have travelled, exchanged and imported cultural and material goods for centuries. Although distance was making considerable hindrance for a speedy movement of people and goods, still it would be wrong to argue that there was absolutely no contact and exchange among them. So, Stager has rightly pointed out that to answer the question whether globalisation constitutes a new phenomenon depends upon how far we are willing to extend the chain of causation that resulted in those recent technologies and social arrangements that most people have come to associate with this fashionable buzzword(2009:18). He goes on saying
that while some scholars consciously limit the historical scope of globalisation to the post-1989 era or the last four decades of post-industrialism in order to capture its contemporary features, others are willing to extend this time frame to include the ground-breaking developments of the nineteenth century and yet some others argue that globalisation really represents the continuation and extension of complex process that began with the emergence of modernity and the capitalist world system some five centuries ago (Stager, 2009:18).

As to McNeill, (1986) cross-border processes such as inter-regional trade, migration/movement of people from one place to another, diffusion of technological know-how, religious conversion, and military conquest are not new phenomenon. But what is new and distinctive to contemporary global change is nevertheless connected with a new variety of integration and interdependence between the various parts of the globe and as Robert Holton (2000:141) puts it, the integration and interdependence these days have an intensified spatial and temporal dimension to them, something that lacked in the earlier period. This may have forced Harvey to invent the phrase 'compression of time and space' (See Harvey, 1989).

So the essence is that, rapid advancement of science and technology and in particular information technology has not only made geography and distance out dated concepts but also created a 'global virtual reality'. This is something where time presents no fundamental barrier to social exchange and interactions. Distances have been shrinking while information and ideas are spreading at faster rate. 'The Internet and the World Wide Web (WWW), the computers, fiber-optics and satellite technology have helped this process, enabling business to communicate more smoothly and efficiently and sparking what some have called the 'third wave' of economic growth' (Ellwood, 2005:9-18). So, it is relevant to mention Ellwood when he says that 'globalisation is a new word which describes an old process: the integration of the global economy and began in earnest with the launch of the European colonial era five centuries ago. But the process has accelerated over the past quarter century with the explosion of computer technology, the dismantling of trade barriers and the expanding political and economic power of multinational corporations' (2005:12). So, a globalised world is one of increasing instantaneity, where communication media
enable people in disparate locations to experience events simultaneously which creates a complex range of social interconnections governed by the speed of communications, thereby creating a partial collapse of boundaries within national, cultural, and political space (Ray, 2007:1). Praising the fast spread of communication technology, Giddens has opined that it took 40 years for radio in the United States to gain an audience of 50 million. The same number was using personal computers only 15 years after it was introduced and it needed a mere 4 years, after it was made available, for 50 million Americans to be regularly using the internet (2002:12). There are several authors who periodise globalisation with different phases and ups and downs. However, for a brief analysis, here an attempt has been made to begin the enquiry of phases of globalisation since the mid-nineteenth century.

The period in between 1850 to 1929 is one of the most important phases since all national currencies were attached to the gold. The major happenings during these periods included among others, the completion of the process of colonisation, growing superiority of Britain as an economic and military power, the scientific and technological inventions leading to easy access to faraway places with phenomenal inventions like rail, road, telegraph, etc. along with the flourishing of industries first in Britain and later spreading to other parts of Europe, and growing trade in different parts of the world. Marx and Engels have illustrated that, 'the rise of European bourgeoisie and the related intensification of global interconnections would not have been possible without the nineteenth century explosion of science and technology' (In Stager, 2009:32). Stager remarks that, the 'telegraph and its transatlantic reach after 1866, provided for instant information exchanges between the two hemispheres and later telegraph set the stage for the telephone and wireless radio communication' (2009:33). This phase witnessed the introduction of Fordism (a model of economic expansion and technological development based on the method of mass production which advocates the manufacture of standardised products in huge volumes using special purpose machinery and unskilled labour force), and also the advancement of the theory of Scientific Management, something best known as Taylorism (a scientific method for organising the labour through specialisation, increasing efficiency, decreasing waste) and the fast flourishing of big business enterprises and their monopoly in world market and subsequent advancement of
capitalistic economy all over. Therefore, this phase saw an increasing trend towards an open world society and world economy. Important to note here is that this period also witnessed the inter(world)war years of economic recession that witnessed the ‘Great Depression’ caused by the Wall Street crash in 1929 and the subsequent policy of protectionism exercised by different countries who were trying to bring their economies back into track. This period went against the ‘open-economy’ ideology of globalisation theory.

The next important phase in the history of globalisation can be categorised between 1950s and 1960s. If the earlier period had seen colonisation of the Afro-Asian countries by the Europeans, this period witnessed a process of decolonisation with the colonised countries getting independence and statehood. Soon after the Second World War was put to an end, the heads of different developed countries began to think about the urgency of establishing a proper set of rules to manage the post war world economy. In July 1944, delegates from 44 countries participated in a conference in the New England village of Bretton Woods in the United States to erect a new framework for a stable, cooperative international monetary system which would promote national sovereignty and prevent future financial crisis (Ellwood, 2005:27). The conference advocated free movement of goods across borders and accepted US dollar as the medium of exchange in world trade. The formation of International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank followed the Bretton Woods gathering. This period also marked the boom in the development of communication technologies and other scientific inventions which brought about drastic reduction in travel time therefore, making the movement of people, goods and services faster and easier, something that globalisation theorists call as the compression of time and space (See for example, Harvey, 1990).

Nevertheless, the next phase, say the 1970s was not so smooth from economic point of view and the world trade didn’t see any positive trend. A severe economic recession appeared and resulted in a situation called ‘stagflation’ due to many factors-the control of oil price by the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), the United States worst ever economic situation following heavy financial
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burden to the Federal Reserve during the Vietnam war and the subsequent devaluing of dollar by President Nixon being the principal ones. (see Ellwood, 2005:41-43)

However, the final phase of the contemporary globalisation started in 1980 onwards. The difference with this phase is that it is much more intense than the previous ones with integration of countries across the world in political, economic and socio-cultural sense. A common market was achieved in Europe after the adoption of the Single European Act in 1986 in Luxemburg as a major revision to the 1957 treaty of Rome which brought several European countries together and later known as the European Union to become an easy and effective trade block. The increased growth of trade and foreign investments across borders gave birth to the concept of 'casino capitalism' (see Strange, 1997 [1986]) implying any lack of guarantees for a gain. In the cultural sphere, this period saw the emergence of a new kind of society called by many as 'knowledge-based society' or 'information society'\(^1\) which Daniel Bell referred to as the 'post-industrial society\(^2\)' (see Bell, 1974) that replaced the earlier 'industrial society\(^3\). Besides, in the political sphere, also most of the national governments gradually lost their influence - fully or partially on their economy and market at large due to the influence and spread of powerful and prominent International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) and various TNCs. Especially, the global spread of the TNCs was so fast and widespread that in 1970, there existed only 700 TNCs, which grew an estimation says to at least 53,607 by 1998 (Mishra, 2004:12).

The year 1995 saw the birth of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) which was intended to supervise and liberalize international trade and make the free flow debate livelier. This replaced the earlier General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)

---

1. It is viewed as the successor to the industrial society, referring to a society in which the creation, distribution, use and integration of information is a significant activity. It is characterised by a high level of information intensity in the everyday life of people through the use of telecommunication devices for a wide range of activities where information are exchanged rapidly irrespective of distance.

2. The term was coined by Daniel Bell (1974) in his book 'The Coming of Post-Industrial Society' who described it as a society characterized by the 'centrality of theoretical knowledge as the source of innovation and policy formation.' It is a structure of society based on the provision of information, innovation, finance, and services.

3. Industrial society refers to a society driven by the use of technology to enable mass production that supports a large population with a high capacity for division of labour. It began in the west following the Industrial Revolution and it replaced the agrarian societies.
which was commenced in 1948. The Uruguay Round of agreement that brought the WTO into existence is based on the hypothesis that liberalisation is panacea for all ills in the economy, trade and commerce for the society and it not only reduced trade barriers by an average of 40 per cent but also laid down rules for what kinds of policies governments can make on matters such as intellectual property and investment (Mishra, 2004:10). Furthermore, the rivalry between the capitalist and communist block has came to an end in this phase of globalisation with the collapse of the Soviet Union that ended the so-called ‘Cold War’, bringing an ideological victory for the USA lead capitalistic block and pushing further the free-market notion. And this led to the beginning of the global debate on ideologies especially, Francis Fukuyama’s (1992) ‘End of History’4 and Huntington’s (1996) ‘Clash of Civilisations’. To Huntington, “it is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation-states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilisations. The clash of civilisations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilisations will be the battle lines of the future” (1993). So while there is an end to the age of ideology, what the world has witnessed is a state of affair characterised by cultural conflicts.

To sum up, globalisation has a long history and the present era is an extended and intense form of what happened earlier. The current phase of globalisation is multidimensional in nature having links with political, social, economic and cultural spheres that brings transformation faster than ever before. The acceleration of technological innovation that brought a revolution in transport and communication sphere has redefined the perception of time and space. Here, attempt has been made to

---

4 ‘End of History’ thesis claimed that the liberal democracy will triumph as a global reality, and there would not be any more war or clash of ideas since nations will have the common form of government-liberal democracy. So the ‘history of ideas’ will be put to an end.

5 ‘Clash Civilisation thesis’ argues that the differences between nations in the new world order will not be of political or economic, but rather of cultural in nature. As Huntington propounded, the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War times will be the cultural and religious identities of the people.
discuss the two main discourses that are related to the globalisation debate. First, that
globalisation creates a world that is increasingly becoming homogenous in nature
spreading the dominant culture across the globe. Second, that world cultures are
becoming more and more diverse leading to heterogeneity in its form and content, and
that there is always the interface between the global and local leading to
plurality/hybridity. It is in between these debates that the discussion follows.

