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2.1. Globalization

2.1.1. Definitions, History, Aspects and Developments

In its literal sense, Globalization can be viewed as the process of metamorphosis of local or regional phenomena into global ones. It is an ongoing process for the integrity of regional economies, societies and cultures through worldwide networks of exchange. Globalization is often used to refer to economic globalization, that is, “integration of national economies into the international economy through trade, foreign direct investment (by corporations and multinationals), short-term capital flows, international flows of workers and humanity generally, and flows of technology.”\(^1\) Or as in a broad overview definition, “globalization is the worldwide process of homogenizing prices, products, wages, rates of interest and profits.”\(^2\) Accordingly globalization has been established as a key idea in the economics and just as a buzzword of academic milieu since 1990s, the term has become one of the most hotly debated issues of the previous and present centuries in other areas of human knowledge such as social, political, cultural and literary studies, as economics couldn’t be dealt with separately. However, in order to make a brief clarification on the core of the term Globalization, and in order to find the connections between this phenomenon and the selected texts in this study, in much of the bulk of this chapter, the researcher elaborates on some major responses to the key questions such as:

1. What is globalization and when did it start?
2. Who are the major players of globalization?
3. What are the cultural, social, and literary aspects of globalization?
4. How and in what ways the selected texts in this study relate to globalization?

As Manfred B. Steger states, “since its earliest appearance in the 1960s, the term globalization has been used in both popular and academic literature to describe a process, a condition, a system, a force, and an age.”\(^3\) Undoubtedly such a diverse functionality then makes this term bear varying levels of significance and different meanings and inevitably its definition includes a number of related features as well. Hereafter we may have a quick look at some definitions of the term which are, of course, from different perspectives as, “globalization is usually recognized as being
driven by a combination of economic, technological, socio-cultural, political and biological factors.”

Sheila L. Croucher argues that “globalization can be described as a process by which the people of the world are unified into a single society and function together. This process is a combination of economic, technological, socio-cultural and political forces.”

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia in 2002 reports that:

Globalization is a widely-used term that can be defined in a number of different ways. When used in an economic context, it refers to the reduction and removal of barriers between national borders in order to facilitate the flow of goods, capital, services and labour. Globalization is not a new phenomenon. It began in the late nineteenth century, but its spread slowed during the period from the start of the First World War until the third quarter of the twentieth century. This slowdown can be attributed to the inward-looking policies pursued by a number of countries in order to protect their respective industries […] however, the pace of globalization picked up rapidly during the fourth quarter of the twentieth century…

Marjorie Mayo reminds us that a number of key features that are typically considered characteristic of globalization in the twenty-first century are found in a much-quoted passage from the Marx and Engels’ *Communist Manifesto*, in 1848:

‘Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way,’ they argued (Marx and Engels 1985:81), going on to point to the constant processes of change inherent in capitalism, the ‘everlasting uncertainty and agitation’ that distinguish the
bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones’ (ibid:83). ‘All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air’ (ibid), a phrase that has been regularly quoted in the context of globalization and the increasing rate of economic, political, social and cultural change.

Saskia Sassen writes that “a good part of globalization consists of an enormous variety of micro-processes that begin to denationalize what had been constructed as national – whether policies, capital, political subjectivities, urban spaces, temporal frames, or any other of a variety of dynamics and domains.”

Through his detailed work, Jan Aart Scholte presented at least five broad definitions of globalization: “One common notion has conceived of globalization in terms of internationalization. From this perspective, ‘global’ is simply another adjective to describe cross-border relations between countries and ‘globalization’ designates a growth of international exchange and interdependence. In this vein Paul Hurst and Grahame Thompson have identified globalization in terms of ‘large and growing flows of trade and capital investment between countries.’ […] A second usage has viewed globalization as liberalization. Here ‘globalization’ refers to a process of removing government-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an ‘open’, ‘borderless world economy. On these lines one analyst suggests that ‘globalization has become a prominent catchword for describing the process of international economic integration’ (Sander, 1996:27). […] A third conception has equated globalization with universalization. Indeed, when Oliver Reiser and B. Davies coined the verb ‘globalize’ in the 1940s, they took it to mean ‘universalize’ and foresaw ‘a planetary synthesis of cultures’ in a ‘global humanism’ (1944: 39,201,205,219,225). In this usage, ‘global’ means ‘worldwide’ and ‘globalization’ is the process of spreading various objects and experiences to people at all corners of the earth. […] A fourth definition has equated globalization with westernization or modernization especially in an ‘Americanized’ form (Spybey, 1996; Taylor, 2000). Following this idea globalization is a dynamic whereby the
social structures of modernity (capitalism, rationalism, industrialism, bureaucratism, etc.) are spread the world over, normally destroying pre-existent cultures and local self-determination in the process. ‘Globalization’ in this sense is sometimes described as an imperialism of McDonald’s, Hollywood and CNN (Schiller, 1991). Martin Khor has on these lines declared that ‘globalization is what we in the Third World have for several centuries called colonization’ (Khor, 1995; see also Ling, 2000). […] A fifth idea identifies globalization as *determinationalization* (or as I [J. A. Scholte] prefer to characterize it, a spread of supra-territoriality). Following this interpretation, globalization entails a reconfiguration of geography, so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distances and territorial borders. On these lines, for example, David Held and Tony McGrew have defined globalization as ‘a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions. (Held et al, 1999:16).”

Noam Chomsky argues that the term globalization is also used, in a doctrinal sense, to describe the neoliberal form of economic globalization:

The strongest proponents of globalization have always been the left and the labor movements[...]The strongest advocates of globalization are the remarkable and unprecedented global justice movements, which get together annually in the World Social Forum, and by now in regional and local social forums. In the rigid Western-run doctrinal system, the strongest advocates of globalization are called “anti-globalization.” The mechanism for this absurdity is to give a technical meaning to the term “globalization”: it is used within the doctrinal system to refer to a very specific form of international economic integration designed in meticulous detail by a network of closely interconnected concentrations of power: multinational corporations, financial institutions, the few powerful states with which they are closely linked, and their international economic institutions (IMF, World Bank, WTO, etc.). Not surprisingly, this form of “globalization”
is designed to serve the interests of the designers. The interests of people are largely irrelevant.\textsuperscript{10}

In \textit{The Lexus and the Olive Tree}, Thomas L. Friedman tries to describe the forces that are globalizing the world at the end of the twentieth century and their effects on environment, economics, politics, geopolitics, and culture:

I define globalization this way: it is the inexorable integration of markets, nation-states, and technologies to a degree never witnessed before – in a way that is enabling individuals, corporations, and nation-states to reach around the world farther, faster, deeper, and cheaper than ever before, and in a way that is enabling the world to reach into individuals, corporations, and nation-states farther, faster, deeper than ever before.\textsuperscript{11}

Friedman also asserts that:

The driving idea behind globalization is free-market capitalism – the more you let market forces rule and the more you open your economy to free trade and competition, the more efficient and flourishing your economy will be. Globalization means the spread of free-market capitalism to virtually every country in the world. Globalization also has its own set of economic rules – rules that revolve around opening, deregulating and privatizing your economy.\textsuperscript{12}

In his next book \textit{The World is Flat}, Thomas L. Friedman refers to “the ten forces that flattened the world.”\textsuperscript{13} He dedicates one whole chapter of his book to these forces and the multiple new forms and tools for collaboration that this flattening has created. He argues that globalized trade, outsourcing, supply-chaining, and political forces have changed the world permanently, for both better and worse. He also argues
that the pace of globalization is quickening and will continue to have a growing impact on business organization and practice.

Through his essay “Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue,” Fredric Jameson presents his explicit account on globalization:

Four positions on our topic seem logically available. The first affirms the option that there is no such thing as globalization (there are still the nation-states and the national situations; nothing is new under the sun). The second also affirms that globalization is nothing new; there has always been globalization and it suffices to leaf through a book like Eric Woolf’s *Europe and the People without History* to see that as far back as the Neolithic, trade routes have been global in their scope, with Polynesian artifacts deposited in Africa and Asian potsherds as far afield as the New World.

Then I suppose one should add two more: one that affirms the relationship between globalization and that world market which is the ultimate horizon of capitalism, only to add that the current world networks are only different in degree and not in kind; while a fourth affirmation (which I have found more interesting than the other three) posits some new or third, multinational stage of capitalism, of which globalization is an intrinsic feature and which we now largely tend, whether we like it or not, to associate with that thing called postmodernity.¹⁴

In his attempt to make an “analytical distinction between causes and effects”,¹⁵ and while observing globalization both as a process and as a condition, Manfred B. Steger provides his readers with the term *globality*, “to signify a *social condition* characterized by the existence of global, economic, political, cultural and environmental interconnections and flows that make many of the currently existing borders and boundaries irrelevant.”¹⁶ Steger further adds that “the term globalization
should be used to refer to a *set of social processes* that are thought to transform our present social condition into one of globality. At its core, then, globalization is about shifting forms of human contact.” However, according to the economists such as Daniel Yergin, globality is the end-state of globalization; it is considered as a hypothetical condition in which the process of globalization is complete or nearly so, barriers have fallen, and a new global reality is emerging. Hence, globality is what comes next after globalization: a new state of worldwide hyper-competition. Yergin’s chief distinction between globality and globalization is conceptual – he says that the former is a “condition” while the latter is a “process.”

In an attempt to discuss the “attraction of globality” and its “seductively irresistible” rhetoric, R. Radhakrishnan suggests:

[...] the triumphalism of globality has to do with the fact that it seems to emanate from reality itself even as it speaks persuasively for that reality. As a *fait accompli*, globality presents itself both as reality and as a representation of that reality, all within a unified temporality. It is as though the very essence of reality is global; therefore, any attempt at interrogating globality would be nothing short of discrediting reality itself.

Commenting on Fredric Jameson’s debate upon four positions of globalization, R. Radhakrishnan disagrees with Jameson who “reads an oppositional relationship between the transcendent dynamic of globality and the territoriality of nation-states: so long as nations and nation-states continue to exist and exert hegemonic influence on geopolitical circumstances, globality and globalization are at best an ideological illusion.” R. Radhakrishnan, instead, finds no contradiction between “the logic of globalization” and “the self-interest of dominant nationalisms and nation-states”:

Just as, analogously, notions of transnationalism and internationalism are posited, not on the basis of any critical negation of and/or divestment from the ideology of nationalism but, rather, on the basis of a supra-nationalism
that holds on to and consolidates the privileges and prerogatives of dominant nationalism; so too, globalization extends the regime of uneven development as it exists between developed and developing nations.\textsuperscript{22}

At another level and as a different development on globalization debate, much effort has been put to show “how [in the latter part of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries] globalization has replaced international relations by examining the interrelated areas of power and inequality, and technology and social change.”\textsuperscript{23} Accordingly globalization demonstrates contrasting qualities to international relations: “it emphasizes a global rather than a national context, […] globalization also suggests a processual approach to world affairs: that we are dealing with realities in motion on the large scale of the globe, […] it is more dynamic than international relations” [and] includes everything and therefore is much less precise than international relations.”\textsuperscript{24}

**********

Any attempt to make a quick review on the history of globalization is underscored by two key points. First is the fact that the historical significance of the concept of globalization is in close affinity with the shifting perceptions of time and space, since mostly globalization is considered as an ongoing process and not a static condition. This in turn has made up the nucleus for one of the four main approaches to the historical perspectives on globalization which will be mentioned here. Hence particular attention has been given to historical analysis of the term. And the second significant point is that there has always been the big issue whether globalization is something new or not. As Manfred B. Steger points out “the answer to the question whether globalization constitutes a new phenomenon depends on 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.”\textsuperscript{25}

According to Roland Robertson (who is at odds with postmodern theorists such as Anthony Giddens and David Harvey) the process of globalization has a long history which undoubtedly predates modernity and evolves mostly since fifteenth
century. He distinguishes five stages in this history: a *germinal period*, which runs from 1400 to 1750, an *incipient phase*, beginning in 1750 and lasting until 1875, a *take-off phase* (1875-1925), a *struggle for hegemony* (1925-69), and finally a stage he labels *uncertainty*, running from 1969 to the present.26

According to Steger, four approaches are available regarding the historical background of globalization. For one group of scholars, the historical scope of globalization is confined to the last four decades of post-industrialism. Such a view could be considered crucial for “the dramatic expansion and acceleration of global exchanges since the early 1970s represents a quantum leap in the history of globalization.”27 The second approach emphasizes on the grand developments of the 19th century and the close connections between Industrial Revolution and contemporary forms of globalization. Elaborating on the significance of the *time-space* compression that occurred in the 16th century, the advocates of the third approach believe that “globalization really represents the continuation and extension of complex processes that began with the emergence of modernity and the capitalist world system some five centuries ago.”28 The fourth and the marginal group of researchers go beyond the time-based limitations of decades or centuries and claim that “any truly comprehensive account of globalization falls woefully short without the incorporation of ancient developments and enduring dynamics into our planetary history.”29 They emphasize that such processes like globalization “have been unfolding for millennia.”30

Among such on-going debates about the historical origins of globalization, Andre Gunder Frank,31 an economist, regards its origins as a phenomenon with a long history going back to the rise of trade links between Sumer and the Indus Valley Civilization in the third millennium B.C. Critics of this idea point out that such a viewpoint rests upon an overly-broad definition of globalization. The early business between the Roman Empire, the Parthian empire, and the Han Dynasty is also known to be considered as primitive form of globalization. The increasing articulation of commercial links between these powers inspired the development of the Silk Road, which started in western China, reached the boundaries of the Parthian empire, and continued onwards towards Rome.
Based on the data presented in his books *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* and *The World is Flat*, Thomas L. Friedman distinguishes three dominant eras of globalization. The first era, which he names as Globalization 1.0, is all about “countries and muscles” and “lasted from 1492 – when Columbus set sail, opening trade between the Old World and the New World – until around 1800.” Accordingly “the second great era, Globalization 2.0, lasted roughly from 1800 to 2000, interrupted by the Great Depression and World Wars I and II.” Here the main dynamism for pushing the global integration forward is considered multinational companies. Globalization 3.0 starts from 2000:

Globalization 3.0 is shrinking the world from a size small to a size tiny and flattening the playing field at the same time. And while the dynamic force in Globalization 1.0 was countries globalizing and the dynamic force in Globalization 2.0 was companies globalizing, the dynamic force in Globalization 3.0 – the force that gives it its unique character – is the newfound power for individuals to collaborate and compete globally.