1.5 THE INTEGRATION-IMPERIALISM DYNAMICS:

The first discourse as mentioned above talks about the question of
homogeneity/uniformity. There are basically two arguments on how the world is
gradually becoming one and homogeneous. One, that the world is becoming
integrated socially, culturally and economically with the free flow of ideas, values,
images etc from one part of the world to the other and vice versa. Two, that the
integration is not a two way process and is imperialistic in nature i.e. the
predominance of the developed over the underdeveloped, the occident over the orient,
the first world over the third world. This is the argument behind the integration­
imperialism dynamics.

Theorists argue that, due to globalisation and technological revolution; ideas, images,
and information are moving worldwide freely and very rapidly. Many claim it as the
process of cultural interconnectedness and as a sign of global cultural integration. In
recent decades, the volume of the global circulations of the cultural goods has been
increased. According to Sheila L. Croucher, in terms of printed matter, music, visual
arts, cinema and photographic, radio & television equipment shows, the value of
 cultural imports and exports almost tripled from $ 67 billion in 1980 to $ 200 billion
in 1991 and the proportion of world trade in cultural goods rose from 2.5 per cent of
all imports in 1980 to 2.8 percent in 1997(Croucher, 2004: 15). This shows how the
world is getting integrated. Contending the homogenisation and Americanisation
thesis and the argument that globalisation is bringing the world under the clutches and
total control of the developed/western countries, Giddens argues that ‘it is
fundamental to my argument that globalisation today is only partly westernisation and
it is increasingly becoming decentered-not under the control of any group of nations,
and still less of the large corporations. Its effects are felt as much in Western countries as elsewhere’ (2002: 16).

Contrary to it, is the discussion on homogenisation that talks of not just integration but emphasizes on the way the whole world with the spread of American/western culture becoming one and the same. One of the important discussions on homogenisation thesis is carried out by George Ritzer when he describes about the McDonaldisation process. Inventing the term, Ritzer defines ‘McDonaldisation’ “is a process whereby the principles of the fast food restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of American society as well as the rest of the world” (Ritzer, 1993, 2002, cited in Pieterse, J. N. 2004: 49, Robinson, 2007: 140). Arguing about this homogenisation approach he suggests that, “Weber’s process of rationalisation became epitomised in the late twentieth century in the organisation of McDonald’s restaurants along seemingly efficient, predictable and standardised lines – an instrumental rationality (the most efficient means to a given end)- yet results in an ever deeper substantive irrationality, such as alienation, waste, low nutritional value and the risk of health problems, and so forth”. (Robinson, 2007: 140) It is argued that ‘McDonaldisation’ spreads across boundaries and across cultures undermining cultural diversity and as a result uniform standards eclipse human creativity and dehumanize social relations. In a more recent argument Ritzer himself has devised the term ‘globalisation of nothing’ while extending the McDonaldisation thesis, where he opines that culturally meaningful institutions, sites and practices locally controlled and rich in indigenous content, that he calls as- ‘something’ – are being replaced by (corporate driven) uniform social forms devoid of distinctive substance, which he calls as – ‘nothing’ (Ritzer, 2004, also see Robinson, 2007: 140).

Notwithstanding the global information flow and interrelations, how far this global interconnectedness is a two-way process? Critics place the argument that, not all parts of the world are experiencing the effects of globalisation. The process is biased in every form and content. There are places, which are absolutely excluded and isolated from today’s global changes. The so called globalised zones form the Global Triad - that includes “Asia - with particular reference to East Asia, not necessarily forever, but at least for the last quarter of a century, Japan, in particular; Secondly, there is, of
course, Europe, particularly the countries that constitute the European Union; and thirdly, there is the Western hemisphere, particularly North America, and even more particularly, the United States of America."(Robertson, "Comments on the 'Global Triad' and 'Glocalisation', Internet source) Tore Linne points out that 'approximately 80% of the world trade is still between the United States, the EU and Japan', which means that the global transformations take place within the framework of this triad. Another estimation shows, the six largest corporations in the world (Exxon, General Motors, Ford, Mitsu, Daimler Chrysler and Mitsubishi) have combined revenues larger than the combined budgets of 64 nations that include 58 per cent of the world’s population including India, Indonesia, Brazil, Russia, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nigeria and Mexico and only seven nations have budgets larger than Ford, Exxon or General Motors, namely France, the UK, Italy, China, Japan, Germany and USA (Mishra, 2004:12). So, how can globalisation be a global phenomenon when its reach is encapsulated? This question indicates that globalisation has not only unifying, but also diversifying tendencies. Geographically, it also brings about regionalisation and thus divides the world. On an economic level, apart from stimulating economic growth and wealth, it engenders polarisation, marginalisation. The world is gradually becoming more and more polarised with widening gulf between the 'haves' and 'have-nots'. From 1970 to 2000, the share of the poorest 20 percent rose from 70 percent to 85 percent (Mishra, 2004:12). Again the share of the poorest fifth of the world’s population in global income has dropped from 2.3 per cent to 1.4 per cent between 1989 and 1998 whereas the proportion taken by the richest fifth on the other hand has risen (Giddens, 2002:15). The globalisation which has been advocated for promoting integration and inter-connection, is rather bringing fragmentation/disintegration and dividing people, communities across nations. On a cultural level, the hot debate is whether globalisation will lead to a cultural homogenisation or to a cultural heterogenisation.

In the days of globalisation, there are also evidences of increasing imperialistic venture of western and American culture- something called as 'Cultural Imperialism'. Introduced by Herbert Schiller (1976), the term 'cultural imperialism' is referred to the way in which large multinational corporations, including the media, of developed countries dominated developing countries. Supporting the cultural imperialism theses
in a very provocative article, David Rothkopf, said that 'It is in the general interest of the United States to encourage the development of a world in which the fault lines separating nations are bridged by shared interests. And it is in the economic and political interests of the United States to ensure that if the world is moving towards a common language, it be English; that if the world is moving toward common telecommunications, safety, and quality standards, they be American; that if the world is becoming linked by television, radio, and music, the programming be American; and that if common values are being developed, they be values with which Americans are comfortable' (1997: 43). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1999) regard globalisation as conceptual imperialism that projects American concerns and viewpoints worldwide, thereby facilitating the very process of globalisation (also see Ray, 2007:26).

In the United States the largest single export sector constitutes its films and television industry. The growing gap between the rich and the poor countries, massive class difference within countries and equality being conspicuous in its absence is understandable. In the economic sphere, a U.N. report issued in 1999 shows that the combined wealth of the world's three richest families was greater than the annual income of 600 million people in the least developed countries. Three-four decades ago, the gap between the richest fifth of the world's people and the poorest was 30 to 1, by 1990, it had widened to 60 to 1, and today it stands at 74 to 1(Croucher, S L, 2004: 23). As said by David Held (ed.), an estimation of the U.N. shows that during the second half of the 1990s, the world's 200 richest people have doubled their wealth to more than $ 1 trillion ($ 1,000 bn.), and the number of people living on less than a dollar a day has remained unchanged at 1.3 billion(2000: 112). As various statistical informations reveal, the West is a privileged part of the globe. In 1997, the combined wealth of the 350 billionaires of the world was greater than the annual income of the 45% of humanity (Valaskakis, K, 1999: 157). Statistics suggest that 'the ratio between the incomes of the richest and the poorest country was 3:1 in 1820; it became 35:1 by 1950 and shot up to 72:1 in 1992. In the year 2000, the richest one percent of world’s population received as much income as the poorest 57%’ (Oommen, T. K. 2007: 438). ‘Again, in 2000, of the world’s 6 billion people, 2.8 billion live on less than $2 a day and 1.2 billion on less than $1 a day and six infants of every 100 don’t see their first birth day and 8 don’t survive to their fifth. While of those who do reach
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school age, 9 boys in 100 and 14 girls don’t go to primary school.’ (Mishra, 2004:13) Again Stiglitz points out that, ‘some 40 percent of the world’s 6.5 billion people live in poverty (a number that is up 36 percent from 1981), a sixth-877 million—live in extreme poverty (3 percent more than in 1981) and here the worst failure is Africa, where the percentage of the population living in extreme poverty has increased from 41.6 percent in 1981 to 46.9 percent in 2001. So given its increasing population, this means that the number of people living in extreme poverty has almost doubled, from 164 million to 316 million’ (2006:11). The statistics show globalisation’s biased ramifications to an extent as discussed above.

In the cultural sphere, the global diffusion of Levi’s, McDonalds, MTV and Coca-Cola-Pepsi-Cola has shown increasing assimilation of local cultures into the American culture or what could have been said as Americanisation, or McDonaldisation and Benjamin Barbers’s (1996) terminology of ‘Mc World’. Americanisation is a process that refers to the growing influence of the United States of America on the culture of other countries, as a result substituting a given culture with the American one. McDonaldisation refers to the global spread of the fast food restaurant as discussed in earlier section. Mc World is a consumer oriented global culture having international commercialisation motives. Now these global spread of multinationals like Coca and Pepsi have also created something called as ‘consumer culture’ which is spearheaded/facilitated by an otherwise hi-tech media through advertisements, leading to the emergence of global consumerism, ‘a cultural ideology whereby the sense of self, personal fulfillment and happiness are seen as being intimately interlinked with the products and services that we use and consume’ (Mooney and Evans (Eds), 2007:39). Critics view that the spread of global consumerism is leading to the proliferation of a homogenous global (American?) culture.

From this perspective, it is claimed that cultural globalisation is spreading cultural imperialism. Jagdish Bhagwati points out that, ‘if the 19th century was British, a time of Pax-Britanica, and the 20th century was American, when Pax-Americana prevailed, the 21st century which many feared would be Japan’s, a Pax-Japanica promises to be American again’ (2004: 108). The cultural imperialism thesis is
supported by another report that shows, “world-wide exports of programming hours, of which over 40% come from the U.S.A. Of those, imported by Europe, 44% are from the U.S.A. Of imports to Latin America, 77% are from the U.S.A. In the case of Canada, 70% of imports are from the U.S.A. and for Africa, South of the Sahara, 47%. Conversely the U.S.A. imports only 1% of its commercial programming and 2% of its public service programming” (David Held ed. 2000: 63).

1.6 THE GLOBALISATION- GLOCALISATION DEBATE:

The second discourse that is intended here to discuss is related to the worldwide diversification of culture rather than unification, that there is increasing heterogeneity in world cultures rather than homogeneity. One of the arguments that carry forward this discourse is the ‘glocalisation’ thesis. Under this scheme of thought, it is believed that global culture doesn’t replace the local, rather goes with the latter hand in hand. Instead of assimilation of the local with the global cultures, there is accommodation of the two, that produce a hybrid culture. The scholarships on globalisation and development literature define it as ‘hybridisation’. Coined by Roland Robertson, ‘glocalisation’ refers to the process where, global culture confirms to the local conditions without replacing the local. He predicts a pluralisation of the world as localities produce a variety of unique cultural responses to global forces (See Steger 2004: 36). According to him, ‘glocalisation’ theses emphasizes that it is a process of the global creation of the local and, moreover, the localisation of the global (See Foley M, et.al, 2006: 4). Robertson argues that global cultural flows often reinvigorate local cultural niches and cultural globalisation always takes place in local contexts and he predicts a pluralisation of the world as localities produce a variety of unique cultural responses to global forces (Stager, 2004:36). According to him, the result is not increasing cultural similarity or homogeneity, rather ‘Glocalisation’- a complex interaction of the global and local characterised by local borrowing (Ibid. 2004:36).

So the process of glocalisation has important implications for the consideration of the

---

6 The concept of ‘hybridisation/ hybridity’ is associated with Jan Nederveen Pieterse (1995) and is related to the globalisation analysis. This term is coined to collapse the global-local differentiation. It is a mixture of both global and local cultures and the argument is set to contend those who claim that similar global process like availability of similar products everywhere is making a process called ‘homogenisation’ of the world.
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'local'. As Robertson puts his understanding, local cultures don't simply mark themselves off from each other; rather glocalisation also includes the construction or the invention of local traditions or forms of particularity. (Robertson, 1995:29; Giulianotti and Robertson, 2006:172) In a sense this process is similar to such conceptions as the 'invention of culture', the 'invention of tradition' or the creation of the so-called 'imagined communities'. (Wagner, 1975, Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983, Anderson, 1983, Robertson, 1995:35, Giulianotti and Robertson, 2006:172) In cross-cultural terms, glocalisation doesn't simply produce or reproduce random forms of cultural heterogeneity; it also registers the 'standardisation of locality' so that various localities may possess very similar structure, reference points, symbolic textures or contents. (Robertson, 1995, Giulianotti and Robertson, 2006:172). As he says, local is globally institutionalised (Robertson, 2003).

The same happens with 'McDonaldisation'. The argument that favors the cultural pluralisation debate is that McDonald's in non-Western countries usher in difference and variety, producing new, mixed social forms. "McDonald's may have penetrated the far corners of the globe, but when the Indian residents enter the local McDonald's in New Delhi or Mumbai, they choose between 100 per cent beefless Moharaja Mac or vegetable Mc Nuggets with Mc Masala sauces (Croucher, 2004: 27). Similarly, as said by Appadurai "for the people of Irian Jaya, Indonesianisation' may be more worrisome than 'Americanisation', as 'Japanisation' may be for Koreans, 'Indianisation' for Sri Lankans, and 'Vietnamisation' for the Cambodians (Sited in Croucher, 2004: 28). T.K. Oommen argues in similar manner when he rejects the possibility of a global culture and says that, there are four interrelated processes involved in the creation of the same- homogenisation, pluralisation, traditionalisation and hybridisation. All these process exist side by side. As he says, there is enormous amount of naivety in talking about world culture as monoculture (Kumar and Welz, 2003:103-4). Further, to Oommen, "one must avoid the unsustainable assumption that the world is one. ....A world society discerned in terms of one culture, one civilisation, one communication system and the like is not only not possible but not even desirable. It is not possible because world society is an aggregation of state-societies, the effective units of operation. .....Pluralisation encapsulates the very conception of world society" (2007:157-8).
Following the discussions presented above, it can be summarised that, apart from creating social inequality and different global risks like that of ecological and health ones, globalisation promotes many other unwanted consequences. Rise of depression, farmer suicides, upsurge of religious and ethnic violence as well as civil wars, increase in urban violence and in clandestine, illegal survival strategies, growth in trade in prohibited products and Mafia-type organisations etc represent a major danger for the global economy (Bhalla and Lapeyne, 1999: 177). At the same time, there are both winners and losers from this complex process. Thus, the forces of globalisation can also be a means in pursuit of greater equality, democracy and prosperity. The poor countries also gain out of it. For example, the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) has estimated that for music, printed matter, visual arts, photography, radio, television and other media, the share of just the developing countries had risen from 12 to 30 per cent in 20 years ending 1998 (Bhagwati, 2004: 111).

It is in this backdrop that the case of Indian handicrafts and craftspersons is analyzed in subsequent sections/chapters. The point of reference is, it is not always true that distinct societies are day by day becoming more and more alike. The local cultural values are not assimilated into the global or more particularly the Western/American cultures - the argument that is forwarded by the Cultural Imperialism theses. Instead there is fragmentation and greater diversity in the cultural sphere bringing plurality/hybridity/heterogeneity. Globalisation doesn’t bring total homogeneity. ‘Glocalisation’ is one of those scholarships that supported the latter discourse. This work discusses how in the age of globalisation Indian hand-made goods have become highly responsive to the choices of the global consumers and even home consumers who are highly influenced by the global cultural forms and consumerist behavior. The global-local combination brings multiplicity to the local craft forms.

1.7 GLOBALISATION AS A DISCOURSE:

There can be three theoretical debates on which the discourse of globalisation stands. The discourse of globalisation provides the definition of the term and conceptually
analyses its driving forces, its socio-economic consequences & the consequences for the nation/states, governance and the historical trajectories. This can be briefly discussed below.

I: The Hyper globalist Thesis:

For the hyper globalizers, globalisation is a new epoch in human history and defined as an irreversible, inevitable and necessarily a privileged process. "Globalisation defines a new age in which peoples everywhere are increasingly subject to the disciplines of the global marketplace" (Held et al. 1999). Here globalisation is seen as the beginning of a single global market, driven by its logic of competitiveness and profit motives. For the advocates of globalisation, its sole force is the market economy. The 'Hyper globalists' argue that due to globalisation, there has been significant shift in the geography of social relations and that social processes now operate predominantly at a global scale and increasing interconnections are making national boundaries less important (Held ed., 2000:22). As Larry Ray puts it, for 'Hyper globalists' globalisation is leading towards an end state in which the whole earth will be criss-crossed by global processes to the extent that individual places will lose significance and there will be a single global society (2007:24). As for its socio-economic consequences, they foresee a fully integrated global market. In reference to its implications for the state, hyper globalizers share an understanding that economic globalisation is creating new forms of social organisations that are displacing traditional nation states as the primary economic and political units of society. Market forces are more powerful than national governments and the latter always come under the pressure of regional and international organisations, like WTO and E.U. Finally, as for the historical course of globalisation, hyper globalizers consider it as a linear and end-state process, the final aim of which is a fully integrated global market.

II. The Sceptics' Thesis:

The thinkers coming under this school of thought argue that globalisation as a concept is not new. The only difference between the globalisation of the past and of the
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present is an increasing intensity of interaction between nations in case of the later (See Giddens, 2001:58). However, with rising regional groups on trade as in Europe, Asia-Pacific and North America that leads to regionalisation they question the true character of the present global economy, since it is not sufficiently integrated. Unlike the hyper globalizers, sceptics do not see globalisation as a historically unprecedented process, but one with long historical happenings. Branding globalisation as 'a myth' the skeptics argue that it is not totally a global phenomenon since the world economy evolves in the direction of principally three major financial and trading blocs namely, Europe, Asia-Pacific and North America. While comparing the present economic integration of the world and flows of trade and investments with that of the 19th Century, Hirst (1997) argues that today's integration is much less significant than that in the 19th Century and therefore, the extent of contemporary globalisation is wholly exaggerated. (as quoted in Held et al. 1999:5) Again Hirst and Thompson (1996) argue that between 1890 and 1914 trade and investment flows were higher than at present, borders between countries were more open than they are now and the transnational migration were at higher levels (Also in Ray, 2007:25). Therefore, the globalisation of today isn’t unprecedented as claimed by the hyper-globalists. The Sceptics also reject views regarding the decreasing role of the nation-states as the national governments continue to regulate the economic activities (Held ed., 2000:23). In a social sphere, the skeptics argue, the current market economy will create more difference among people and countries leading to increase of social inequality and hierarchy in the society.

III. The Transformationalists Thesis:

Taking a middle path the Transformationalists argue that globalisation has been a central force behind the change in the society not only economically but also in the realm of politics and culture. But at the same time complete transformation has not come so far and the society still holds many of its old patterns. Globalisation to them is not a one-way process but a two-way flow of images and information. International migration and advancement in science and technology especially telecommunications technology help in the diffusion of cultural traits. Instead of losing sovereignty, as the Hyperglobalizers claim, the Transformationalists underline that, countries are
restructuring in response to new forms of economic and social organisations that are non-territorial in basis like international organisations and corporations. So, globalisation is a much more complex process (See Giddens, 2001:60). The principal argument of the transformationalists' is that contemporary globalisation is reconstructing and reshaping the power, role, and the authority of national governments across the world. In sum, for the transformationalists, globalisation is a contradictory process with confusions and discontinuities. At the same time it includes disintegration and integration and also universalisation and particularisation.