Some other resources distinguish three phases of globalization which have similarities with the previously-mentioned historical categorizations. They see the first great wave of globalization from 1870 to the beginning of World War I. The next period contains First and Second World Wars, and the Great Depression. Accordingly then the third phase of globalization starts from the mid 1970s to the present day.

**********

Making an answer for the second question posed at the beginning of this section leads us to enumerate many names and titles in connection with various players of globalization. In fact, lots of people and organizations all around the globe are involved in the phenomenon of globalization. These contributions are underlined from one side by an ample wider range of thinkers who deal with globalization from various perspectives and from another side by two main standpoints of pro-globality and anti-globality. As for that broader category of thinkers we can mention names like Noam Chomsky, Walden Bello, Manuel Castells, John Kenneth Galbraith, Francis
Fukuyama, Susan George, Anthony Giddens, Marjorie Lister, Arundhati Roy, Douglas Kellner, David Moore, David Held, Roland Robertson, and Frank Lechner. For pro-globalization individuals we may turn to names such as Mike Moore, Philippe Legrain, Jagdish Bhagwati, Martin Wolf, Johan Norberg, and Douglas A. Irwin; for institutes and organizations The Cato Institute (USA), The Institute of Public Affairs (Australia), The American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research and The International Policy Network (UK) could be mentioned among many others. For anti-globalization inclinations one can list names like George Monbiot, Naomi Klein, Martin Khor, Mary Robinson, Vandana Shiva and Joseph Stiglitz; among different groups we can refer to The World Social Forum, The Centre for Research on Globalization, The International Institute for Sustainable Development, Greenpeace, The World Wide Fund for Nature, Oxfam, Medecins Sans Frontieres, Focus on the Global South.

Making a review on the propensities of the people and the organizations mentioned above gives us a clearer view about the cultural, political, social, and literary aspects of globalization more to the point of its economic aspects. In fact, it is the multidimensional nature of globalization that has turned it to one of the most polemical debates in many academic circles. It is in dealing with various topics such as literature, art, poverty, feminism, human rights, nature, food, technology, etc that each of these individuals or institutes tries to establish a certain doctrine of globalization according to their own credos.

As Paul Jay asserts, “the study of globalization, initiated by economists and social scientists, developed as a response to the emergence of a global economy grounded in modernization and fueled by the expansion of Western capitalism. Initially, attention was devoted to how the growth of capital production had, by the 1960s, become increasingly tied to the rise of transnational corporations and the proliferation of markets that regularly crossed nation-state boundaries.” At this time political scientists like Immanuel Wallerstein paid much attention to the rapid growth of a world economy which depended so much on the power of the nation-state. In fact, it is Wallerstein’s well-known formulation “the modern world system,” that paved the way for more comprehensive theories about globalization. This theory was based on the idea that “nation-state economies facilitated the development of a world
economic system in the West: “In the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century,” [Wallerstein] observes, “there came into existence what we may call a European world-economy. [...] It is a ‘world system.’ The basic linkage between the parts of the system is economic, although this was reinforced to some extent by cultural links” (Modern World System15)."\(^3\) Paul Jay believes that there are two main differences between Wallerstein’s modern world system and later theories of globalization. “The first is that the nation-state still has a central role to play in keeping the world system in place, whereas under Wallerstein’s modern world system “core states,” characterized by voracious economic development, strong governmental structures, and a powerful sense of national identity, controlled the evolution of a world economy for their own benefit, in a thoroughly globalized economy the nation-state’s power to regulate and control the flow of commodities and information among transnational entities is so diminished that some globalization theorists postulate the imminent demise of the nation-state. The other important difference between Wallerstein’s modern world system and globalization theory is that for Wallerstein, globalization is an overwhelmingly economic phenomenon, while for globalization theorists, it is also cultural. Wallerstein gives a nod to how “cultural links” can have a secondary role in reinforcing the world system, but that system is in his view fundamentally economic.”\(^3\)

2.2. Cultural and Social Dimensions of Globalization

2.2.1. Cultural Aspects (a History and Review of Literature)

Though many scholars are still doubtful about the emergence of a complete global culture, it may be fair enough to say that during recent decades, technology has created the opportunity and even the chance of a global culture. Generally cultural boundaries are swept away by fax machines, internet, satellites, and cable TV. Global entertainment companies determine the perceptions and dreams of ordinary citizens, wherever they live. From another standpoint, it is believed that such spread of values, norms, and culture tends to promote Western ideals of capitalism. Consequently certain issues come into the scene: the fate of local cultures in their struggle against global consumer culture, a future world of common culture reinforced by social solidarity and political unity or shattered in chaos, and the status of a language like
English in the global arena. These and some other issues could be seen inside the debate on culture and globalization, which itself is a part of greater system of world culture theory.\(^{39}\)

Jan Nederveen Pieterse maintains that “globalization and culture is a fairly well-established theme. It has first come up in the work of Roland Robertson (1992) with considerable finesse. Robertson came to globalization as a sociologist of religion, so culture is fundamental to his perspective. In globalization studies, culture is prominent in the work of anthropologists, and in the comparative literature, media and cultural studies.”\(^{40}\) Roland Robertson purports that “globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole.”\(^{41}\) Through most parts of his book, Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture, Robertson elaborates on various aspects of the sociologists’ and social theorists’ eye-catching concentration on culture and its relation to globalization from 1990s onward. Vital merits of culture and its importance as a sociological theme, the conditions which caused the conspicuousness of culture, genealogy of the concept of culture in itself and in comparison to other interdisciplinary areas of study, and the significance of culture in various studies concerning global arenas are among dominant discussions presented by Roland Robertson. In another section of the book, he also elaborates more on an implication of the global culture particularly in the form of a cultural response to globality and globalization.

As far as the role of culture in global process is concerned, there are mainly two approaches. One focuses on the globalization’s positive consequences: here globalization is defined as “a process in which goods and people, ideas and behaviors, technology and information are freely exchanged and disseminated between different cultures worldwide.”\(^{42}\) Accordingly, then the economic side of globalization is “de-emphasized” and just “another instance of cultural diffusion or hybridization”\(^{43}\) is conceived. It is believed that “the most sophisticated version of cultural globalization is given by Malcolm Waters’ theorem, which purports that while material exchanges localize and political exchanges internationalize, symbolic exchanges globalize. This allows Waters to assert that globalization embodies a historical crisis of capitalism and the nation-state that ends up in “a general expansion of the cultural arena at the
expense of the economy and the polity.”

Magically detached from economics and politics, culture becomes the universal realm of individual freedom and post-materialist values.” The second approach posits that “cultural globalization, characterized by massive acculturation, worldwide homogenization, and ethnic annihilation, is an inevitable, though deplorable, side effect of the otherwise good economic globalization and its spin-offs – political modernization and global integration.”

Accordingly two opposite positions are found within this approach: “that of neo-liberals and neo-imperial warmongers who believe that economic progress and modern institutions are worth the price of disposing of traditional and local cultures; and that of the liberals and third-positionists who see in local cultures and in ethnic diversity the alternative for globalization with a human face.”

As John Tomlinson conceives, “the impact of globalization in the cultural sphere has, most generally, been viewed in a pessimistic light. Typically, it has been associated with the destruction of cultural identities, victims of the accelerating encroachment of a homogenized, westernized, consumer culture. This view […] tends to interpret globalization as a seamless extension of – indeed, as a euphemism for – western cultural imperialism.” Or as D. Ray Heisey puts it, “on the negative side, as cultures are propagated and advanced, share and mix with one another, and are exposed to one another in our fast-moving world of media and transportation, they are vulnerable in the ways they may influence each other and become modified from their original and authentic form. When dominant cultures overtake and absorb marginal cultures in any part of the world, the danger of losing cultural integrity on the part of each culture is evident.” In general, such a concern on the disparaging quality of globalization in areas other than economics is nothing new or surprising. Even Tomlinson himself approaches this pessimistic claim of danger with a good deal of skepticism.

If we accept that globalization has changed most people’s sense of who they are and where they live, then as John Tomlinson poses the question, how do globally connected people make their new circumstances meaningful? The answer to such a question is addressed by Tomlinson through his work, too. As a reviewer on Tomlinson’s notion argues:
Tomlinson defines globalization simply as “complex connectivity,” the expansion of social ties across the planet. As we travel more easily through space, interact with other across vast distances, receive information from near and far, our sense of who “we” are necessarily changes as well. Globalization “alters the context of meaning construction . . . it affects people’s sense of identity, the experience of place and of self in relation to place.” Tomlinson takes his inspiration from Anthony Giddens and others, who stress the way in which social relations increasingly are “lifted out” of their local context. Yet he also adopts the view of Roland Robertson, who argues that in globalization the world becomes a single place that serves as a frame of reference to everyone. What unites Giddens and Robertson is the idea that globalization is a reflexive process. In a sense, participants must monitor the impact of changes on their lives and must identify their own position in relation to the larger process. No one can feel comfortably “at home” anymore. But globalization has a bright side: as it “dissolves the securities of locality, it offers new understandings of experience in wider-ultimately global-terms.”

Negating the old story which labels cultural and national identities as victims of globalization, John Tomlinson suggests that “globalization, far from destroying it, has been perhaps the most significant force in creating and proliferating cultural identity. This story involves a rather different understanding of the idea of ‘identity’ than the somewhat reified understanding of an individual or collective possession. And it also involves a rather more complex understanding of the globalization process: one, at least, which allows for a degree of unpredictability in its consequences.” Tomlinson believes that “as a considerable dimension of institutionalized social life in modernity,” identity is located “at the heart of our contemporary cultural imagination.” Claiming that “globalization actually proliferates rather than destroys identities,” Tomlinson elaborates more on the claim
“that globalization actually generates identity – and, indeed, [...] in some circumstances, it produces too much identity.”\textsuperscript{54} He also emphasizes on the “compelling inner logic between the globalization process and the institutionalized construction of identities;”\textsuperscript{55} and hence for him “globalization is really the globalization of modernity, and modernity is the harbinger of identity.”\textsuperscript{56} Moreover, he adds:

But the cultural implication, rather less easily swallowed by some, is that globalization involves not the simple enforced distribution of a particular western (say, liberal, secular, possessive-individualist, capitalist-consumerist) lifestyle, but a more complicated dissemination of the entire range of institutional features of cultural modernity.\textsuperscript{57}

As far as the associations between culture and globalization are concerned other relevant approaches also put themselves in the agenda. The all-encompassing definition that “cultural globalization refers to the intensification and expansion of cultural flows across the globe”\textsuperscript{58} shows the verve of this dimension of globalization. Leslie Sklair posits that as a complement to social dimension of globalization, the approach on cultural globalization “focuses on the problems that a homogenizing mass media-based culture poses for national identities.”\textsuperscript{59} He further adds that here the researchers “tend to prioritize the cultural over political and/or the economic.”\textsuperscript{60} He also conceives that “there is a common interest in the question of how individual and/or national identity can survive in the face of an emerging ‘global culture’.”\textsuperscript{61} Sklair also emphasizes:

Globalization is not simply about the ‘disembedding’ of the ‘local’, it is rather about the creation of a new global-local nexus, about exploring the new relations between global and local spaces. These questions have been explored most fully in a sub-set of the global culture approach, known as globo-localism. [...] The main research question in this context is the autonomy of local cultures in the face of an advancing ‘global culture’. Competing claims of local
cultures against the forces of ‘globalization’ have forced themselves onto sociological, cultural and political agendas all over the world.\textsuperscript{62}

Such a verdict on the nature of cultural globalization has been prevalent in much of the impressions conveyed by other researchers. Following the same line of thinking, Thomas L. Friedman conceives that:

In my own travels, two aspects of culture have struck me as particularly relevant in the flat world. One is how outward your culture is: To what degree is it open to foreign influences and ideas? How well does it “glocalize”? The other, more tangible, is how inward your culture is. By that I mean, to what degree is there a sense of national solidarity and a focus on development, to what degree is there trust within the society for strangers to collaborate together, and to what degree are the elites in the country concerned with the masses and ready to invest at home, or are they indifferent to their own poor and more interested in investing abroad?\textsuperscript{63}

In another attempt to show what is new about globalization in 1980s and 1990s, and through his book \textit{Modernity at Large} Arjun Appadurai, the cultural theorist, focuses on the cultural dimension of globalization too. Early in his first chapter he asserts on the role of globalization in the modern world:

We cannot simplify matters by imagining that the global is to space what the modern is to time. For many societies, modernity is an elsewhere, just as global is a temporal wave that must be encountered in their present. Globalization has shrunk the distance between elites, shifted key relations between producers and consumers, broken many links between labor and family life, obscured
the lines between temporary locales and imaginary national attachments.64

He further reflects on the implications of the terms such as culture, cultural and culturalism and accentuates on the concept of difference as the most valuable feature for culture. Appadurai simultaneously explores and explodes boundaries – between how we imagine the world and how that imagination influences our self-understanding, between social institutions and their effects on the people who participate in them, between nations and peoples that seem to be ever more homogeneous and yet ever more filled with differences. Modernity at Large offers a path to move beyond traditional oppositions between culture and power, tradition and modernity, global and local, pointing out the vital role imagination plays in our construction of the world.