1.8 UNDERSTANDING GLOBALISATION THROUGH THE CLASSICAL SOCIOLOGISTS:

As has been discussed in previous sections, globalisation as a term has comparatively a late origin but as a process, and as an idea of imagining the globe/world and the concept of global/universal humanity have long historical past and have found adequate level of discussion among the classical sociologists. These analyses have been the bases of later globalisation theories. Sociologist by and large it is understood talk about ‘society’, their primary subject of analysis as the body existing within the borders of the nation-state. But as Ray says, ‘several classical conceptions of society offer multidimensional and fluid conceptions of social relations that acknowledge the internationalisation of world connections (2007:17). One of the earliest social thinkers Saint Simon had a vision of a socially and politically integrated Europe and a system of international governance based on common practices and shared values (Ray, 1999:36-41, 2007:17). Similarly, August Comte’s notion of future was one in which the national identifications would be superseded by a commitment to humanity guided by transnational universal values (Ray, 1999:36-41; 2007:17). Apart from these two thinkers, the most vocal and visible analysis of the globalisation process, in particular the spread of global capitalism has been done by none other than Karl Marx. As he said, the historical mission of global capitalism was to spread beyond the Great Wall of China and bring the economies of whole world into a single system of production. To Marx, “...national differences and antagonism between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the
conditions of life corresponding thereto" (See Marx and Engels, 1967, sited in Ray, 2007:17). Marx was of the idea that if both industry and labour go together on a global scale, it would bring peace. As Robertson points out, 'Marx had mentioned that, capitalism as a determining mode of production would provide the ground for universalisation on a global scale and the proletariat as an exploited but potentially global class within expanding capitalism, would eventually develop and install a genuine global universalism' (Robertson, 1992:17). Marxists argue that the expansion of trans-border economic relation is the result of the capitalist mode of production. Scholte observes that 'on Marxists accounts globalisation happens because transworld connectivity enhances opportunities of profit making and surplus accumulation and for them globalisation is a strategy that enables the capitalists, bourgeoisie, accumulating class to increase its resources and power over the laboring, proletarian, exploited class' (2005:129).

Again, Max Weber, another influential thinker among the classical school of sociologists, had done the analysis of globalisation in his various theoretical works. He was thinking of the rise of world capitalism (in his analysis of the Protestant Ethic), the growth and spread of bureaucratic organisation (in his work on Bureaucracy), rationalisation and the rise of world religions. For Weber, 'sociology is a cultural science concerned with understanding how different world views are expressed in contrasting institutional forms which governs the ways in which human existence is experienced as meaningful. Of central concern was the specific and peculiar form of rationalism that gave rise to an uncontrollable spread of bureaucratic and calculable forms of action and depersonalisation' (Rosenberg, 2000:97, Ray, 2007:17-18). A close look at the Weberian sociology would make one understand that his focus has primarily been on 'social action' rather than 'societies' and the ways in which the action has been structured through multiple configurations of economic, cultural, institutional and value systems (See Weber, 1978, 1984).

To Emile Durkheim, the notion of 'social' or 'society' was not restricted to the national borders or nation-state. According to him, 'every aggregate of individuals who are in continuous contact form a society' (Durkheim, 1984:276). So to him, society was any form of ongoing patterned group that could cohere at the level of
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nations but just as much within local or transnational associations; in contemporary terms they could be e-communities (Ray, 2007:18). Durkheim has argued that social integration in highly differentiated organic form society was possible only through commitment to formal principles of human rights, and his own pioneering involvement in the human rights movement pointed to the possibility of transnational forms of sociality (Durkheim, 1969, also in Ray, 2007:18).

Talcott Parsons although talks of society and his concept of 'societal community' within the parameters of the national borders or nation-state, his idea of a society beyond borders still finds mention in his works. To him, the process of adaptation, goal attainment, integration and latency which is better known as the AGIL model is operating within self-closed societies, although these interact collectively and separately on multiple levels (Ray, 2007:19). Parsons outlines that 'it is not essential to the concept of society that it should not be in anyway empirically interdependent with other societies, but only that it should contain all the structural and functional fundamentals of an independently subsisting system' (Parsons, 1979:23, also in Ray, 2007:19). This reflects that Parsons' notion of society although has a bounded space may be in the form of national borders, still he insists that it is also a part of internationally interdependent societies. Parsons stressed the development of a complex normative order in which common memberships of social orders could be detached from 'national' societal communities and grounded in networks integrated through universalistic individual rights-optimistically looking towards strong, open, cosmopolitan and democratic social orders (see Parsons, 1979, also in Ray, 2007:20).

So, the understanding of the classical thinkers on the issue of global or international or open border societies gives the base for the development of further globalisation theories and proves as relevant today as it was during its inception days. With its rich source of comprehensive intellectual arguments, development of wide variety of concepts and analytical abilities, the classical sociology has been a major source for the later social thinkers to carry forward the debates on globalisation and develop subsequent theories and concepts.
1.9 THE CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGICAL DEBATES ON GLOBALISATION:

The focus in this section is on the key theories and theorists that have already made considerable presence across social sciences disciplines in particular related to globalisation studies. However, it is impossible to present a comprehensive review of existing theories on globalisation. Hence, here is an attempt to pursue with a limited theories and analysis of globalisation which are someway or other related to the present work. Here discussions are on a concrete analysis of the process of globalisation taking into consideration the current sociological debates on it. As said above the analysis is restricted and covers five stalwarts of globalisation theory—Anthony Giddens, Joseph Stiglitz, Immanuel Wallerstein, Roland Robertson Arjun Appadurai, and Jan Aarte Scholte.

I. Anthony Giddens:

For Giddens (1990), the process of globalisation is principally understood through the idea of 'time-space' distanciation depicting which he says that in the globalisation days we can be in the same space but not necessarily in the same locale. This is a process in which locals are shaped by events far away, and vice versa, while social relations are disembodied or 'lifted out' from locals (See Ray, 2007:9). He defines globalisation as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanciated relations that shape them. A local transformation is as much a part of globalisation as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space.” (Giddens, 1990: 64). He further says that 'globalisation is restructuring the ways in which we live, and in a very profound manner. It is lead from the west, bears the strong imprint of American political and economic power, and is highly uneven in its consequences. But globalisation is not just the dominance of the west over the rest; it affects the United States as it does other countries’ (Giddens, 2002:4). Although as he says, the industrialised nations have more influence over matters of international/global importance than the poor countries, still it will be untrue to claim that globalisation process is one sided. Rather
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it is getting decentered and the global power belt is changing/ shifting. To him, a process called 'reverse colonisation' which is becoming more and more common where non-western countries are influencing developments in the west like, Latinisation of Los Angels, the emergence of globally oriented high-tech sector in India or the selling of Brazilian television programmes to Portugal (Ibid: 16).

According to Giddens, globalisation affects our everyday life in as intensive manner as it affects the bigger events happening across the world. Looking at the high volume of trade, global flow of electronic economy in million and trillion dollars value in just the click of a computer mouse, and the sheer vastness of the market, Giddens says that the globalisation as it is experienced today in many respects is not only new, but also revolutionary (Giddens, 2002:9-10). Criticising the theorists like the sceptics, who brand globalisation as purely an economic phenomenon, he argues, globalisation is cultural, political, technological and economic. He describes the global order as the result of an intersection of four processes – capitalism, the interstate system (the world order), militarism (world security and threats) and industrialism (the division of labour and life styles) (See Ray, 2007:9-10). Further, Anthony Giddens calls globalisation as the direct consequence of modernisation. He links globalisation with modernisation as he says all the features of modernisation like capitalist system (which is concerned with commodity production), individualism, rise of nation-states, etc. are involved in the process of globalisation. The radicalised version of modernity is post modernity and globalisation carries the elements of both (See Giddens, 1990).

II. Joseph Stiglitz:

Joseph Stiglitz says, globalisation by increasing the interdependence among the people of the world has enhanced the need for 'global collective action' and the importance for 'global public goods'. (2002:224) Criticising the global financial institutions like the IMF for being failed to integrate the economies of the world properly, Stiglitz remarks, the most fundamental change that is required to make globalisation work in the way that it should is a change in 'governance' of the international economic institutions and maintaining in it the 'transparency', which would be more responsive to the poor, to the environment, to the broader political and
social concerns. (See Stiglitz, 2002) He vociferously criticizes the recommendations of the IMF, the policies like-Fiscal Austerity, imposing high interest rate, trade liberalisation, and privatization, etc. and says that the transition to capitalism and market economy from the communist/socialist style of rule has been so badly managed that with the exception of China, Vietnam and a few East European countries there has been rise in poverty levels as incomes dropped sharply. As he argues, 'globalisation is not working for many of the world's poor. It is not working for much of the environment. It is not working for the stability of the global economy......the problem however is not with globalisation but with how it has been managed' (Stiglitz, 2002:214). He advocates that the international financial institutions must work not just for the wellbeing of the developed nations but also for the betterment of the global south, the poor and developing nations. Stiglitz says that 'about 80 percent of the world's population lives in poor and developing countries, characterised by low incomes, high poverty, high unemployment and low education. For those countries, globalisation presents both unprecedented risks and opportunities. Making globalisation work in ways that enrich the whole world requires making it work for the people in those countries' (2006:26).

II. Immanuel Wallerstein:

It is argued by some that the 'world-system theory' of Wallerstein is a 'predecessor' to globalisation theories that are existing today. According to Arrighi, 'world-systems analysis as a distinctive sociological paradigm emerged at least 15 years before the use of globalisation as a signifier that blazed across the headlines and exploded as a subject of academic research and publication' (Arrighi, 2005: 33, sited in Robinson, 2007:128). But the important feature that makes this theory different from other globalisation theories is not its long historical precedence, rather this paradigm and certainly its principal progenitor, Immanuel Wallerstein tends to view globalisation not as a recent phenomenon but as synonymous with the birth and spread of world capitalism at around c.1500 looking at the capitalist world-economy that emerged in Europe and later spread outward over the next several centuries, absorbing in the process all existing mini-systems and world-empires, establishing market and production networks that ultimately brought all peoples around the world into a single
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worldwide structure (Robinson, 2007:128-129). It is in this perspective that the world-system theory is described as a theory of globalisation. To Wallerstein, the modern world system is analyzed not on the basis of class, state, society or country but the unit of analysis is the larger historical system, in which these categories are located.