It is through such a new framework for the cultural study of globalization that the imagination works as a social force in today’s world, providing new resources for identity and energies for creating alternatives to the nation-state. Appadurai explores how the interconnectedness of twin forces of mass migration and modern mass media (electronic media) affects the imagination and defines notions of neighborhood, nation, and nationhood. He also provides fresh ways of looking at popular consumption patterns, debates about multiculturalism, and ethnic violence. In his view, it has only been in these two decades that the media and migration have begun to dterritorialize, which has led to the emergence of long-distance nationalism, “diasporic public sphere,” ethnic violence, and the growing disjunction of various economic, cultural, and political aspects of daily life.

Most importantly, Appadurai also characterizes a certain “rupture” within social theory: global cultural flows are viewed as composed of “complex, overlapping” and “disjunctive” orders that do not allow of any homogenized perspective. Commenting on the tension between cultural homogenization and cultural heterogenization, he maintains:

The new global cultural economy has to be seen as a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order that cannot any longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery
models (even those that might account for multiple centers and peripheries).65

In fact the above-mentioned theorem is at the heart of Appadurai’s position on cultural globalization. It is through Appadurai’s neologism of five “scapes” that readers come to know more about his new theoretical framework for examining cultural dimensions of globalization in 1980s and 1990s:

I propose that an elementary framework for exploring such disjunctures is to look at the relationship among five dimensions of global cultural flows that can be termed (a) ethnoscapes, (b) mediascapes, (c) technoscapes, (d) financescapes, and (e) ideoscapes.66

For Appadurai these various “scapes” suggest “an alternative spatial rendering of the present: one that is not fixed as a typical landscape might be, but amorphous and flowing in various directions and with various sizes. These “scapes” are the building blocks of the contemporary imagined worlds.”67

In 2001 and at the Globalicities Conference held at Michigan State University, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak made her contribution on globalization debates and started her introduction with highlighting four prevailing modes of globalization:

First, that there is nothing new about it: attempts to take in the available world in a system are as old as history. In other words, globalization is a repetition. Second, that globalization as such can be identified with the efforts at global governance signaled by the Bretton Woods Conference, remotely inaugurating a postcolonial and a postnational world. Third, that the entire globe is now in a common culture fix, and its signature is urbanism. And finally, that globalization is distinguished from world trade and world systems through the ascendancy of finance
capital, helped by the silicon chip and the Fall of the Wall. In other words, that globalization is a rupture.\textsuperscript{58}

The new concept of “planetarity” proposed by Spivak also makes a different twist in social and cultural debates of globalization. She believes that the rural should be considered as the real front of globalization. Spivak specifies last chapter of her book \textit{Death of a Discipline} to this counter concept of “planetarity” in order to clarify her stance against what she perceives as destructive realities of globalization. As Katie Smith reviews “Spivak argues that the popular conception of globalization as the financialization and computerization of the globe leads to a vicious system of exploitation, whereby it is assumed that the globe (as a kind of imaginary terrain that exists only on our computers) can and should be controlled to produce capitalist gains. Planetarity, on the other hand, is a more sensitive and attuned way of understanding the materiality of the world and our collective place and responsibility as humans within it.”\textsuperscript{69}

However some writers such as Mario Vargas Llosa, who believes, “the most effective attacks against globalization are usually not those related to economics; instead, they are social, ethical, and, above all, cultural,”\textsuperscript{70} finds the causes of globalization’s deficiencies somewhere else. He asserts:

Even though I believe this cultural argument against globalization is unacceptable, we should recognize that deep within it lies an unquestionable truth. This century, the world in which we will live will be less picturesque and imbued with less local color than the one we left behind. The festivals, attire, customs, ceremonies, rites, and beliefs that in the past gave humanity its folkloric and ethnological variety are progressively disappearing or confining themselves to minority sectors, while the bulk of society abandons them and adopts others more suited to the reality of our time. All countries of the earth experience this process, some more quickly than others, but it is not due to
globalization. Rather, it is due to modernization, of which the former is effect, not cause.\textsuperscript{71}

Another dignified authority on the subject of cultural aspects of globalization is undoubtedly Homi K. Bhabha, who is also best known for his central contribution to the development of post-colonial theory. Moreover, he has written extensively on literature in English, human rights, and globalization. As one of the most disputed terms in postcolonial studies, “hybridity” commonly refers to “the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization.”\textsuperscript{72} In fact, to put it more accurately the much contested term hybridity is recently seen as a cultural effect of globalization. M. M. Kraidy presents hybridity as the “cultural logic” of globalization as it “entails that traces of other cultures exist in every culture, thus offering foreign media and marketers transcultural wedges for forging affective links between their commodities and local communities.”\textsuperscript{73} Also Nederveen Pieterson,\textsuperscript{74} who labels hybridity as the rhizome of culture, argues that globalization as hybridization opposes views which see the process as homogenizing, modernizing, and westernizing, and that it broadens the empirical history of the concept. Hybridization takes many forms including cultural, political and linguistic. This notion of hybridity is central to Bhabha’s work “in challenging notions of identity, culture, and nation as coherent and unified entities that exhibit a linear historical development. Hybridity expresses a state of “inbetweenness,” as in a person who stands between two cultures.”\textsuperscript{75} Hybridity, Bhabha argues, subverts the narratives of colonial power and dominant cultures. In his article entitled, “Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences”, Bhabha stresses the interdependence of colonizer and colonized. He argues that all cultural systems and statements are constructed in what he calls the ‘Third Space of Enunciation’.\textsuperscript{76} Bhabha urges us into this space in an effort to open up the notion of an international culture “not based on exoticism or multi-culturalism of the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture’s hybridity.”\textsuperscript{77}

\textbf{2.2.2. Social Aspects (a History and Review of Literature)}

The history of the studies on social aspects of globalization goes back to the time when “nineteenth century social theorists and sociologists such as Comte, Saint-
Simon and Marx made what many now call globalization central to their analytical (as well as their political) work.”

Accordingly in its later period, the classical sociology was dealing with phenomena caused by expansion of state-nation and nationalism and the “simultaneity of nationalization and globalization” laid the basis for modern sociology. However, as Leslie Sklar maintains “Globalization is a relatively new idea in the social sciences, though some commentators argue that, while the term is new, what the term denotes is an ancient, or at least not novel, set of phenomena. The central feature of the idea of globalization that is current in the social sciences is that many contemporary problems cannot be adequately studied at the level of nation-states, that is, in terms of national societies or international relations, but need to be theorized in terms of global (transnational) processes, beyond the level of the nation-state.”

Roland Robertson, who backs the idea of the existence of globalization long before the emergence of modernity, develops his own theoretical framework of the relation between sociology and globalization partly on Martin Albrow’s:

Albrow (1990: 6-8) has argued that we can identify five stages in the history of sociology, considering the latter from within the current concern with globalization: universalism; national sociologies; internationalism; indigenization; and globalization. Although I have some reservations about this scheme it is, on the whole, a helpful way of considering the history of sociology in relation to the theme of globalization.

Since Robertson believes that Albrow’s scheme of the sociology history during globalization stage is mainly associated with the sociologists’ relations around the globe rather than the essence of sociology itself, then primarily he highlights on the difference between globalization of sociology and globalization of sociologists. Later on, Robertson refers to great thinkers such as Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Georg Simmel who paid attention to the theme of globalization, though in their own terminology and from their own specific viewpoint. In fact in the works of Durkheim and Simmel Robertson finds “definite concerns with the category of
humanity” which later in his special scheme relate to the “overall delineation of global circumstances.” Louis Dumont’s conceptual framework becomes another keystone for Robertson’s model on social globalization, where he introduces his quadrilateral formula with its major components: national societies, world system of societies, selves, and humankind.82

The great role of such pioneering theorists as Roland Robertson or Anthony Giddens has always been cherished in contemporary social studies of globalization, as they contribute much in the formation of ideas like global awareness or planetary consciousness. This is happening even despite Robertson’s and Giddens’ different attitudes in the origination and historical appearance of the globalization process; indeed their new thoughts have created a different twist in the social approach to globalization. As Leslie Sklair asserts “global society theorists argue that the concept of world, or global, society has become a believable idea only in the modern age and, in particular, science, technology, industry and universal values are increasingly creating a contemporary world that is different from any past age. The globalization literature is full of discussions of the decreasing power and significance of the nation state and the increasing significance of supra-national and global institutions and systems of belief.”83 As Leslie Sklair reminds us four dimensions are found in Giddens’ definition of globalization: the nation state system, the world military order, the international division of labor and the world capitalist economy.84 Much of Anthony Giddens’ contribution to this realm has been focused on the relations between modernity and globalization. “He [Giddens] characterizes the transformation of key social relations in terms of the relation between globalizing tendencies of modernity and localized events in daily life.”85 In his earlier comments on the term he proves sharp-sighted:

However, the idea of globalization is misunderstood if it is only applied to connections that are literally world-wide and if it is treated as only, or even primarily, economic. Globalization, as I shall conceive of it in what follows, at any rate, is not only, or even primarily, about economic interdependence, but about the transformation of time and
space in our lives. Distant events, whether economic or not, affect us more directly and immediately than ever before.\textsuperscript{86}

Claiming that “globalization is the reason for the revival of local cultural identities in different parts of the world,”\textsuperscript{87} Giddens emphasizes on the \textit{communications revolution} as the driving force for the new globalization. According to him such a revolution affects both the individual and the way public institutes interact. Just in the same line of thought he proposes another definition of globalization: “Globalization can [...] be defined 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.”\textsuperscript{88}

Such a definition reminds us how social dimension of globalization is characterized variously from different viewpoints. Through another standpoint we can say that the social dimension of globalization “refers to the impact of globalization on the life and work of people, on their families, and their societies. Concerns and issues are often raised about the impact of globalization on employment, working conditions, income and social protection. Beyond the world of work, the social dimension encompasses security, culture and identity, inclusion or exclusion, and the cohesiveness of families and communities.”\textsuperscript{89} As it is clear such an account is made at a different level and as a different development on social globalization debate; here we come to know about more pragmatic procedures in recent years. Such new measures are taken not only by leading individuals but also by various institutions involved in the global interactions and The World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (WCSDG) is one of those organizations which aims at making globalization a fairer and more suitable process for all. The WCSDG aims to underscore “the importance of a strong social dimension in regional integration, which is seen as a stepping stone towards a more effective social dimension of globalization.”\textsuperscript{90} Observing the great role of such establishment, Joseph Stiglitz corroborates:

Whatever one thinks of the many concrete suggestions made by the Commission, this much is clear: we need a more inclusive debate about globalization, one in which
more voices are heard, and in which there is more focus on the social dimensions of globalization. This is a message the world would do well to heed, lest discontent with globalization continue to grow.91

As stated in the working paper No.24 for the 2004 sessions of WCSDG, certain objectives were delineated to be achieved:

[Commission’s] broad goals were: to identify policies for globalization that reduce poverty, foster growth and development in open economies, and widen opportunities for decent work; to explore ways to make globalization inclusive, so that the process can be seen to be fair for all, both between and within countries; to promote a more focused international dialogue on the social dimension of globalization; to build consensus among key actors and stakeholders on appropriate policy responses; and to assist the international community forge greater policy coherence in order to advance both economic and social goals in the global economy.92

The authors of the final report of the commission call for “an urgent rethink of global governance and its current policies. The authors recommend focusing attention on the needs and concerns of citizens, and on the best means of harnessing the potential of globalization for the benefit of the majority of populations.”93

As a final summation to this section a brief abridgement from William E. Scheuerman’s account on the perspective of globalization in contemporary social theory seems appropriate. He observes five aspects in this regard:

First, is the concept of deterritorialization, which is associated with globalization and refers to “a growing variety of social activities takes place 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” (Scholte,
Second, recent theorists conceive of globalization as linked to the growth of social interconnectedness across existing geographical and political boundaries. In this view, deterritorialization is a crucial facet of globalization. Yet an exclusive focus on it would be misleading. [...] Third, globalization must also include reference to the speed or velocity of social activity. Deterritorialization and interconnectedness initially seem chiefly spatial in nature. Yet it is easy to see how these spatial shifts are directly tied to the acceleration of crucial forms of social activity. [...] Fourth, even though analysts disagree about the causal forces that generate globalization, most agree that globalization should be conceived as a relatively long-term process. The triad of deterritorialization, interconnectedness, and social acceleration hardly represents a sudden or recent event in contemporary social life. Globalization is a constitutive feature of the modern world, and modern history includes many examples of globalization (Giddens, 1990). [...] Fifth, globalization should be understood as a multi-pronged process, since deterritorialization, social interconnectedness, and acceleration manifest themselves in many different (economic, political, and cultural) arenas of social activity. Although each facet of globalization is linked to the core components of globalization described above, each consists of a complex and relatively autonomous series of empirical developments, requiring careful examination in order to disclose the causal mechanisms specific to it (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999).

2.3. Globalization and its Relationship with Literature and Literary Studies

“[…] all literature is now global, all literature is a literature of globalization.”

Susie O’Brien and Imre Szeman

2.3.1. General overview

The literary aspect of globalization or the connection between globalization and literature is dealt with in this part. As two seemingly separate areas of study, both globalization and literature share some meeting points in their institutional and structural edifices; undoubtedly debates about globalization are relevant to debates in literary studies and certainly existing ideas of interest in literature and literary studies fit with notions of globalization. As a matter of fact this is a reciprocal course through
which literature and globalization affect each other interactively. And quite plausibly there are greater causes for the attachment of literature and globalization. As Paul Jay claims “our awareness of the complex ways in which English and American identities have been constructed historically through migration, displacement, colonialism, exile, gender relations, and cultural hybridity has radically restructured our sense of what Paul Gilroy has dubbed the “roots/routes” of these identities. With this awareness it has become increasingly difficult to study British or American literature without situating it, and the culture(s) from which it emerged, in transnational histories linked to globalization.” Of course, there are some other reasons to justify the need for such affiliation between the two principles as Paul Jay further asserts the importance of English language and literature appearing in the wider scope:

At the same time the remarkable explosion of English literature produced outside Britain and the United States has made it clear that this literature is becoming defined less by a nation than by a language, in which authors from a variety of cultural and ethnic backgrounds write. The globalization of English from this point of view is not a theoretical formulation or a political agenda developed by radicals in the humanities to displace the canon. It is a simple fact of contemporary history. English literature is increasingly postnational, whether written by cosmopolitan writers like Derek Walcott, Arundhati Roy, and Nadine Gordimer or by a host of lesser-known writers working in their home countries or in diasporic communities around the world, from Europe and Africa to the Caribbean and North America. I want to argue that we can more effectively reorganize our approach to the study of what we have heretofore treated as national literatures (in our curricula and programs) by emphasizing literature’s relation to the historical processes of globalization.

Through his methodology then Paul Jay rejects the idea that globalization is a fundamentally contemporary event. Accordingly, he recognizes that it has a long
history and tries to review the development of globalization theories with an eye toward underscoring some of the differences between globalization conceived of as a postmodern phenomenon and globalization conceived of as a long historical process.

However, while approaching literature and globalization within literary studies several broad areas become visible. After explorations on the core of this connection and as far as the objectives of the present study are concerned here three correlative levels of attachment or association become further highlighted. At one conceptual level, this relationship mainly engages with literary theory, discipline and criticism. Many studies have tried and succeeded to fit discussions of globalization with certain established fields of literary studies. Here we trace some links between globalization debates and literary postmodernism and postcolonialism since these terms have been on the highest point of agenda during the same post-1970s period in which the term globalization has extended itself to its current prominence. Susie O’Brien and Imre Szeman also posit that “a cursory survey of contemporary literary critical discourses suggests that some of the tools to address these issues [like seeking literatures outside national framework] are ready-to-hand: the (messy, unwieldy, heterogeneous) critical discourses of postcolonialism and postmodernism each address, more or less explicitly, the relationship between literature and globalization.”
Also at this level notions such as world literature and comparative literature and their bonds with globalization are considered of great value which will be discussed briefly.

The second level could be called one of tools or mediums with certain key terms. The Media and specially its new forms is one of the key terms here. Indeed, modern technologies such as satellite communications and World Wide Web have made drastic changes in dissemination of various forms of literature and quite relevantly information explosion has played a central role in distribution of social and cultural packages all around the globe. Also we may have a short look here at the globalization of publishing and literary institutions. English language status in the world – and its popularity with different forms of socio-cultural exchanges or with literary productions – is the second key figure. The reasons for such a grand position sound straightforward and uncomplicated as “English [is] the language of globalization,” and at the same time a great part of literary production is created or at least transmitted via global English as it is the lingua franca. The third important
medium is undoubtedly translation practice. From one angle and closely related to the dominant position of instrumental global English, translation practice plays a very dynamic role in the connection between globalization and literature. This in part goes back to the grand role of translation in practices of world literature and comparative literature; as a matter of fact without translation the existence of these two principles of literature would seem unimaginable, as Bassnett and Lefevere emphasize that “[…] with the development of Translation Studies as a discipline in its own right, with a methodology that draws on comparatistics and cultural history. Translation has been a major shaping force in the development of world culture and no study of comparative literature can take place without regard to translation.”

From another perspective, the rise of English as the international lingua franca and the simultaneous increase in the global demand for translations in various fields again asserts the importance of such a medium. On the surface, translation conveys or transmits texts across boundaries and communicates across languages, but indeed, building a part of social, cultural, political and economic existence is the profound work it does. In either surface or deep perspectives the grand role of translation in the global patterns of communication is quite outstanding. Translation has become a more and more important tool to enhance understanding between cultures; translation brings cultures closer. Hence, it is quite reasonable if we claim that culture is one of the meeting points in translation/globalization relationship; globalization has always been an important aspect of translation.

The third level in itself includes broad disciplines and methods through which literary studies has evoked globalization. This is partly about the reflection of different themes of globalization in literature, and to another degree about the way “literary texts and the interpretation thereof have been recruited to support or elucidate conceptual positions taken by political and social [or cultural] theorists about globalization.” One aim here is reading or analyzing literary works in order to verify the realities of globalization and at a greater level another aim focuses on the improvement of our understanding of globalization’s discourses and narratives within literature realm. In this regard, Suman Gupta asserts that “[…] acts of literary reading will both register globalization’s appearances as literary theme and seek to develop or extend narratives of globalization. Debates about globalization and literature, thus, are not held apart with merely the possibility of the latter being able to present something
of the former, but are meshed together so that they merge in a conjoined field that processes globalization in literature and the literariness of globalization.\textsuperscript{102} The third level also bears a rather problematic issue within its sphere. The uncertainty that if, in practical terms, there are certain passwords to the world of literary globality; in other words, some questions are raised about any definite formulations for a literary text in qualifying to get the etiquette of global.

Dealing with the first level of the above-mentioned relationship, here Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, World Literature and Comparative Literature will be discussed in their interactions with globalization.

2.3.2. First Level: Conceptual Literary Theories and Disciplines

2.3.2.1. Postmodernism

Bran Nicol’s claim that “postmodernism is impossible to introduce satisfactorily”\textsuperscript{103} might seem paradoxical in the first glance but it is true, indeed. As one of the most challenging concepts in contemporary cultural criticism, the term postmodernism has impinged upon various disciplines – architecture, philosophy, literary studies, history, social theory, cultural studies and globalization as well. This multimodality, or “haunting” nature, then, renders it difficult to explain postmodernism easily as Ihab Hassan believes that we are unable to define postmodernism thoroughly, despite the fact that it haunts “the discourse of architecture, the arts, the humanities, the social and sometimes even the physical sciences; haunting not only academic but also public speech in business, politics, the media, and entertainment industries; haunting the language of private life styles like postmodern cuisine – just add a dash of raspberry vinegar. Yet no consensus obtains on what postmodernism really means.”\textsuperscript{104} Such diversity in the principles and strategies of engagement for postmodernism is obviously understood from the wide range of definitions:

Contemporary science describes postmodernism as a “fact of a global change of epochs,” in which “modernist Eurocentrism is replaced with postmodern global polycentrism.” So far, however, researchers either pointed
to the tie between postmodernism and post-industrial society or concluded that information society had entered the stage of globalization. We have to complete the circle by formulating a paradigm that would include postmodernism, information society and globalization.105

However, the term postmodernism was first used in 1930s by Federico de Onis “as a definition of a ‘conservative reflux within modernism itself’. “106 Postmodernism was then first used in reference to a style of architecture as early as 1947 and then by the historian Arnold Toynbee in the 1950s. Coming in the aftermath of artistic Modernism, “postmodernism asserts itself from about 1956 with the exhaustion of the high Modernist project, reflected in the work of S. Beckett among others, and the huge cultural impact of television and popular music.”107 Postmodernism has been a much-contested term from its early appearance in literature; nevertheless, literary critics such as Leslie Fiedler and Frank Kermode used the term for the first time as a definition for experimental fictional writing which followed modernism and it is only after the publication of Jean-François Lyotard’s La Condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir (1979, The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge, 1984) that for the first time theory becomes associated with postmodernism. As John McGowan recounts “[Lyotard] proposes a postmodern world in which decisions are made on the basis of local conditions and are applicable only in that limited context. Individuals participate in a multitude of such localities, and the lessons, beliefs, and practices of one site are not transferable to any other.”108 Lyotard adds that postmodernism is essentially characterized by “incredulity toward metanarratives”109 that serves to mask the contradictions and instabilities inherent in any social organization. And similarly, the French sociologist Jean Baudrillard describes the “simulacra” of postmodern life which have taken the place of “real” objects. He further argues that we enter a postmodern world once it is the production of images and information, not the production of material goods, that determines who holds power.

Such verbal battles in literary and social theory around postmodernism were carried on for fifteen years (1979-94) during which Jürgen Habermas and Fredric Jameson led the retaliations against Lyotard. As a postmodernist theorist who
recognizes the force of economic and social transformations in contemporary postmodernity, Fredric Jameson in his book, *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (1991), relates that “every position on postmodernism in culture – whether apologia or stigmatization – is also at one and the same time, and necessarily, an implicitly or explicitly political stance on the nature of multinational capitalism today.”110 In this way a kind of political and economic order i.e. the *advanced international capitalist order* becomes the dominant way for explaining postmodernism, as Suman Gupta posits “in a paradoxical way, advanced capitalism therefore provides an underlying holistic structure for postmodernism, which is experienced and expressed in contemporary cultural forms and everyday life as comfortably fragmented and ephemeral.”111 Just through certain witticism, Susie O’Brien and Imre Szeman play a pun over Jameson’s terminology:

[…] globalization denotes what might be described as the “noncultural logic” of late capitalism that has produced the cultural logic hitherto named “postmodernism.” Given the ever-increasing interrelation between the cultural and the economic, it now seems for most critics pointless not to call this cultural logic “globalization,” too, and to see postmodernism as the early name for social and cultural forces whose emergence was only partially grasped two decades ago.112

Moreover, Fredric Jameson sees artistic movements like modernism and postmodernism as cultural formations that accompany particular stages of capitalism and are to some extent constructed by it. Also, as Simon Malpas asserts, “for Jameson, the sorts of postmodernism we have been discussing in art, literature and general culture emerge out of the transformations that have taken place in capitalism during the second half of the twentieth century. And, as the title of his book suggests, postmodernism is not just contemporaneous with this transformation of economic structures into what he calls ‘late capitalism’, it is its ‘cultural logic’.113 However, according to a group of writers and critics including Terry Eagleton, Edward W. Said, and Fredric Jameson the vitality of language, images, and other cultural phenomena to the production of contemporary social order is not less than economic or political
processes. Such common measurements, together with many other arguments “make cultural politics central and lead directly to the interest on the part of Cultural Studies in identity formation and collective action through signifying practices,”[114] maintains John McGowan. He further adds that the controversies over postmodern theory slowed down by 1995:

We appear to be in a pluralistic, eclectic moment in which both artists and critics use bits and pieces of various theories and cultural materials without being concerned about allegiance to one side or the other in some central debate. Just as one does not need to be either a Derridean or an anti-Derridean, so one does not have to choose whether to be modern or postmodern. In the early 1990s, Jameson and David Harvey tried to link the stylistic features of contemporary art to a more general account of the current social order, adopting a fairly traditional notion that art reflects the material realities of the day. But they also had to adopt the Hegelian and Marxist notion that every era has an essential unity, one that they associated with globalization.[115]

Generally, postmodernism became a hot topic within its wide range of disciplinary perspectives during 1970s and 1980s and early 1990s and among other major discussants of the concept we may name Leslie Fiedler, Charles Jencks, Bernard Smith, Rosalind Krauss, Marjorie Perloff, Linda Hutcheon and Ihab Hassan. And as mentioned before globalization experienced its prominence, by and large, in the same period, a fact that leads some analyst to ponder that “it was primarily with regard to postmodernism that the literary and the sociological seemed to converge on discourses of globalization.”[116] Accordingly the study of postmodernism and globalization could be seen in a conjoined direction as the former invests in literature and literary studies and the latter in sociology and social studies. At least one can ask the question: “[…] do such concretizations of literary postmodernism as appear in and with reference to (for instance) *Midnight’s Children* resonate at all with sociologically
oriented approaches to globalization?" Of course this has never been a trouble-free pathway as evidenced by the modifications imposed on globalization:

[...] before the emergence of postmodernism as a conceptual mode of explaining the nature of global culture, theories of globalization were constructed around the concept of modernization, a powerful and homogenizing category that appealed as much to colonial systems as it did to nationalist movements in the so-called third world. With the emergence of postmodern theories of cultural formation, however, certain key categories in theories of modernization were called into question. These categories included the efficacy of homogenizing notions such as modernization, the authority of the nation-state as the central institution in the management of social relationships, and the idea of culture as the embodiment of symbolic hierarchies such as patriotism and citizenship. Against the totality implicit in colonial and nationalist theories of globalization, postmodern critics sought to show, after Jean-Francois Lyotard, that “eclecticism [was] the degree zero of contemporary general culture.”

From a different and yet relevant perspective, the relationship between postmodernism and globalization is observed bearing two aspects, as Suman Gupta puts it: first “the manner in which formulations of postmodernism enabled literary studies to engage with apparently all dimensions of the contemporary social world, including increasing evidence of global integration,” and second “the extent to which sociological approaches to questions of culture and identity – and therefore globalization process – also reckoned with formulations of postmodernity.”