In his book ‘The Modern World-System’ (1974), Immanuel Wallerstein has made the most significant argument unlike most other Marxian theorists who talked about the development of capitalist economy and subsequent inequalities on the basis of class. His theory does not concentrate on the relations between social classes or between the state and workers; rather, it focuses on a large economic entity, the ‘world system’ that is not constrained by sociopolitical boundaries something that is characterised by an unjust division of labor which produces unequal exchange relations between different geographical areas of the world. (See Mooney and Evans, eds. 2007:252) His approach to globalisation is called as a ‘distinct economic conception of globalisation’.

According to Wallerstein (1990, 2000), the existing integrated world capitalist economy dates back to the 16th Century. The transition from feudalism to capitalism involves the creation of the world economy. As he says, capitalism, which was restricted to Europe first, went beyond it and covered the whole world. In his theory of the Modern World System, Wallerstein (1974) argues of two types of world systems- ‘World Empire’ referring to the ancient Rome for example which is based on political and military domination, and ‘capitalist world economy’ which relies on economic domination. Of the two he says the later is more stable. He also talks about a possibility of another world system a ‘socialist world government’, which unlike its capitalist counterparts integrates the political and economic sector. In the capitalist world economy, Wallerstein describes the geographical division of labour- the core, the periphery and the semi-periphery. In general as he argues, the core geographical area dominates the world economy and exploits the rest of the system. The semi periphery is a residual category that encompasses a set of regions somewhere between the exploiting and the exploited, i.e. the core and the periphery respectively. ‘As the world system gradually expands across the globe, it exerts pressure on individual
nations to become part of the world economy. Nations remain independent as states, as long as they integrate themselves into the ‘interstate’ system. Otherwise, they risk being taken over by states already incorporated into that political system’ (Mooney and Evans, eds. 2007:253). After individual states become part of the world system, as a matter of policy, they have to employ various strategies/approaches, including the cultural denigration of ‘others,’ to protect their economies from outside influence. The world system again is not maintained through consensual agreement, rather through social forces which are in constant conflict, threatening to collapse the system and Wallerstein argues, the modern capitalist world economy is the current type of world system which operates on the basis of economic exploitation through an unjust global division of labor rather than relying on political domination as did an earlier system (Ibid, 252).

Nederveen Pieterse notes, the classic argument of the world system theory is that, it is not the society that is the developing unit but the ‘world system’, i.e. the unit integrated by an international division of labour of goods necessary for reproduction (2001:44). So to Wallerstein this division is not based on state borders rather on the bases of the economic division of labour. In the modern era, capitalism provides a basis for the growth and development of a world economy. ‘The Premise of the World System theory is that the world order has a patterned unity in which it is possible to weight the relevance of different components of the system and it proposes that levels in the system are integrated and claims to show how the global systems impacts on locals and the reciprocal effects of these on each other’ (Ray, 2007:21-22).

For a ‘just’ human cause, Wallerstein advocates that, more equitable global exchange relations can be achieved through the formation of a ‘third world system’, which he refers to as a socialist world government. A socialist world economy, based on collective ownership and control of the (economic) resources, would both integrate the political and economic spheres that modern capitalism separates and eradicate the economic exploitation between geographical regions/borders, among laborers across the globe and eliminate unequal distribution of resources. (See Wallerstein, 1974, 1990, 2000, Mooney and Evans, eds. 2007: 253)
IV Roland Robertson:

Robertson defines globalisation on the basis of two main features, 'compression of the world' and 'global consciousness'. Commonly known as the cultural theory of globalisation, Roland Robertson’s theory defines globalisation as ‘the compression of the world on the one hand and the intensification of consciousness of the whole world on the other’ (1992: 8). The former is the real experience of the way that interdependencies are being created in the economies of the world to such an extent that, today, the way people spend their lives on one side of the globe has immediate consequences for people on the other side (See Robertson, 1992). Such a global consciousness means that the domain of reflexivity becomes the world as a whole. Hence as he argues, 'the world has moved from being merely 'in itself” to being ‘for itself’” (Robertson, 1992: 55, 1990:23). In Robertson’s account, the gradual emergence of a global consciousness, an awareness of the world as a single place, signals a Durkheimian kind of collective conscience that becomes now a global consciousness (Robinson, 2007:139). Robertson (1992) says that global compression intensifies ‘global consciousness’, which is manifested when people speak (through mass communication) of military, political issues in terms of the ‘world order’ or of economic issues as in international recession, and speak of ‘world-peace’ and 'human rights', while issues of pollution and purification and other important facets of global life are talked about in terms of ‘saving the planet’. To him, “globality- defined in the immediate context of consciousness of the (problem of) the world as a single place-appears increasingly to permeate the affairs of all societies and multitudes of people across the world” (Robertson, 1992). He further states that 'contemporary globalisation has produced a global circumstance in which civilisations, regions, nation-states, nations within or cutting across states and indigenous peoples are increasingly constrained to construct their own histories and identities- or at least reappropriate selectively their own traditions’ (See Robertson, 1992). To him, though globalisation has a long history it has been so intensive in the last decade or so, because it has moved to the level of consciousness.

Objecting to Giddens, Robertson states that 'globalisation is not equated with or seen as a direct consequence of modernity. Rather it should be seen as a very long, uneven
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and complicated process’ (1992:8). He advocates for a theoretical approach, which goes beyond simple models of the so called ‘world polity’ or ‘global polity’ or ‘world economy’ or ‘global economy’ to the independent dynamics of ‘global culture’. So Robertson’s analysis is focused on the cultural aspects of globalisation which is different from that of Giddens.

For Robertson, globalisation is a dialectical process, consisting of two contrary sub-processes – i) particularism, which stresses on the cultural uniqueness and diversity and ii) universalism, which emphasizes on the cultural unity and homogeneity. According to him, the central dynamics of globalisation involves the two fold process of particularisation of the universal and the universalisation of the particular (Robertson, 1992:177). So, both a process of unification and diversification are underway. Hence, globalisation cannot be directed only at cultural unification and homogeneity because although that it enables flows of goods, capitals, people and information to transgress many boundaries, there is a backlash coming from the natural cultures in their attempt to preserve their particularities (See Dimitrova, 2002:77). To put in Robertson’s words, ‘we have to be conscious about the fact that indigenisation is the other side of the coin of the homogenising aspects of globalisation. We should consider globalisation to be simultaneously homogenising - making things the same - and at the same time, making things different.’ (Robertson, “Comments on the ‘Global Triad’ and ‘Glocalisation’ Internet Source: p.3)

So, in Robertson’s analysis, globalisation brings about both cultural homogenisation on the one hand and cultural heterogenisation on the other and these two processes overlap and set up a global culture. And this is where he coins the term ‘glocalisation’ which has been discussed adequately in the previous section of this chapter.

To Robertson, local is considered as an aspect of globalisation and in fact included within the global. As he says, ‘for my own analytical standpoint the concept of globalisation has involved the simultaneity and the interpenetration of what are conventionally called the global and the local, or in more abstract vein the universal and the particular, talking strictly of my own position in the current debate about and the discourse of globalisation, it may even become necessary to substitute the term ‘glocalisation’ for the contested term ‘globalisation’(Robertson, 1995:30). The
condition of globality facilitates the interaction between local and global forces, and it needs to be examined in concrete localities (Helvacioglu, 2000:329). His notion of glocalisation aims to elucidate two inter-related theoretical points: the relatively independent significance of space and geography and making the concern with space as important as the focus upon temporal issues (Robertson, 1995:25-40, Helvacioglu, 2000:329). So, it is a process which depicts how global culture is made to conform to local conditions i.e. a dialectical and contingent interchange between the global and the local cultures. Robertson has described globalisation in five phases. (1990:26-27, 1992) Rejecting Giddens' argument of globalisation as a consequence of modernity, he says that it is a process with its own historical logic. His periodisation of globalisation is described below.

Phase one: The germinal phase, lasting in Europe from the early 15th Century until the mid 18th Century, incipient growth of national communities and downplaying of the medieval 'transnational' system, expanding scope of the Catholic Church. During this phase, there was an accentuation of concepts of the individual and the ideas about humanity, heliocentric theory of the world and the beginning of modern geography and also the spread of Gregorian calendar.

Phase two: The Incipient phase, lasting from the mid-18th Century until the 1870s. It has seen sharp shift towards the idea of the homogenous, unitary state, crystallisation of conceptions of formalised international relations, of standardised citizenry, individuals and more concrete conception of humankind. There was thematisation of nationalism.

Phase three: The Take-off phase, lasting from the 1870s until the mid-1920s. This is a period which saw increasingly manifest globalising tendencies of previous periods and which gave way to a single, inescapable form centered upon the four reference points. This is early thematisations of the problem of modernity. It also featured implementation of World Time and near global adoption of Gregorian calendar.

Phase four: The Struggle-for-Hegemony phase, lasting from the mid 1920s until the late 1960s. It saw disputes and wars about the fragile terms of the dominant globalisation process established by the end of the take-off period, establishment of
the United Nations, conflicting conceptions of Modernity, nature and prospects for humanity sharply focused by Holocaust and atomic bomb followed by the high point of the Cold war.

Phase five: The Uncertainty phase, beginning in the 1960s and displaying crisis tendencies in the early 1990s. In this phase there was heightening of global consciousness in the late 1960s. The number of global institutions and movements greatly increased, sharp acceleration in means of global communication, societies increasingly facing the problem of multiculturality and polyethnicity, arising of interest in world civil society and world citizenship, consolidation of global media system.

V. Arjun Appadurai:

Appadurai's analysis of globalisation is reflected in his theory of the 'global cultural economy' where he states that the central problem of today's global interactions is the tension between cultural homogenisation and cultural heterogenisation (1990: 296). Identifying these tensions he talks about the 'global cultural flows' that 'move in isomorphic paths'. These flows generate distinct images - sets of symbols, meanings, representations and values that he refers to as 'scapes', or globalised mental pictures of the social world, perceived from the flows of cultural objects. (Ibid:141) These 'scapes' illustrate for Appadurai what he refers to as a disjunctive order, or a disjuncture between economy, culture and politics in the globalisation age. (Robinson, 2007:141) Appadurai's approach to global culture is developed in these five-dimensional model of global cultural flows moving in non-isomorphic paths, and the five dimensions/scapes/ imagined worlds are - 'ethnoscapes', 'technoscapes', 'mediascapes', 'finanscapes' and 'ideascapes'. According to him, the current global flows occur 'in and through the growing disjunctions between ethnoscape (people), technoscape (machinery), financescape (money), mediascape (images) and idea scape (ideas). (Appadurai 1990, 301)

By 'ethnoscapes', Appadurai refers to the landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live: tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles and other
moving groups and persons. 'Technoscape' is the global configuration of technology. Financescape is the dimension of global capital - of currency markets, national stock exchanges and commodities. 'Mediascape' refers to the distribution of the electronic capabilities to produce and dissemination of information through newspapers, magazines, TV stations, film production studios, etc. 'Ideoscape' is also a concatenations of images but these are politically directed and frequently have to do with the ideologies of states or the counter-ideologies of movements explicitly oriented to capturing state power or a piece of it (Appadurai: 1990, 296-299). The five 'scapes' described above depict an abstract model and try to show the paths in which the current global flows occur. These different flows through these scapes, Appadurai says, create transnational cultural spaces and practices not linked to any national society or bounded within borders and may be new and syncretic and thereby, bringing disjuncture between culture and the economy and culture and politics.

Appadurai argues that 'the central feature of global culture today is the politics of mutual effort of sameness and difference to cannibalize one another and thereby proclaim their successful hijacking of the twin enlightenment ideas of the triumphantly universal and the resiliently particular' (1996:43). Understanding the center - periphery model of arguments, where the dominant culture tries to impose its traits on the local/indigenous cultures and tries to integrate with it through the process of assimilation, Appadurai considers this center - periphery models valid and says - 'the new global cultural economy has to be seen as a complex, overlapping, and disjunctive order' (Appadurai, 1996: 34). As said above, to Appadurai, under the conditions of global interactions, which makes movements of people, commodities and information easier and faster, these domains are interlinked and they influence each other. The flows are real transactions of people, capital, commodities and information, but they have yet another dimension - imaginary, as far as we conceive them by our imagination and the very idea of flow, as something that crosses real and imaginary borders, has connotations of 'chaotic', 'irregular' and 'divergent' (Dimitrova, 2002:97). Therefore, Appadurai suggests that 'the theory of global cultural interactions will have to move into something like a human version of the theory that some scientists are calling 'chaos theory' (Appadurai, 1996: 46)
As Helvacioglu points out, Appadurai's theory enables us to view globalisation both as a universal condition and as a disjuncture. As a universal condition, the common characteristic features of globalisation have been responsible for the world becoming more homogenous and yet simultaneously globalising forces like finance, trade and information technologies are articulated with regional, national and local politics, and therefore, we come across a multitude of contradictory and paradoxical forms of globality (2000:328). So globalisation exists in both as a singular/universal phenomenon and as a plurality at the same time featuring different historical and geographical specificities of various particular localities or regions. The role of the global cultural process in the context of the imagined worlds/scapes that Appadurai talks about is also contradictory and paradoxical. On the one hand it introduces universal life style, habits and modes of expression via mediascapes, technoscapes and financescapes and on the other hand it also meets with resistance at various levels- national and local in the form of identity politics or ethnic nationalism, etc. (Cvetkovich and Kellner, 1997, Helvacioglu, 2000:328-329).

VI. Jan Aarte Scholte:

Jan. A. Scholte argues (2005: 15-17) that at least five broad definitions of 'globalisation' can be found in the social science literature and can be distinguished. These are discussed below.

1. *Globalisation as Internationalisation*: Here globalisation is viewed as simply another adjective to depict the cross-border relations between nations with fast expansion of international exchange and interdependence. Hirst and Thompson identify globalisation in terms of large and growing flows of trade and capital investment between countries. (1996a:48, Sited in Scholte, 2005:16) As Scholte says, the evidence of such globalisation is purportedly also to be found in enlarged movements between countries of people, diseases, messages and ideas. (Scholte, 2005: 16)

2. *Globalisation as Liberalisation*: Here 'globalisation' refers to “a process of removing state-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an 'open', ‘borderless’ world economy” (Scholte 2005: 16). Those who have
argued with some success for the abolition of regulatory trade barriers and capital controls have sometimes clothed this in the mantle of 'globalisation'. In this context Sander suggests that globalisation has become a prominent catchword for describing the process of international economic integration. (1996:27, Sited in Scholte, 2005:16) Widespread abolition of trade restrictions by the national governments to attract the economy flow from across borders, reduction in the restrictions of visa rules, foreign exchange etc. are found to be the glaring examples of such trend.

3. **Globalisation as Universalisation:** In the third conception of globalisation, it is referred to as a process of universalisation. In this usage, 'global' means 'world-wide', and 'globalisation' is understood as the process of spreading various objects and experiences to people at all corners of the earth for example, the globalisation of automobiles, Chinese Restaurants, decolonisation, cattle farming and much more. (Scholte, 2005:16)

4. **Globalisation as Westernisation or Modernisation** (especially in an American form): In this conception, as Scholte says, globalisation is understood as a dynamic, whereby the social structures of modernity (capitalism, rationalism, industrialism, bureaucratism, individualism, etc.) are spread the world over, normally destroying pre-existent cultures and local self-determination in the process. (2005:16) In this context globalisation is often branded as an imperialism of McDonald's, Hollywood, CNN etc. (Schiller, 1991, Barber, 1996, Ritzer, 1996, Gowan, 1999, Sited in Scholte, 2005:16)

5. **Globalisation as Respatialisation:** Here, globalisation refers to a reconfiguration of social geography where there is increased transplanetary connection between people. Following Held and McGrew in this context, globalisation can be called as a 'process or set of processes which embodies a transformation in the spatial organisation of social relations and transactions'. (Held et al., 1999:16, Sited in Scholte, 2005:17) As Scholte argues some theorists have associated globalisation with the process of deterritorialisation, where territorial borders have become obsolete and outdated. Here, Scholte advocates for the rise of a tendency called supraterioriality in contemporary globalisation.
Of the five broad definitions/approaches given above in relation to globalisation, according to Scholte it is only the last one that gives a clear and specific definition of globalisation. All others don’t give any new insights to the definitional problem of globalisation and are old concepts. Whereas the concept of ‘supraterritoriality’ is relatively new to contemporary history and unlike earlier times, contemporary globalisation has been marked by the spread of supraterritoriality in wider scale. In his words, ‘the term globalisation reveals most about social relations when it is understood as the spread of transplanetary (and in contemporary times also increasingly supraterritorial) connections between people’ (Scholte, 2005:424). According to Ray, ‘what Scholte regards as genuinely novel with globalisation is the emergence of transplanetory relations and supraterritoriality. The rise of supraterritoriality he argues, is recent and appears with the global jet travel, transworld migrants and economic remittances, satellite communications, transplanetary TV, intercontinental production chains and anthropogenic ecological like the global warming’. (Ray, 2007:28) The important point however is the fast pace communications that these processes facilitate presuppose global social relations and to Scholte these global connections have often the qualities of transworld simultaneity, i.e. they extend anywhere across the planet at the same time and transworld instantaneity i.e. they move anywhere on the planet in no time (Scholte, 2005:61) and these bring greater complexity to society, culture, ecology, politics and economy.

1.10 TOWARDS A UNIQUE AND CONTEXTUAL DEFINITION OF GLOBALISATION:

Following the globalisation analysis given by different social theorists, this study takes six important features of globalisation process through which it defines this complex process and through which different arguments are developed pertaining to the issue of handicrafts. To synthesize the arguments presented above, this study defines globalisation as a process of cross-border relations between societies, cultures and economies, through the growth in international exchange and interdependence (internationalisation), removing restrictions on trade by creating a borderless global
economy (liberalisation), spreading different cultures to people at all corners of the
globe (universalisation/homogenisation), accelerating a consumer centric culture
(consumerism), intense competition in the market place as the measure source of
profit making and innovation (competition) and through the amalgamation of both
global and local cultures by creating a hybrid variety of cultural form (hybridisation).

As the definition above clarifies the present study characterizes the process of
globalisation as internationalisation, liberalisation, universalisation, rise of
consumerism, competition and hybridisation. It is through this understanding that the
process of globalisation is analyzed in subsequent chapters with respect to Indian
handicrafts in general and ‘Chandua’ craft of Pilili in particular. To make
understanding clear, the above mentioned features of globalisation are analyzed below
briefly.

Internationalisation refers to the flow or exchange of different goods & services,
money, idea, images and even people among two or more countries/nations. The
present study understands internationalisation as the process of rise of level of
transaction among countries and increasing interdependence between them. It gives
importance to international trade, relations across nations and international treaties
etc. It is a state of relation between/among nations. Notwithstanding increasing
relation between/among nations, the ‘nation’ still remains the sole player/unit.

Liberalisation on the other hand refers to relaxation of restrictions (government) in
areas related to social and economic policies. Often planners view liberalisation as
another name for ‘deregulation’. This is basically a situation where the national
governments gradually withdraw from the policy & implementation issues and make
way for the private sectors giving the latter wider field to function. Most
developed/western countries and later the developing economies of the South in order
to be competitive in global market sphere have advocated economic liberalisation
through privatisation of government companies/institutions in different degrees,
relaxing tax rate for accommodating businesses, bringing flexibility in labour-market,
reduction of restrictions on capital market-both domestic & foreign and
institutionalising open market system, etc. So, liberalisation is understood as opening
up of national economies for foreign capital and investments and advocating expansion of the private sector with gradual withdrawal of the national governments.