As seen through one definition, “postmodernism, like poststructuralism and deconstruction, is a critique of aesthetics of the preceding age, but besides mere critique, postmodernism celebrates the very act of dismembering tradition.” Such a designation asserts the two strands mentioned by S. Gupta regarding the genesis of
postmodernism. In one part, postmodernism is regarded as different from past experiences and its newness is seen “in relation to modernist newness, progressing from and yet disrupting manifestations of modernity”\textsuperscript{122} and at another part, its newness is characterized solely in itself. Just in order to make the concept of postmodernism theory more tangible, Suman Gupta enumerates three important points. First, “instead of taxonomy, then, postmodern theory disposes its field of engagement in terms of what we may think of as continua in which complexities and interpretations and relativities can be reflected or manifested. […] Second, postmodern theory constantly seems to seep out of geopolitical boundaries […] to spread across the boundaryless domain of continua which can extend to everything – tendentiously the contemporary world at large, the globe. […] the methodology and reach of theorizing postmodernism is constitutionally expansionist and attends to a phenomenon it regards as expansionary. Postmodernist theory, therefore, contains within itself at least an affinity, and probably a deep coincidence, with globalization theory. And third, by disposing the postmodern field in terms of continua, the concept of culture assumes an extraordinary pre-eminence. Since continua such as language, text, discourse, space, ‘-scapes’ and audiovisual fields are conventionally instantiated in cultural products and forms, the entire postmodernist perception of the world seems to become an extension of cultural discernment, an autonomous cultural production itself, or seems to contain all aspects of the world within a cultural gaze.”\textsuperscript{123} While reaffirming that it was during the epoch of literary postmodernism that reckonings of literature with globalization processes took place, Suman Gupta then maintains that “the possible convergences of literary and sociological approaches to globalization are predicted on literature and literary studies’ amenability to and institutionalization of (certainly by the 1990s) postmodernism within itself. At any rate, the literary reckoning with globalization […] is rooted in and arguably begins with literary postmodernism.”\textsuperscript{124}

2.3.2.2. Postcolonialism

Unquestionably, another main frame of literary studies, besides postmodernism and relevant to globalization, is postcolonialism. As a matter of fact “the ultimate and unavoidable future of postcolonialism studies lies in its relation to globalization,”\textsuperscript{125} or at least the conjoined directions for these two phenomena show
that their principles and strategies of engagement are similar. It is suggested that the
relationship between globalization and postcolonialism functions in two directions:

We cannot understand globalization without understanding
the structure of global power relations that flourishes in the
twenty first century as an economic, cultural and political
legacy of Western imperialism. But postcolonial theory,
especially of textual and cultural practices can provide very
clear models for understanding how local communities
achieve agency under the pressure of global hegemony.
Postcolonial theory is very useful in its analysis of the
strategies by which the ‘local’ colonized engage large
hegemonic forces.\textsuperscript{126}

Although the term postcolonialism generally refers to the period after
colonialism, the distinction is not always made. Postcolonialism literally refers to the
period following the decline of colonialism, e.g., the end or lessening of domination
by European empires. As a critical approach, postcolonialism refers to “a collection
of theoretical and critical strategies used to examine the culture (literature, politics,
history, and so forth) of former colonies of the European empires, and their relation to
the rest of the world.”\textsuperscript{127} Among the many challenges facing postcolonial writers are
the attempts both to resurrect their culture and to combat preconceptions about their
culture. Alterity, Diaspora, Hybridity, Eurocentrism, and Imperialism are some of the
keywords of postcolonialism. From one standpoint “postcolonial theory has emerged
from an interdisciplinary area of study which is concerned with the historical,
political, philosophical, social, cultural and aesthetic structures of colonial domination
and resistance; it refers to a way of reading, theorizing, interpreting and investigating
colonial oppression and its legacy that is informed by an oppositional ethical
agenda.”\textsuperscript{128} Jonathan Culler expresses the nucleus of postcolonialism, by and large, in
the same way: “the attempt to understand the problems posed by European
colonization and its aftermath. In this legacy, postcolonial institutions and
experiences, from the idea of the independent nation to the idea of culture itself, are
entangled with the discursive practices of the West. Since 1980s a growing corpus of
writings has debated questions about the relation between hegemony of Western
discourses and the possibilities of resistance, and about the formation of colonial and postcolonial subjects: hybrid subjects, emerging from the superimposition of conflicting languages and cultures.\textsuperscript{129}

From another perspective, if during the 1980s sociology and political economy were taking over globalization discourses, then during the 1990s the debates of globalization moved to different focal points: “theories of globalization have moved from expressions of the process as ‘cultural imperialism’ or neo-imperialism to analyses of the ‘hybridization’, ‘diffusion’, ‘relativization,’ and interrelationship of global societies, the ‘compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole’ (Robertson 1992: 8).”\textsuperscript{130} As Simon Gikandi has asserted, in 1990s it was postcolonialism that brought a range of terms such as transculturation, ‘Third space’, hybridity, and some others into the realm of cultural globalization. Accordingly, there are great evidences indicating that interdisciplinary keywords are the meeting points in the relationship between globalization and postcolonialism.

As the two fields show evidences of convergence in the line of consequent historical explanations and concurrent but different emphasis regarding the same concerns, we come to know some celebrated theorists. Having seen many different turns and twists, a key moment in the development of postcolonial theory emerges with the publication of Edward Said’s \textit{Orientalism} (1978). As one of the most influential books of the late twentieth century, this pioneering work of postcolonial studies which examines the construction of the oriental ‘other’ by European discourses of knowledge highly helps to establish the field. Through this significant touchstone of postcolonial studies Said describes the stereotypical discourse about the East as constructed by the West. Rather than realistically depicting Eastern “other,” such a discourse constructs them on the basis of Western anxieties and preoccupations and Said criticizes such Western image of the oriental. As Gail Ching-Liang Low maintains “[Said’s] definition of Orientalism as a ‘discourse’ was distinctly enabling for the emerging field of postcolonial theory because it enabled critics to see how different sorts of cultural and representational texts contributed to the formation of structures of power. Said sees an intimate connection between systems of knowledge and strategies of domination and control; hence his critique is an interdisciplinary
interrogation of western intellectual, aesthetic scholarly and cultural traditions.”

Back to the relation between globalization and postcolonialism, it is asserted that “the impetus that arises from Said’s work in postcolonial theory and literary criticism establishes its assonances with the simultaneously developing sociologically oriented globalization studies. […] ‘globalization has been the term around which, initially, applied economic and political modes of capitalizing on international markets/labor and conducting international regulations and, later, processes of social and cultural and ideological integration and disintegration of an international scale were formulated and registered. This sociological thrust of globalization studies has been on registering these developments in terms of available social, political, economic and cultural models. These could take account of (but, as Said observed, often didn’t, and on the contrary played into) inequities arising out of constructions of Orientalism and the distortions of power-knowledge arising from colonial history. And obviously, as observed above, they eventually did – by attending to postcolonialism.’

Among other prominent thinkers who have made immense contributions on the foundations of postcolonial theories we shall mention Frantz Fanon, Homi K. Bhabha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Frantz Fanon, the French Caribbean psychologist wrote widely about the damage French colonialism had inflicted upon millions of people who suffered its power. “In a literary context, Fanon’s work has been used as a means of conceptualizing the construction of identity under colonialism and as a way of configuring the relationship between literary representations and the construction of national consciousness during the struggle against colonialism.” Frantz Fanon employs his horrific experiences in French Algeria to deconstruct emerging national regimes that are based on inheritances from the imperial powers, warning that class, not race, is a greater factor in worldwide oppression, and that if new nations are built in the molds of their former oppressors, then they will perpetuate the bourgeois inequalities from the past. His important book is entitled The Wretched of the Earth (1961); this book is also generally considered as one of the founding texts of postcolonial cultural studies.

According to Suman Gupta, at a point in its history, postcolonialism turns away from sociologically oriented focus of globalization but because of its political will insists to keep up with the contemporary world and thus it traces a parallel and
converging track with globalization. Hence the affiliation of postcolonial theory and identity politics/cultural studies during 1980s and 1990s becomes the running engine to find common characteristics. At the same time one should not forget that “the construction of literary studies as a field in which identity and culture can be performed (while globalization studies formulates the importance of identity in the cultural field) has now come largely under aegis of postcolonial theory.”134 Practically the material for this vital or critical presence in the global scene is evidenced by the emergence of a scholarly discourse within postcolonial theory “in which notions of marginality, subalternity, hybridity, subjectivity, etc., were constantly reiterated and expanded.”135 It is then generally agreed that Homi K. Bhabha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak are the other two scholars who have played a major role in providing postcolonialism with such treasure of terms or gateways. As Bart Moore-Gilbert maintains “Bhabha is especially preoccupied by questions of cultural exchange and identification that are determined not by problems of geographical distance and overt forms of political inequality, as in colonialism, but by the contiguity of cultures (characteristically from the former colonial “peripheries”) sharing the same (usually metropolitan) space within the former imperium and by relations of ostensible, if often illusory, equality. Such issues involve Bhabha in a complex set of negotiations between postcolonialism and postmodernism.”136 Homi K. Bhabha’s postcolonial theory entails the scrutiny of nationality, ethnicity, and politics with poststructuralist ideas of identity and indeterminacy, defining postcolonial identities as changing, hybrid constructions. Also the presumed dichotomies between colonized and colonizer, center and periphery, self and other are criticized by Bhabha, where instead he proposes a dialogic model of nationalities, ethnicities, and identities characterized by hybridity; that is they become something new, emerging from a ‘Third Space’ to cross-examine the givens of the past. In his book, The Location of Culture (1994), Bhabha accumulates several of his most significant essays, allowing for an examination of his contribution to contemporary literary theory. Through some of his famous essays, Bhabha reflects on important issues; in ‘Signs Taken for Wonders’ he elaborates ambivalence and mimicry through hybridity. Homi K. Bhabha has also been read as a symptom himself, as David Huddart posits: “Indeed, […] there are other responses which are much more general, and use Bhabha as emblematic of what is wrong with postcolonialism generally. These responses are very often made in the name of theorizing globalization – to
some critics, postcolonialism seems like a distraction from contemporary concerns. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s *Empire* (2000) is an influential account of the revolutionary potential of globalization. [...] Hardt and Negri view various responses to globalization as symptomatic of the transition they see between imperial systems and the total yet dispersive system of empire. Their discussion of postcolonial theory as one symptom of this change is conducted through the example of Bhabha’s work.”

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has been one of the most influential cultural critics in the postcolonial studies, no wonder then she is seen as one member of “the holy trinity” of postcolonial theorists (Robert Young coined this phrase for the triad Said-Spivak-Bhabha in his work *Colonial Desire*, 1995). “Spivak’s work is immensely influential in the field of colonial historiography, feminist studies, cultural studies and postcolonial studies and her writing has always sought to bring together the insights of poststructuralism, deconstruction, Marxism, psychoanalysis and feminism in active collision” maintains Gail Ching-Liang Low. Accordingly, such varieties of critical theories are brought together in order to demonstrate their respective limits and incompatibilities, as well as their mutual points of interrogation. She is much concerned with the ‘epistemic violence’ of imperialism as well as questioning of institutions, institutional power and the role of intellectuals. Spivak is also the only one of “the holy trinity” to consistently inflect postcolonialism with a feminist agenda. In her prominent essays ‘Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography’ (1988) and ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ (1993) she explored the possibility of recovering the voices of those who had been made subjects of colonial representations, particularly women, and read them as potentially disruptive and subversive. “In ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ Spivak complicates the extent to which women’s voices can be easily retrieved and restored to history. Rather than making the subaltern as female seem to speak, intellectuals must *bring to crisis* the representational systems which rendered her mute in the first place.”

‘Globalicities: Terror and Its Consequences’ is the title of the paper Spivak presented at the Globalicities Conference held at Michigan State University in 2001, where she describes her stance on the politics of globalization in a straight line:
Globalization as urbanization seems to me one of the least speculative strands in the thinking of globalization. It is yet another example of assuming the most visible violence to be violence as such, an inability to perceive (or ruse not to perceive) the invisible power lines that make and unmake the visible. We can see cities exploding their spatial outlines and virtualizing into nexuses of telecommunication, or indeed being halted from such easy virtualization. That is part of our everyday; that is the canonical account of globalization. The other scene still requires archaeology, genealogy; and, in Derrida’s felicitous words, “Whatever one does with it, one must begin by listening to the canon.”

As it was mentioned at the beginning of this section postcolonialism looks at globalization for two major reasons, one comes from globalization’s demonstration of the structure of world power relations, which stands firm in the twentieth century as a legacy of Western imperialism. Second, the ways in which local communities engage the forces of globalization bear some resemblance to the ways in which colonized societies have historically engaged and appropriated the forces of imperial dominance. Critics such as Arif Dirlik, Arjun Appadurai, and Roland Robertson have exercised on this second aspect through their reviews. Indeed, they focus more on the link between the local and global and the agency of local subjects in appropriating, transforming and consuming global phenomena. Among other major critics who have made great critical contributions on the relation between globalization and postcolonialism, we may refer to Simon Gikandi, who believes that “what makes current theories of globalization different from earlier ones, let’s say those associated with modernization in the 1950s and 1960s, is their strategic deployment of postcolonial theory.” In his essay, Gikandi explores the problems that arise in connection with reading globalization through English literature, beginning with the overly optimistic assumption, bolstered by postcolonial theory, that globalization represents the end of the nation-state and the proliferation of cultural relationships characterized by difference and hybridity. He further asserts that diverse writers on globalization and postcolonialism have at least two things in common: “they are
concerned with explaining forms of social and cultural organization whose ambition is to transcend the boundaries of the nation-state, and they seek to provide new vistas for understanding cultural flows that can no longer be explained by a homogenous Eurocentric narrative of development and social change.\textsuperscript{142}

\textbf{2.3.2.3. World Literature and Comparative Literature}

The concept ‘world literature’ or \textit{Weltilteratur} is first coined by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe in 1827 to describe the growing availability of texts from other nations: “National literature does not mean much at present, it is time for the era of world literature and everybody must endeavor to accelerate this epoch\textsuperscript{143}” Actually, this is the turning point in a prolonged study of a phrase that travels much beyond its realm or function; in fact, during recent decades, Weltliteratur has attracted interest “in two (often overlapping) areas of inquiry, comparative literature and postcolonial studies, most notably (and especially in the United States) in connection with the theme of globalization.”\textsuperscript{144} And just interestingly enough, contemporary literary globalization is widely read under the sign of Goethean Weltliteratur.

Even when Goethe defines this notion more simply: “European, i.e., world literature;” the venture seems bearing connotations. “For Goethe, world literature is an evolutionary process whereby the various national literatures will gradually, through countless individual encounters and “corporate actions,” unite in a grand synthesis (perhaps reminiscent of Northrop Frye’s structuralist notion of an “order of words”). He sees the approaching epoch of “world literature” as an opportunity for authors “to look beyond their own surroundings” and thereby avoid “pedantic arrogance,” as an opportunity for mutual support and correction, and as a development that everyone must now work to accelerate.”\textsuperscript{145} However according to Hendrik Birus, Goethe’s dictum is not to be taken at face value today: “For what we meanwhile observe is not the replacement of national literatures by world literature, but the rapid blossoming of a multitude of European and non-European literatures and the simultaneous emergence of a world literature (mostly in English translations) as two aspects of one and the same process.”\textsuperscript{146} The understanding of such dialectic, Birus argues, ought to be one of the main targets of comparative literature today. Hendrik Birus also emphasizes that Goethe’s notion can help the discipline of
comparative literature to recognize both the limits and possibilities of its field of inquiry.

Later on the term ‘world literature’ was used by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their *Communist Manifesto* (1848) to describe the existence of a world literature which is produced out of the constant revolutionizing of bourgeois production, and spreads across national and cultural boundaries:

> The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country [...] In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction [...] And as in material, so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.\(^{147}\)

In fact, such advice to shun “national one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness” was, from one perspective, an emphasis on Goethe’s goal of *Weltliteratur*: “not that the nations shall think alike, but that they shall learn how to understand each other, and, if they do not care to love one another, at least that they will learn to tolerate one another.”\(^{148}\) And from a more modern standpoint, those statements on world literature could be interpreted as foreshadowing of a greater share in cultural and literary globalization. However, “the manner in which notions of world literature have been reinvigorated in and since the 1990s, primarily in connection with the institutional space of comparative literature, has a necessarily close relation to the association between literature and globalization. This presents a somewhat distinctive institutional track or history when compared with English studies [...]. In this track, one finds negotiations on how literary traditions should be described and institutionally engaged, gradually moving away from conventional organization along national or regional lines towards a more joined-up international or global view.”\(^{149}\) The phrase ‘world literature’ is such an attractive vista that a variety of theorists,
writers, critics and reviewers have already engaged themselves in its implications or disciplines. This has been done either with exclusive concentration on this term or in its conjunction with cultural studies and comparative literature. The contributions of Rene Wellek, Robert Clements, A. Owen Aldridge, Pascale Casanova, Franco Moretti, Vilashini Cooppan, Elinor Shaffer, Djelal Kadir, John Pizer and David Damrosch.

Although anthologies of ‘world literature’ have often used the term to market a largely European canon, the past three decades have given rise to a much more expansive conception of literary interest and value. Recent books such as David Damrosch’s What is World Literature? (2003), for instance, define world literature as a category of literary production, publication and circulation, rather than using the term evaluatively. Quite early in his book, David Damrosch attempts to define his evaluation and also delimitation of the term in its worldwide scope:

I take world literature to encompass all literary works that circulate beyond their culture of origin, either in translation or in their original language. [...] a work only has an effective life as world literature whenever, and wherever, it is actively present within a literary system beyond that of the original culture.¹⁵⁰

Later, in his concluding pages, Damrosch presents a threefold definition for the term world literature: “1. World literature is an elliptical refraction of national literatures. 2. World literature is writing that gains in translation. 3. World literature is not a set canon of texts but a mode of reading: a form of detached engagements with worlds beyond our own time and place.”¹⁵¹

John Pizer avers that Damrosch’s view is unique among scholarly works in its effort to actually ‘follow the international circulation’ of works across time and space as mediated by politics, commerce, competing efforts at translation, and archaeology. He takes into account that “Damrosch believes a text becomes a work of world literature if it continues to remain vibrantly engaged in cultures beyond its sphere of origin. He feels that although translations inevitably distort the original meanings of
such texts, world literature is actually improved by translation when it internationalizes the works’ mode of circulation and challenges different cultures across time to transnational, transethnic hermeneutic dialogue. In Damrosch’s view, controversies concerning the editing and translating of such texts actually enhance their status as world literature, because such controversies continue to stimulate critical interest in them.”^152

Contrary to David Damrosch’s much quoted conviction that world literature does not lie in reading everything but in reading a few things carefully, Spivak reminds us that as the discipline becomes global or planetary, we need to encounter how members of those cultures speak for themselves in their own language. In her book, Death of a Discipline (2003) Spivak tries to “mediate the ‘radical’ political agenda of Theory in comparative literature both by maintaining the particular importance of taking ‘the languages of the Southern Hemisphere as active cultural media rather than as objects of study by the sanctioned ignorance of the metropolitan migrant’ against the hegemony of ‘global English’ (Spivak 2003, 9), and by maintaining a presumptive conceptual horizon that recognizes collectivity: ‘the collectivity that is presumed to be the condition and effect of humanism is the human family itself’(ibid., 27).”^153 Suman Gupta appraises this standpoint by Spivak in the direction of a specific alignment:

The idealistic thrust of world literature, from Goethe to Aldridge, has, however, been pushed towards a more pragmatic and real-world turn, and the consequent process of reconceptualization is still underway. Inevitably this entails, as the phrase ‘world literature’ suggests, a cautious calling up of universalist political thinking to offset and question the emphasis on differences and fissures in postmodernism and postcolonialism. The impetus of a conditional universalism is expressed thoughtfully in Gayatri Spivak’s consideration of comparative literature in Death of a Discipline (2003).^154
Accordingly, Spivak reveals that in opposition to comparative literature’s claim of worldwide scope in 2000 most academic programs in comparative literature in the United States concentrated on “Europe and the extracurricular Orient.” Simultaneously, programs in area studies found themselves in search of a renewed mission, having prospered with the Cold War and declined in its wake. In view of that, Spivak first proposes a coalition between comparative literature and area studies, with the aim of making these enterprises resemble each other. Comparative literature would gain from the linguistic and political coverage, institutional alliances, and rigor of area studies, while area studies would learn to think conceptually about things that are better understood through close reading of all kinds of texts than through empirical observation. Comparative literature committed to a national and territorial model of the world, must, in turn, attend to the new demographic frontiers of the postcolonial and globalized era.

As the movements among comparatists in the US and other parts of the world indicate there have been various attempts to re-focus the discipline of comparative literature away from the nation-based approach with which it has previously been associated towards a cross-cultural approach that pays no heed to national borders. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s *Death of a Discipline* (2003), David Damrosch’s *What is World Literature?* (2003), and also Steven Tótösy de Zepetnek’s edited volume *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies* (2003) are among the works of this nature. In addition to endeavors like the one conducted by Spivak, Damrosch and Zepetnek there have been diverse attempts to provide the literary sphere with newer implications of comparative literature. According to Susan Bassnett the simplest definition for comparative literature goes like that it “involves the study of texts across cultures, that it is interdisciplinary and that it is concerned with patterns of connection in literatures across both time and space.” Bassnett also asserts that the term comparative literature resembles some methodological process as that of science, where comparing (or contrasting) serves as a means of confirming a hypothesis. The first appearance of the term goes back to Europe in the early years of the nineteenth century when some concept of comparative literature including a consideration of more than one literature was in circulation.
Francesco Loriggio maintains that “[…] apart from having addressed issues pertaining to flow and direction, complit [comparative literature] is the discipline that, wittingly and unwittingly, has had to puzzle over the epistemology of the global and the local. It is the branch of literary studies that has asked itself how the kind of knowledge these two dimensions entail can be coordinated into a didactic project. The status that complit [comparative literature] has conferred on the global is instructive.”158

In order to find a plausible definition of comparative literature in the year 2000, Djelal Kadir cross-examines terms such as vocation, process, field or institution to reach to the best adjective for comparative literature in one platform. On the other platform he arrives at some historical and discursive processes which convey him to what is condensed into five propositions amongst which the term globalizations significantly glimmers. He argues that “Globalization could be defined as the pervasive translocation of the local unto a diffuse plane where the location of culture, literary or otherwise, is simultaneously rendered as emphatically incomparable isolate and as subsumed, homologated site. These contending processes may be dialectical or exclusive. In any case, they would appear to undercut the traditional praxes and institutional claims of Comparative Literature, whose disciplinary métier has consisted in the mediation, analysis, and breaching of the interstitial or border-line significations among mutually implicated differentials, a reaching after comprehensibility, however imaginary or provisional, that bridged the fault lines between culturally discrepant alterities.”159 After raising serious questions on the ability of comparative literature to cope with the new circumstances, Kadir then suggests that: “Under the current historical conditions, Comparative Literature is obliged in its intellectual and institutional praxes to do more than merely limn, trace, disentangle, analyze, and mediate differentiated linguistic constructs, definable regional aesthetics, national literatures, or hemispheric cultures. And, at the threshold of the twenty first century, Comparative Literature can no longer just contend with neatly definable hemispheres. Comparative Literature must now countenance the flux and reflux of spherical entanglements, global and globalizing formations, polyglossic aesthetics and heteroglossic constructs, radically enmeshed textualities and historical contexts[…]”160 Djelal Kadir further maintains that “at this transnational and transculturating juncture of globalization, then, the definition of Comparative
Literature I offer, a definition pegged to the historical situatedness of our own time, is unavoidably constructed with certain elemental building blocks that we could delineate as follows: The transnational is a locus, a space. Culture is a practice, or complex of practices. Globalization is a process. Literature is a system. From these lapidary components, then, I construct our definition: *Comparative Literature is the systematic practice of discerning, examining, and theorizing symbolic processes as they affect the material and aesthetic enablements in the production, valuation, and dissemination of literary culture at and through transnational and transcultural sites.*”

Sieghild Bogumil conceives globalization as a new challenge for comparative literature since “more than a theory, globalization is intrinsic to this discipline.” The link is quite obvious: “when this field of studies [comparative literature] was established as a university discipline, its object was to open the boundaries of national literatures, to transgress the narrowness and the dangers of nationalism, and to reach out to nations and peoples.” Bogumil believes that bridging the gap between the comparatists’ idea of world literature and the new concept of globalization remains demanding at least for two reasons: one is the limited literary horizon and the small number of literatures under consideration in that traditional context of the discipline. The second reason according to Sieghild Bogumil is that “comparative literature is running the risk of being absorbed by the increasingly theoretical orientation of the new historicism, which assimilates the idea of globalization to a sense of multiculturalism. The concept has been introduced by an economic vision and fusion of the world supported by the new technologies and the media.” In a further proposition, and in the light of these technical possibilities of the media, electronic technologies and digital texts, Bogumil suggests the term ‘Global Literature’ to replace world literature in order to include the reality of a newer format of the ‘text’ and also to take in a wider scope of coverage. Of course, we know that this term has been exerted also by other scholars like John Pizer from a different viewpoint where he asserts that “with the globalization of the world economy, a true world literature, which is to say a global literature, is being created […] how Goethe’s concept both anticipates and helps us to examine this trend” However Sieghild Bogumil posits that “comparative literature with its idea of world literature seems hopelessly obsolete, not only because it never really lived up to the demands of the term, but also
because, if ever it did, it was extending its field to a lot of literatures without taking account of their human and their cultural dimensions. These were rather considered as non-textual practices and thus not relevant for literature, whose autonomous constitutive process of meaning was emphasized. In other words, comparative literature – as well as all national literary studies – dealt with books and not with men. At present, the notion of global literature signifies nearly the contrary: on the one hand it means the desire to open literature to the other cultural practices in such a manner that literature would figure as one among them, and, on the other hand, it means the claim to take account of all kind of texts in the generic as well as in the geographic sense.”

In one word, Sieghild Bogumil sees Global Literature as the new object of Comparative Literature.

At the second level of the relation between globalization and literature here we discuss the role of media and literary institutions, English language and translation practice as the important tools or mediums in expanding this connection.

2.3.3. Second Level: Tools/ Mediums
2.3.3.1. Media and Literary Institutions

Earlier in this chapter we referred to five dimensions of cultural global flows coined by Arjun Appadurai in a rather different elevated terminology amongst which two, i.e., *mediascapes* and *technoscapes* seem quite relevant here. “By *technoscapes*, I mean the global configuration, also ever fluid, of technology and the fact that technology, both high and low, both mechanical and informational, now moves at high speeds across various kinds of previously impervious boundaries,” Appadurai maintains. The ‘image-centered’ *mediascapes* according to him “refer both to the distribution of the electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information (newspapers, magazines, television stations, and film-production studios), which are now available to a growing number of private and public interests throughout the world, and to the images of the world created by these media.” Quite expectedly, the local, national or transnational recipients within such landscapes experience what is called the effects of cultural globalization.
Undoubtedly, cultural globalization is driven by communication technology and the worldwide marketing of Western cultural industries. The more dominant consequences of such modern technology can be seen in two modes: informational effect and technical effect. Informational effect of globalization has been synonymous with the increase in information flows between geographically remote locations. Arguably this is a technological change with the advent of fiber optic communications, satellites, and increased availability of telephone and Internet. Technical effect of globalization has been synonymous with development of a global telecommunications infrastructure and greater trans-border data flow, using such technologies as the Internet, communication satellites, submarine fiber optic cable, and wireless telephones. The Internet is associated with the process of cultural globalization because it allows interaction and communication between people with very different lifestyles and from very different cultures. Photo sharing websites allow interaction even where language would otherwise be a barrier. The internet breaks down cultural boundaries across the world by enabling easy, near-instantaneous communication between people anywhere in a variety of digital forms and media.