Universalisation refers to the spread of various cultures into different corners of the globe so that those are felt everywhere. It is worldwide dissemination of objects, cultures, life styles, food, dress pattern, consumer goods, automobiles and many more mercantile goods, etc. The wide appearance of McDonald restaurants and Pepsi drinks can be called as the process of universalisation or homogenisation.

Consumerism refers to a philosophy or a set of policies aimed at regulating the goods and services in the market, their standard, quality, etc. for the benefit and interest of the buyers. It advocates a belief system which says that, the free choice of consumers should guide the economic structure of a society. Consumerism is a cultural ideology whereby individual’s sense of self, personal satisfaction and pleasure are seen as linked intimately with the products and services in the market that s/he consumes. Globalization accelerates and advocates this cultural ideology.

Competition in sociology literature refers to an impersonal, unconscious and continuous struggle between individuals or among different groups for achieving a goal whose supply is limited. So competition arises when two or more individuals/groups strive for a goal which cannot be shared. In globalisation times, in the capitalistic market place, it is the ‘perform or perish’ mantra that works. In order to make a product demanding and saleable both in local and global markets, producers compete with each other in terms of efficiency, price and quality. In globalisation era, harsh competition brings profit and efficiency. It is the motive of transferring goods from the producer to the consumer that brings competition. In a liberalised market, where borders are meaningless and economies are free/open, it is competition and innovation that determines existence.

Finally, hybridisation is a process of amalgamation of both local and global cultures that makes a new/hybrid form of culture. It’s a blending of two or more cultures and creating a unique one. The global culture while coming into contact with local residents tries to acquaint with local needs and choices and in the process gets a
transformation leading to a hybrid culture possessing both the global and local elements. The same happens with local culture which tries to become global.

1.11 INDIA’S TRYST WITH LIBERALISATION AND GLOBALISATION:

A brief glance at India’s great civilisational history will make one believe that for at least four millennia, India’s economy has in some way or other been planned and controlled by her government. As Stanley Wolpert rightly remarks, ‘the standard-sized burned bricks of Harappa and the elaborate hypocaust and drainage system of Mohenjo-Daro bear mute but eloquent testimony to the success of India’s earliest planning commission and by the fourth century B.C., Mauryan bureaucrats paid as much attention to economic matters, from the taxation of remote villages to the management of Pataliputra’s arsenal and mint, as the Arthashastra attests they did to the education of Indian monarchs in realpolitik’ (1991:223). Unsurprisingly, in the modern times, since the late years of British colonialism the Indian economic planning has been principally the merchandise efforts of the main national political establishment which fought the freedom movement- the National Congress, when it promised of eradicating poverty and fair distribution of wealth among all in the early 1930s. The tallest leader of its soil, the father of nation, Mahatma Gandhi later favored the revival of rural economy and cottage industries and endorsed his economic theory of ‘Sarvodaya’- universal uplift or progress of all the people. The Mahatma and his followers viewed urban industrial development more as a polluting blight than a liberating force of modern society while hand labor and locomotion by foot were encouraged as the healthiest sources of economic strength, and India’s rural masses were taught to take pride in the simplicity of their daily lives and to use their idle time in productive handicraftsmanship (Wolpert, 1991:223-224).

However, Gandhiji’s political disciple, country’s first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and most of his party colleagues favoured to develop industries and make India economically self-sufficient and a progressive nation in world arena. Nehru who had first visited the then Soviet Russia in 1927 and was convinced with its Five year planning, initiated the same in India in 1950 being the first chairman of the Indian Planning Commission. Since then the government of India have been pursuing its
developmental agendas through successive five year plans. However, in the last part of the last century several critical macro-economic situation erupted in the country due to the longstanding controlled economic regime by the government and many more reasons following which in 1991, the government of India came out with its structural adjust policies and economic reforms giving adieu to its earlier suppressive license raj. In fact in June 1991, India came close to defaulting on its international debt commitments, with balance of payments deficit running high, foreign exchange balance going precariously low (enough for only 13 days of normal imports) and fiscal deficit high which prompted major reforms in 1991 through liberalisation (Basu, K. 2006:66). Describing the precarious situation that the country was undergoing during the summer of 1991, Omkar Goswami says,

"The economy was in tatters. Inflation was ruling at over 13%; the combined fiscal deficit of the central and state governments was almost 11% of India's GDP; entrepreneurial growth was totally stultified by a pervasively restrictive environment of industrial licensing, extensive public sector reservations; a dysfunctional anti-monopolies law, severe limitations on the use of foreign exchange, and over 900 products kept reserved for small scale industries; competition was further minimised thanks to a peak tariff of 350%, backed by some of the highest customs duties among industrialising nations and a massive list of quantitative restrictions on imports; decades of poor lending practices and poor recognition and inadequate provisioning of bad debts had led to a seriously weakened banking system; and a severely over-valued fixed exchange rate had contributed to the rapid weakening of balance of payments. It all came to a head when non-resident Indians began to rapidly withdraw their dollar deposits and foreign commercial banks stopped lending to India. Suddenly, the country's foreign exchange reserves were barely enough for two weeks of imports, and there was an acute possibility of a first-time default on international payments." (Goswami, 2006:75)

If the worse economic situation could be stretched to a little backward, then it could be established that financial situation of the country both internal and external had already showed signs of decline even in 1980s. To quote Francine R. Frankel, 'by 1985/86, non-plan revenue expenditure of the central and state governments constituted 24.2% of the GDP at market prices while by contrast, development expenditure stagnated at roughly 10% of Gross Domestic Products (GDP) and rising interest payments by 1985-86 constituted 15.2% of combined revenue receipts of central and state governments and 5.3% of GDP'. (2005:585) So, the unfavorable economic situation in the country forced Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India to endorse to whatever little liberalisation policies his mother, former Prime
Minister, Indira Gandhi had initiated few years before and even to go well beyond that by advocating a comprehensive liberalisation plans. His seriousness in this respect was witnesses in 1985/86 budget when the word 'socialism' which the country had adopted even in the 'preamble' of its constitution and tried to follow this ideology while making economic plans, was not even mentioned once throughout. The strategies his government adopted included, 'increasing the number of industries exempted from licensing; encouraging large business houses regulated by Monopoly and Restrictive Trade Practices (MRTP) and Foreign Exchange Regulation Act (FERA) legislations to participate in a number of high-technology industries; raising the limits on foreign exchange for imports of raw materials and introducing tax concessions for the corporate and urban upper-middle classes, etc. (Frankel, 2005:586).

Although many in the Congress party were still in favour of continuing with the old-fashioned Nehruvian legacy of socialistic principles and were opposing to the open economy formula, the Planning Commission in 1987 came out with a 'New Industrial Policy' promoting several pro-liberalisation steps like encouraging investments, modernisation of industries, etc. However, several political constraints sounded as hindrances before the government and the Planning Commission. And it was only in 1991 with Dr. Manmohan Singh as Finance Minister and Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao as Prime Minister that the true economic liberalisation started when a very unwarrantable economic situation had arrived. This has been discussed in considerable details in the beginning and middle of this section.

So, it was in 1991 that India was forced to take serious and drastic economic reforms and adopt policies of globalisation. In this context, economists and planners discuss about two important economic processes- 'reforms' and 'globalisation'. As Mazumdar and Sarkar say, 'reform' is supposed to emphasize the process of easing control of the domestic economy, while 'globalisation' refers to the attempts at liberalisation on the external account. (2008:1) In practice though both are so inter-related. Nayar says,
"Economic liberalisation within a country creates pressures to integrate the national economy with the world economy... Say, for example, a country commences economic reform and removes restrictions on production by the private sector to accelerate growth. Eventually the state would have to allow imports of capital goods and intermediate goods to increase production – and that means integration into the world economy. And if it allows imports of these goods, then it must also promote exports in order to pay for them – further integration into the world economy." (2006:10, see in Mazumdar and Sarkar, 2008:1)

The fact is that in order to make domestic sectors more competitive and efficient, the government adopts to the import of various consumer goods along with capital and other goods. Although the macro-economic reform in paper was introduced in 1991, the ground work had started much earlier. While some scholars view the process started in 1980s with Indira Gandhi regaining power in the center some opine that the process started few years earlier in 1975-76 by Indira Gandhi herself. As Frankel says, 'the rudiments of the new policy were put in place in the early 1980s against the backdrop of India’s Special Drawing Rights (SDR) $5billion loan agreement with the IMF to cushion balance of payments deficit arising from the 1979/80 oil shock and higher costs for growing imports under various liberalisation measures which included placing some 100 items on open General License; granting ‘automatic licensing’ to 20 major industries; lifting price controls on steel and cement and providing incentives for Indian business firms to enter into technical collaboration with foreign corporations to acquire state of the art manufacturing facilities' (2005:585).

However, it is only after the 1991 economic crisis that the government of India took drastic steps and seriously endorsed the shift in its economic policies and followed the path of integrating the national economy with that of the international/global economy. The strategies involved, 'a sharp devaluation of the rupee; removal of quantitative restrictions on imports, reduction of import tariffs and a unification of the exchange rate as the rupee was made convertible for current-account transactions and on the domestic front the strategies like removing the system of industrial licensing, minimising the number of items in the list reserved for the small-scale producers, etc. were also followed and besides the program also saw fiscal reforms though the maintenance of important subsidies, particularly on the agricultural front,
continued to plague the budget' (Mazumdar and Sarkar, 2008:2; Aslo see Ahluwalia 2002; Joshi and Little 2000).