The deployment of new communication technologies where “we have a mass media system that can dissolve and permeate boundaries between localities and between political entities allowing the transmission of cultural products to take place at an increasingly rapid space,”169 is only one of the areas of the increasing trend towards globalization of the mass media. Another area as Natalie Fenton depicts it refers to “media industries [as] part of communication conglomerates which are increasingly transnational in terms of the range of their operations and activities. This is a process that has been spurred on by large-scale mergers and take-overs among the communication conglomerates.”170 The last area covers “the increasing role of exports and the production of media goods for an international market.”171 International film and television sales (which are mostly dominated by American companies) are presented as good examples here. The greater environment or context of all three areas mentioned here, as Anthony Giddens has rendered it, is society or better say social relations. As it was mentioned before, Giddens defines globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant locations in such ways that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice
versa."\textsuperscript{172} With no doubt Giddens appreciates the mediums or tools in strengthening those social relations as he says:

The communications revolution and the spread of information technology are deeply bound up with globalizing processes. This is so even within the economic arena. Twenty-four-hour money markets depend upon a fusion of satellite and computer technologies, affecting many other aspects of society too. A world of instantaneous electronic communication, in which even those in the poorest regions are involved, shakes up local institutions and everyday patterns of life. The influence of television alone is considerable.\textsuperscript{173}

Certainly the development of mass media and new communication technology which is closely and directly related to globalization, has profoundly affected the activities of media industries as well as other areas. Among those other areas one can definitely refer to literature. Nico Israel posits that globalization’s impact on literature is manifold, with both positive and negative associations. On one hand the World Wide Web allows ever greater access to literary texts while on the other hand the publishing industry has itself become more globalized (and consolidated into multinational media conglomerates). The relation of globalization and literature for Nico Israel is mostly maneuvering in one direction: how literature responds to globalization. The answer for this question comes from two aspects. In one measurement, we may conceive, “how globalization has affected the business of literature – its “production” in the commercial sense.”\textsuperscript{174} Israel confirms the great role of media, new technologies and literary industries, though he casts some doubt on the new situation:

The last fifteen years have seen a remarkable consolidation of the publishing industry, with multinational conglomerates (e.g. AOL-Time Warner, Viacom, News Corp, Pearson) acquiring controlling stakes in formerly family-owned literary publishing houses. (Alfred A. Knopf,
for example, is part of Random House, which is owned by the German media giant Bertelsmann.) At the same time, the expansion of the World Wide Web (and online booksellers such as amazon.com) has allowed for an exponential extension of the reach of literature, exposing buyers in remote areas of the world to an ever wider range of texts, while also increasingly putting local bookshops, with their owners’ sometimes idiosyncratic affinities, out of business. It is still unclear whether this new situation (increased consolidation and increased reach) will entail a genuinely multidirectional flow of ideas around the world or rather that books, like other “luxury” goods, will move largely from the United States and Europe to the developing world, while the labor that goes into book production is itself outsourced. In any case, glancing back at the last fifteen years, the contemporary books that literature students in US and UK universities tend to read come from a significantly wider geographical area than formerly, even if those books are largely written by a handful of Western-educated Anglophone authors.175

Israel’s concern over that increased consolidation is shared by other scholars as well. Suman Gupta believes that such a great shift from being a stronghold of a large number of independent and mainly nationally based firms to becoming dominated by a limited number of multinational corporations has been one of the most effectively discussed developments in the publishing industry in the late twentieth century. Yet the implications of this change for literature have been viewed with misgivings. Most of these multinational corporations are dominated by profit-driven rationales and this means that the consolidation of literary publishing (as a part of the greater industry) has been leaning towards a corresponding narrowing down of the kinds of literary productions that are not in the same line of profit for these giant publishers.
The second and more complex aspect that remains for Nico Israel is what globalization has to do with the very form(s) of contemporary literature:

Just as Proust, Kafka, Joyce, Woolf, Eliot, and Beckett expressed a state of the (“modern”) world in the very shapes of their sentences or poetic lines, maximal or minimal, thereby pressing against the frontiers of knowledge and historical and geographic memory, the contemporary era’s most powerful, path-breaking literary writers – W. G. Sebald, J. M. Coetzee, and Ben Okri among them – shun the low-affect irony associated with postmodernism, conveying the import of globalization as both multilateral ethical conundrum and horizon of promise. By exploring the limits of self-reflection and creating new forms of expression, these writers challenge a new generation of literary and cultural critics to find fresh, more piercing ways to picture “life englobed.”¹⁷⁶

The way Sieghild Bogumil summarizes the relationship among globalization, literature and new media is also noteworthy:

[…]the concept of globalization was brought into circulation by the worldwide economic system, promoted by the new technical possibilities of the media, especially of electronic communication, and was finally integrated as a possible vision of literature into methodological approaches to the text such as new historicism. If the latter may be considered as having conceived the most advanced form of the ‘explosion’ of the text after M. Bakhtin’s dialogic dissolution of it, the main challenge must be seen not in any theoretical approach but in the practice of electronic surfing.¹⁷⁷
In a different twist and through his outstanding article, “The Impact of Globalization and the New Media on the Notion of World Literature,” Ernst Grabovszki178 deals with the various aspects of communication and scholarship in the humanities in the context of social processes resulting from globalization and the impact of new media. Grabovszki proffers that the process of communication, the process of creativity, and the study of literature and the changes these areas are now experiencing due to the impact of globalization and new media should be studied contextually, from a systemic and empirical point of view. Moreover, an exposition of changes we observe regarding the traditional model of literary communication contrasted with the new possibilities offered by the internet and the World Wide Web is presented in this article. Grabovszki’s discussion includes his views on how this new situation results in new possibilities as well as requirements authors, distributors, and readers of literature today have to cope with.

In extension of Anthony Giddens’ definition of globalization, Ernst Grabovszki first coins his own as “globalization also means the intensification of literary relations and of communication including that of artistic, i.e., literary communication and production.”179 In the next step and in the context of an empirical approach to the situation of globalization and world literature, Grabovszki puts forward seven preliminary aspects for his discussion amongst which three seem more relevant here: “2) The role and function of literary institutions: The regional densities of literary institutions such as publishers, libraries, bookstores, distributors, etc. mean that the circulation and knowledge of literature depend on the existence and function of the said institutions. In consequence, we must pay attention of the how of these institutions in their appropriate context. For instance, when considering African literature one would be misguided to assume that literary production and the business of literature in Africa is similar to the production and consumption of literature in European countries or North America. Obviously, […] because of the high quota of illiteracy in certain parts of Africa, printed texts are less used than media which do not require reading abilities such as radio, TV, theater, or video. Our Eurocentric notion where literature is more often than not equated with the written and/or printed text will not serve us well here. Literature, clearly, is not only the printed text and there are parts in the world where oral literature has a much broader tradition as well as social and cultural importance.”180 “4) The problematics of the development of
electronic media and the cultures of information with regard to their technical and content development in their global and regional settings: This point is again suited for making us realize that literature is not only bound up with the book as its traditional medium but that it is also perceived and functions as an oral form. Thus we have to draw our attention to such media which are dominant in a certain region such as certain parts of Africa and Asia. In the technologically advanced countries of the world, the role of the internet as a medium of communication between distributors and customers is still insignificant, [...]. Further, an analysis of the content of the media taken into consideration has to cover the ways and manners literature is dealt with in its different manifestations. The following questions can be posed: How is literature discussed? What rank does literature hold within the program of a radio or TV station or within literature-related sites on the World Wide Web? Which literature is discussed (high-brow, trivial literature, etc.)? Is there also foreign literature that receives attention or only literature in the national language(s) and if yes, is it dealt with in its original language or in translation? Especially radio or audio media allow to present literature in an authentic way. Audio books, for instance, may intensify the authenticity of literature by presenting a text read by its author in the original language. In addition, this kind of authenticity proceeds from the assumption that, according to the old model of literary communication a piece of literature is always linked with the name of a person.\textsuperscript{6} The monopoly of media giants and its implications: The concentration of media businesses, enterprises, and publishers suggests increasing tendency towards the globalization of their operations. In turn, this may lead to a monopoly of conglomerates which means undue control of what gets produced and what does not, including the type of literature and the contents of the types of literature. With regard to specifics of the economics of the European Union, for example, this concentration poses the question whether the implementation of market prices based on competition of literary products in the European Union would help the preservation of the diversity of literary forms or destroy it.\textsuperscript{182}

2.3.3.2. English Language

Among nearly 6900 living languages in the world, English is the most popular language.\textsuperscript{183} As a matter of fact Modern English, sometimes described as the first global lingua franca, is the dominant international language in science, business,
aviation, communications, mass media and diplomacy. English is spoken as a first language by more than 330 million people throughout the world. While it is not an official language in most countries, English is currently the language most often taught as a second language around the world. The geographical spread of English is unique among the languages of the world, throughout history. Countries using English as either a first or a second language are located on all five continents, and the total population of these countries amounts to about 49% of the world’s population. A working knowledge of English has become a requirement in a number of fields, occupations and professions such as medicine and computing; as a consequence about one in five of the world’s population speaks English with a good level of competence.

It is, by international treaty, the official language for aerial and maritime communications. English is an official language of the United Nations and many other international organizations. It is believed that English is the most widely published language; the availability of books, magazines, and newspapers written in English in many countries around the world is a good proof. Also as shown in the following bar chart, during the first quarter of the year 2009 English has the first rank among the internet users:
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As here briefly been commented upon, English language’s reach to nearly every corner of the earth and its dominance in many milieux, have made it a global or world language with both positive and negative sides. The power of global English has raised worldwide concerns:

Whether we consider English a “killer language” or not, whether we regard its spread as benign globalization or linguistic imperialism, its expansive reach is undeniable and, for the time being, unstoppable. Never before in human history has one language been spoken (let alone semi-spoken) so widely and by so many. With unprecedented reach comes a form of unprecedented power. Although language is synonymous with neither ideology nor national interest, English’s role as the medium for everything from high-stakes diplomacy to air traffic control confers certain advantages on those who speak it.¹⁸⁴

The origin of such superior status for the global English, as David Crystal relates it, should be searched for on two main grounds of geographical-historical and socio-cultural explanations.¹⁸⁵ Quite reasonably whatever reasons played major roles in the development and expansion of the English language, today we are experiencing a different manifestation or function of it:

In recent years, the political dimension of the global spread of English has become a pronounced topic of discussion among language scholars. In tandem, political scientists have started taking into account cultural factors affecting global politics. Nevertheless, the language factor remains underdeveloped in the study of global politics, and language is at best tangentially referenced in globalization studies. Yet the linguistic dimension of globalization is the ideal focus for an attempt to understand the relation between politics and culture at the turn of the millennium. For language, as is widely acknowledged, is both a cultural
marker and a means of communication. Embedded in language use is information about status and identity, as well as cold economic calculations based on efficiency and opportunity. The politics of global English are the politics of globalization, both economic and cultural.¹⁸⁶

As it is concluded from previous explanations, global English bears cultural and political implications associated with globalization. This involvement partly stems from the nature of a world language. Naz Rassool maintains that global or world languages transcend national boundaries. This is to say that “they are understood, and serve communication purposes within and across different geographical contexts, by large groups of people. This would suggest that the conferment of ‘world’ languages status is based, largely, on the fact that these languages are incorporated into institutions and social processes of different societies and cultures. […] only a select few languages [she means English, Spanish and French] have the status of powerful ‘world’ languages conferred upon them.[…] ‘World’ languages then are integrally linked with global economic, cultural and political power institutions, practices and processes.”¹⁸⁷ And global English for sure has excelled the other world languages.

Seemingly “we can define global English as part of globalization. It is part of the cause, the process, and the product of globalization.”¹⁸⁸ Joshua A. Fishman even goes much beyond this to pronounce “English [as] the language of globalization.”¹⁸⁹ Yet David Crystal calls for a broader outlook on the status of global English since “a more deep-rooted process of globalization seems to be at work today, transcending individual language situations.”¹⁹⁰ He draws attention to the more effective factors including “the recognition of global interdependence, the desire to have a voice in world affairs, and the value of multilingualism in attracting trade markets which all support the adoption of a functionalist account of English, where the language is seen as a valuable instrument enabling people to achieve particular goals.”¹⁹¹ Crystal also insists on “a model which sees English playing a central role in empowering the subjugated and marginalized, and eroding the division between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’.”¹⁹²
Alastair Pennycook’s contributions to the concept of global English are also grave and noteworthy. He uses the term *global Englishes* to situate the use and spread of English within critical theories of globalization:

English is closely tied to processes of globalization: a language of threat, desire, destruction and opportunity. It cannot be usefully understood in modernist state-centric models of imperialism or world Englishes, or in terms of traditional, segregationist models of language. […] I prefer to locate these Englishes within a more complex vision of globalization. This view seeks to understand the role of English both critically – in terms of new forms of power, control and destruction – and in its complexity – in terms of new forms of resistance, change, appropriation and identity. It suggests that we need to move beyond arguments about homogeneity or heterogeneity, or imperialism and nation states, and instead focus on translocal and transcultural flows. English is a translocal language, a language of fluidity and fixity that moves across, while becoming embedded in, the materiality of localities and social relations. English is bound up with transcultural flows, a language of imagined communities and refashioning identities. 193

By implementation of the term ‘global Englishes’, Pennycook attempts to capture two polarities – the critical theory of globalization (where globalization is seen as an inherently destructive force homogenizing the world) and a pluralist vision of Englishes (where English is seen as a pluralized entity) – while at the same time distancing himself from these two ways of viewing English in the world (imperial or pluralist).

In addition to viewing global aspect of English, we can also see it from a different viewpoint which could still be taken as a medium or tool. This perspective is much concentrated on English as a discipline; the studies here are more concerned
with English language, English literature and literary studies in their relation to globalization. As was mentioned before, much attention has been paid to Paul Jay’s notions in this domain. He approaches the topic of globalization in a useful context by asking what globalization will do to the discipline known as English. In his article “Beyond Discipline? Globalization and the Future of English” Paul Jay strongly sides with those who, like Waters, Clifford, Friedman, and particularly Appadurai, argue that globalization also involves processes of exchange, dissemination, and transformation that are cultural and symbolic. Just at the concluding section of his article he sketches out his approach to the idea of globalizing literary studies. He deals with the problem of how to develop a transnational approach to English that avoids simply colonizing the literature of the “other.” In more elaboration on the point he avers that “the key question […] is how to shift the center of English away from its traditional British and American focus without colonizing the variety of literatures and cultures now contributing to the transnational explosion of English.”