Then, an important feature of the controlled economic regime, the quantitative restrictions on imports or the QRs, on intermediate and capital goods were removed although on several consumer goods it still remained in force. As to Mazumdar and Sarkar, 'over the next ten years, a series of international negotiations, starting with the 'Uruguay Rounds' of the WTO, saw a gradual whittling down of these barriers although tariffs remained as a deterrent to imports on a variety of goods' (2008:2-3). If compared with other developing countries, India’s tariff rates were higher. Nevertheless, in the following years, the Indian economy has considerably been integrated with the World economy in various levels and Indian market is trying to be as competitive as its foreign counterparts are. What happened to India’s economy over the last few years in post-liberalisation phase has been beyond what anybody had in fact expected. As Kaushik Basu says, 'the economic growth following liberalisation, continued and picked up steam; and from 1994 the GDP growth rate broke the 7% mark for three consecutive years and over the last decade averaged over 6% per annum and India's foreign exchange balance, which hovered at a precariously low level for decades, began to rise from the early 1990s and yet again India's savings rate that had hovered around 12% in the late 1960s had risen to 23% by the end 1970s’ (2006:58). He further argues that, with the economic reforms of 1991 that subsequently removed the industrial licensing raj, introduced lowered tariff rates and assigned greater freedom to the state governments to pursue global investments, for the first time Indian government attempted allowing freer competition and greater play of anonymous market incentives and indeed the years post-1990 have seen faster growth than any previous period and witnessed sustainable changes in the economy (Basu, K. 2006:64-65).

Another analysis shows that 'despite three downward blips, India's trend rate of real GDP growth between 1993-1994 and 2004-2005 is 6.1% per year and during each of these 12 years, India grew faster than the USA, and significantly faster than the Euro zone. Among large, continental-sized economies, only China grew faster than India with the latter being the second fastest growing large economy in the
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world' (Goswami, 2006: 77-78). It is not only the economy that demonstrated a sustainable change after liberalisation, but along with it some important social indicators like literacy and poverty followed suit. As the government of India data show India’s literacy which was 43.57% in 1981 rose to 52.21% in 1991 and then 64.84% in 2001. (India 2010: A Reference Annual, 2010: 11) Also data show, India has emerged as the second biggest foreign investor in the UK (after the USA) in 2008-09, with 108 Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) projects, a 44% increase in the number of projects announced by Indian companies last year. With this increase India has replaced Japan as the largest Asian supplier of FDI projects in the UK (The Financial Express, 19 June 2009, quoted in Sahoo, 2010: 488).

Also, along with it another bigger change that was witnessed during the post-liberalisation decade was the remarkable invention of information technology which brought in what can be called as ‘Information Revolution’. Available statistics reveal that, ‘exports of software and related services grew by 50% annually to reach $6 billion in fiscal 2000 and subsequently at a slower but still impressive rate to reach $9.5 billion in the year ending March, 2003’ (The Economic Times, June 2003, Standard and Poor’s, May, 2000, quoted in Frankel, 2005: 597). Also, the internet became one of the easiest and principal modes of communication between people residing in different parts of the world and Indian society took advantage of the rapid advancement of information and communication technology.

However, the impact of economic liberalisation has been mixed in the country and large sections of the society have not been benefitted the way they should have been. Particularly, people residing in rural hinterlands have hardly taken true benefits of the liberalised market and globalised society. Quoting the ‘Updated Poverty Estimates from Market Information Survey of Households’ of National Council for Applied Economic Research (NCAER), New Delhi (2002) Frankel remarks that, as of 1999/2000, across most income categories, in rural and urban areas, the penetration levels of market in particular the durable consumer goods for purchases were very low often less than 5 per cent (2005: 597). In the rural areas, more than 79% of the households in two lowest income groups had yet to significantly participate in the benefits of economic reforms and breakthrough in large numbers to a better quality of
life (Frankel, 2005:597). Scholars have also argued that globalisation has largely benefited the already privileged sections and has failed to influence the lives of the poor in a positive way (For example see, Corbridge and Harriss, 2000; Hanumanth Rao, 2005; Varshney, 2007, as Quoted in Sahoo, 2010:488). The Indian engagement with globalisation has been found to have caused marginalisation of peasants and artisans, without any substantial relief from the challenge of poverty and under-development. (Kumar, A. 2009:16) However, Sahoo argues that 'though the poor have been the losers in the economic field, they have found an avenue for political expression through self-mobilisation and as he argues, contradictions of globalisation like rising inequality, more visible forms of exploitation, growing unemployment and most importantly, the state's withdrawal from social welfare services – have created the conditions for organising along many common grounds and through participation in traditional electoral politics and various grassroots movements to assert their citizenship and welfare rights' (2010:489).

1.12 GLOBALISATION AND INDIAN HANDICRAFTS INDUSTRY:

As has been stated and elaborated in detail in the previous section, India opened up its economy and adapted to globalisation in the early nineties. Major changes initiated as a part of the liberalisation and globalisation strategy included scrapping of the industrial licensing regime, reduction in the number of areas reserved for the public sector, beginning of the privatisation programme, reduction in tariff rates etc. India's export and import in the year 2007-08 was to the extent of Rs. 65, 5864 and Rs.10, 12312 crores respectively. (Economic Survey, 2008-09:A82-A88). Many Indian companies have started becoming respectable players in the international markets. The liberalisation of the domestic economy and the increasing integration of India with the global economy have helped step up GDP growth rates which has been described with relevant data in the previous section. As mentioned in the Economic Survey of India (2008-09:A7), in the year 1991-92, the GDP growth was just 1.4%, but in 1992-93 it reached at 5.4%. Year 1996-97 witnessed a remarkable growth of 8.0%. In 2003-04, the GDP growth of the country was 8.5% while in 2006-07 it was 9.7%. Although there has been a comparatively low growth rates in between, for
example the year 1997-98, that recorded a 4.3% growth, a global comparison shows that India is the fastest growing economy after China.

Since the advent of globalisation in 1991, Indian economy has witnessed several changes and the society has undergone transformations. Though the forces of globalisation have several positive effects in the long-run, some of its contradictions cannot be ignored. However, one of the growing sector benefited during globalisation, is the handicrafts industry with ‘Indian handicrafts export crossing Rs. 2543.18 crores in 1992-93 from merely 10 crores in the mid-fifties’ (Annual Report (1998-99). Ministry of Textiles, Govt. of India) Again, the export registered a growth of Rs. 4517.52 Crores in 1994-95, and Rs. 9270.50 Crores in 2000-01, Rs. 20963.00 crores in 2006-07 and Rs.10891.85 crores in 2008-09 (Annual Report of Ministry of Textiles of various years). Handicrafts constitute a significant segment of country’s decentralised economy and its importance is being felt when it is assessed that it provides employment to lakhs of artisans belonging to weaker sections of the society. The Annual Report of the Ministry of Textiles presumes that, the total employment in the handicrafts sector at the end of 10th plan is 67.70 lakhs, which at the beginning of the 10th plan was 60.16 lakhs, showing an annual growth rate of about 3% whereas the Sub Group on handicrafts for 11th Plan has expected this employment to reach 80 lakhs by the end of 11th Plan which at present is estimated at 71.81 lakhs (2008-09:129).

The skilled hand of the Indian craftsmen is country’s most important and yet most invisible asset and once lost nothing can replace this age old tradition. As the data shown above clarifies, remarkable progress has been made in exports of handicrafts since India’s independence. The Handicrafts and Handlooms Exports Corporations of India Ltd (HHEC) a government of India undertaking established in 1962 has been instrumental in promoting Indian handloom fabrics in the West. There is a vast scope for the Indian’s handicrafts exports to grow further. In the age of globalisation, where efficiency meets success, Indian handicraft’s further prospects lies in diversification of products and markets. The Indian manufacturers and craft makers need to be ahead of their global competitors in keeping themselves informed about market trend and changes in fashion and design.
1.13 ORISSAN HANDICRAFTS AND CRAFTSPERSONS:

Orissa, one of the backward states of India also takes the advantages of new opportunities of globalisation, and it has attracted Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flows in different sectors of its economy. Its huge deposit of mineral resources has been one of the principal causes of attracting FDI. Globalisation has considerable impact on its handicrafts sector. Orissa, has a distinguished crafts heritage, which is home to 69,356 handicraft artisans, that includes 41,612 males and 27,744 females. The Appliqué work of Chandua in Pipili of Puri district is an internationally recognised craft which has its own age old history. The Appliqués are also used in different festivals of Lord Jagannath of Puri, the presiding deity of Orissa.

According to available statistics during 1998-99, the total procurement and sale of handicrafts and art-textile products through government sources was to the tune of Rs. 289.05 and Rs. 526.97 lakh respectively. During 1998-99, handicrafts and art-textile goods worth Rs. 28.76 lakh were exported to countries like Germany, Australia and France. However the total export of Orissan handicrafts during the year 1998-99 was only Rs. 63.60 lakh. This is at a time when the all India export figures of handicrafts were worth Rs. 58.40 Crore. (Mishra, 2005:5) Again, surprisingly according to available data, the number of Crafts persons engaged only in Applique sector in Orissa stands at 6,444 and the annual production in this sector stands at approximately Rs 280 lakh (Ibid, 2005:5). Now it has become a fashionable element in almost everybody's house and of course with the business going beyond borders, it has attracted foreign tourists and foreign markets (thereby increasing the demand), thanks to the growing intensity of the forces of globalisation (Jena, 2007:14).

Despite its huge deposits of various minerals throughout the length and breadth of the state, Orissa continues to remain as one of the most backward states of the Indian Union. Limited industrialisation and limited openings in the state's agricultural sector hardly make promising opportunities for its young workforce. Therefore, the issue of promotion and revival of traditional village and cottage industries in an extensive manner carries importance. In the era of globalisation and changing the taste and fashion of consumers, the appliqué works have been reoriented to make appliqué umbrellas with metal fabrications, which are used in beaches and gardens, while saris, chholies, ladies purse, mobile covers, etc. with appliqued folk motifs are becoming popular.
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