Paul Jay provides a methodology in this regard and finalizes like this:

It seems to me that the future of English lies squarely at the conjunction of these two fields. On the one hand, the discipline has moved away from a narrow focus on literature per se in the increasing attention it pays to a range of cultural forms, and on the other hand, we have come to realize the inadequacy and even arbitrariness of studying literature and culture within the restrictive and distorting borders of nation-states. Globalization studies in the culturalist mode I have been discussing provides a context for studying literary texts and works in other media not simply as aesthetic objects but also as cultural objects caught up in complex systems of transnational and intercultural exchange, appropriation, and transformation. It offers a context, in particular, for dealing with the proliferation of English literatures written in diasporic conditions, literatures that would otherwise be assimilated to a narrow, nationalist paradigm (“Anglo-Indian” or “Asian American”).
2.3.3.3. Translation

Transmitting texts across boundaries and communicating across languages seems to be the function of translation practice on the face of it, whereas building a part of social, cultural, literary, political and economic existence in a community is the profound work it does. And this function elevates translation and translation studies into a high level as a medium in globalization debates. We know that as far as the relationship between translation and globalization goes, there is a close affiliation undoubtedly. At the same time translation plays an important role within the realm of at least some of the previously mentioned prospects: English language, world or comparative literature, and postcolonialism. There are of course different views about the relationship between translation (and translation studies) and globalization (or various prospects within its scope) as many scholars have contributed on this relation.

Susan Bassnett believes that in a prolonged debate on the issue and traditionally, comparative literature has always claimed translation as a subcategory. But happening as a rapidly expanding development in literary studies, translation studies establishes itself firmly as a subject based in inter-cultural study which gains ground to be seen as a discipline in its own right. As Translation studies offers its methodology in terms of theoretical and descriptive work, then “we need to reassess the role of translation studies vis-à-vis comparative literature, for whilst comparative literature in the West seems to be losing ground, even as it becomes more nebulous and loosely defined, so translation studies undergoing the opposite process.”\textsuperscript{197} The idea of translation as a betrayal of the original text was particularly prevalent by the nineteenth century, and many theorists of comparative literature asserted the primacy of reading in original languages but such tendencies to relegate translation to a subsection gradually altered. By the efforts and contributions of many scholars such as Toury, Lefevere, Hermans, and Lambert it became possible to view translation as vital as a shaping force both in cultural history and in literature. After all since the end of the 1970s translation studies are considered with a distinct discipline. As Bassnett reviews it, three distinct stages in the development of translation studies take place to put an end to marginalization of translation within comparative literature. She believes that in a redefinition of the relationship between the two terms we can see their different objects of study: “For comparative literature has struggled and
struggled to define itself, insisting variously on upholding certain values and rejecting calls for clearer definitions of scope and methodology, while translation studies has concerned itself with texts and with contexts, with practice and with theory, with diachronic and synchronics and above all with the manipulative process of intercultural transfer and its ideological implications.”

As a pioneer in opening up the field of translation studies to questions of cultural identity, the marketing of bestsellers, the status of minority languages, and the impact of globalization, Lawrence Venuti, in addition to his different contributions on the debate, allots the final chapter of his book *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (1998) to globalization. Subtitles in this chapter are Asymmetries of commerce and culture, Transnational identities, Translation as resistance, Translating modernity, and The ethics of location. Lawrence Venuti begins his book with a harsh critique of the emergent discipline of translation studies. He disagrees with the blurb Bassnett and Lefevere have affixed to their Routledge collection which says that translation studies has been “a success story of the 1980s.” Translation studies has not become an academic success, though its status as a young “interdiscipline” should clearly have made it so. Why? Venuti claims that because translation scholars have succumbed to methodological fragmentation and been reluctant “to engage more deeply with the cultural, political and institutional problems posed by translation.” Of course, in 2006, Susan Bassnett quite frankly takes parts of her propositions back in a reassessment; this is with reference to her attitude on the relation between comparative literature and translation:

This was a deliberately provocative statement, and was as much about trying to raise the profile of translation studies as it was about declaring comparative literature to be defunct. Today, looking back at that proposition, it appears fundamentally flawed: translation studies has not developed very far at all over three decades and comparison remains at the heart of much translation studies scholarship. What I would say were I writing the book today is that neither comparative literature nor translation studies should be seen as a discipline: rather both are methods of approaching
literature, ways of reading that are mutually beneficial. The crisis in comparative literature derived from excessive prescriptivism combined with distinctive culturally specific methodologies that could not be universally applicable or relevant.  

However, in compliance with some other scholars, Venuti is also the one who refers to the attitude that English studies is already an institutional area which absorbs literary works in other languages with the assumption of itself as a normative target language. This imbalance is observed in greater dimensions too, as “translation patterns since World War II indicate the overwhelming domination of English-language cultures. English has become the most translated language worldwide, but despite the considerable size, technological sufficiency, and financial stability of the British and American publishing industries, it is one of the least translated into.”

Moreover, the manner in which the inequities of colonial/postcolonial and identity-based power and supremacy are exercised through translation receives attention in Venuti’s work. Following the colonial/postcolonial grouping and identity politics that configures much of the institutional practice of literary studies, Venuti reads globalization as a term denoting the uneven political and economic relations between two systems:

Translation is uniquely revealing of the asymmetries that have structured international affairs for centuries. In many “developing” countries […] it has been compulsory, imposed first by the introduction of colonial languages among regional vernaculars and later, after decolonization, by the need to traffic in the hegemonic lingua francas to preserve political autonomy and promote economic growth. Here translation is a cultural practice that is deeply implicated in relations of domination and dependence, equally capable of maintaining or disrupting them. The colonization of the Americas, Asia, and Africa could not have occurred without interpreters, both native and colonial, nor without the translation of effective texts,
religious, legal, educational. And the recent neocolonial projects of transnational corporations, their exploitation of overseas workforces and markets, can’t advance without a vast array of translations, ranging from commercial contracts, instruction manuals, and advertising copy to popular novels, children’s books, and film soundtracks.202

In the concluding sections, Venuti delves into what the main issues previously-mentioned in the book have meant in terms of the global community. Here the author examines the enormous power translation exercises in the formation of cultural identities and the construction or representation of foreign cultures. Translation has both reinforced existing institutions and served as a form of resistance to these same institutions and their respective societies, as is readily apparent in parts of Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, and South America. He shows how the colonizers’ ruthless effort to force English literacy upon its conquered population actually has worked against the colonizer, and has produced a form of literary and political insurgency. The indigenous person not only mastered his culture but also the culture and language of the conqueror and proceeded to use that colonizing culture’s logic and customs (mainly the practice of scientific reasoning) to his or her advantage. In Venuti’s attitude translation also opens up an anti-hegemonic and anti-globalization direction, and turns attention to the manner in which the colonial-postcolonial situation uses translation to release hybridities, transgress hegemonic values and redirect indigenous traditions and refashion identities.

Anthony Pym’s essay, “Globalization and the Politics of Translation Studies” (2003) also provides the debate with good quality insights. Pym sees globalization as a consequence of technologies reducing the costs of communication: “Globalization, in our technological sense, mostly affects the discourses where the technology for cross-cultural transport and communication is actually used. Many parts of our lives are not subject to it in any radical way; our loves, hates and dreams often proceed virtually untouched, as do local and national politics, for example.”203 Such a reduction has led both to the rise of English as the international lingua franca and to an increase in the global demand for translations, Pym claims. His suggestion is to model globalization as an economic process with certain consequences for the social
role of translation which affect the political organization of Translation Studies as a scholarly discipline. That general process is held to have certain elements of irreversibility because of its grounding in technological change. There are, however, political processes that build on globalization and also have consequences for translation. Some of them can be resisted or influenced by the use or non-use of translation. Those political processes can thus be indirectly affected by a scholarly Translation Studies, which might thus develop its own politics with respect to globalization. According to Anthony Pym, the simultaneous movement on both fronts of English\textit{(lingua franca)} and translation is explained by the divergent communication strategies informing the production and distribution of information, where translation remains significant in the latter. The fundamental change in the resulting communication patterns is the emergence of one-to-many document production processes, which are displacing the traditional source-target models still used in Translation Studies. He also admits that “translation Studies might nevertheless retain a set of problematic political principles that could constitute its own identity with respect to globalization. Such principles would be expressed in the national and regional organization of the discipline, in the defense of minority cultures, and in a general stake in cultural alterity.”\textsuperscript{204} Pym examines the possible existence of such principles “on the basis of three instances where the Translation Studies might address globalization in political terms: the weakness of the discipline in dominant monocultures, the possible development of an international association of Translation Studies, and the rejection of the nationalist boycotts of scholars.”\textsuperscript{205}

If we want to explore an insight which contains both sides of the political agency of translation as Venuti presents them (hegemonic countries and developing countries) and which is more consistent with the multiple connotations that globalization today evokes, then it is better refer to Michael Cronin’s understanding of \textit{globalization as translation} as he observes that “there is no single model of globalization which is adopted willy-nilly by different nation-states but that each country or community translates elements of the global and informational economy into local circumstances.”\textsuperscript{206} As in the first chapter of his book, Michael Cronin admits “the effects of the dramatic changes in technology and in the organization of economies and societies at national and international level are wide-ranging,”\textsuperscript{207} hence, he focuses his attention on the specific consequences of such changes for
translation and translators. Through his work, Cronin tries to develop the attitude that translation and translation studies are ideally placed to understand both the transnational movement that is globalization and the transnational movement that is anti-globalization. Cronin deliberately concentrates more on non-literary translation since he believes that the full significance of this category of translation in cultures is drastically underestimated. “A relative absence of in-depth investigation of non-literary translation which relates it to larger question of culture, society and language,” 208 is what Cronin observes within the prevalent pedagogy. Thus, he shows much interest in the connections between changes in the world of work, business, politics, society and non-literary translation. The major changes in the economy and information technology in the past thirty years have influenced translation as well. These changes caused the emergence of a new kind of economy which means a radically altered context for translation activity. Here Cronin asserts that “as technology features so prominently in any attempt to understand globalization, there is an analysis of the role of tools in translation activity, and the suggestion is made that it is neither possible nor desirable to marginalize the technical in any proper definition of what it means to be fully human.” 209 In the fourth chapter of the book, some of the key features of globalization such as time, the rise of supra-national institutions and organization, automation and the economic might of specific languages are all examined as they influence the future politics of translation. Also in this chapter Cronin elaborates on the visible deficiency: “If literary translation is commonly perceived as the flagship of the creative, the marked imbalance in translation traffic, from economically wealthy nations to economically poorer ones, does not bode well for the openness and diversity promised by the more exalted champions of globalization.” 210 Cronin emphasizes on a more self-aware and activist dimension to the role of the translator in the age of globalization. Translation, for Cronin, plays a crucial role within globalization, since one of its primary functions is “to replenish the intertextual resources of a culture.” 211
2.3.4. Third Level: Globalization in Literature and the Literariness of Globalization

Justifications for the emergence of the third level of the involvement of globalization and literature seem quite reasonable and simple. If we believe that “globalization is something happening out there, so to speak, characterizing the economic, social, political, cultural contemporary world” and if we believe that globalization has many things – including literature – in its grip, then it’s not surprising to see the representations and outcomes of globalization within literature and literary studies or to see that literature and literary studies are becoming globalized since these are part of the same world with which globalization as a phenomenon has a reciprocal interaction. Here on one hand, many researchers scrutinize and explore works of literature so as to find reflections of diverse globalization themes within the texts and contexts and also to verify the realities of globalization through different literary forms. On the other hand, literature and literary studies are developed into a platform for evoking, supporting and interpreting different social, political, literary, and cultural concepts within the realm of globalization.

Paul Jay demonstrates a logical awareness that “literature’s relation to the processes of globalization as they manifest themselves in a variety of historical periods – indeed, literature’s facilitation of economic and cultural globalization – is becoming a potentially important field of study that might get short-circuited if we think of globalization only as a postmodern eruption.” Quite expectedly there have been various attempts to relate discussions of literature, and literary texts in specific, with readings of the social and cultural corollaries of globalization. James Annesley’s work *Fictions of Globalization* (2006) for instance can be interpreted in the same trend where he claims that “globalization must be read in relation to the ordinary transactions of ordinary people.” He introduces his venture in the following manner:

The aim [of the book] is […] to use the analysis of different texts to refine ways of knowing globalization’s discourses. […] The suggestion is that the examination of recent
American fiction and a consideration of the ways in which globalization’s processes are represented offer an insight into the shape and character of concerns that have a key bearing on the interpretation of contemporary culture, social and political life. In these terms the aim is neither to celebrate nor condemn globalization, but to find ways in which it might be possible to read contemporary fiction in terms that adds to knowledge about, and understanding of, its discourses.

Interpreting recent American fiction (including novels by Cisneros, Mukherjee, Palahniuk, Delillo, Lahiri, Ellis, and Gibson) in terms linked to the growing appreciation of culture’s place in the globalization debate, Annesley tries to underpin his “analysis of the representations of leisure, technology, consumer culture, the market and migration in recent American fiction.” Such areas of study would be certainly neglected, Annesley argues, if you only focus on the postcolonial situation and the internationalization of the English language. Accordingly in his book, Annesley tries to ask what the study of literature can do for a better understanding of globalization.

The special issue of the journal South Atlantic Quarterly (Summer 2001) focuses on the fate of literature as a discipline in the age of globalization and connects its debates with established arguments linked to postcolonialism. In the first section of their introduction to this event, Susie O’Brien and Imre Szeman raise a critical question: Does it make sense to speak about a literature of globalization? a question, which according to these researchers, could only be asked in the context of contemporary social, political, and cultural conditions and preoccupations. They claim that “it does not really make sense to search for a literature of globalization – for texts that explicitly thematize the processes of globalization – any more than it does to search for particularly explicit examples of postcolonial literature.” Therefore besides the circumstances under which globalization is reflected thematically in fiction, O’Brien and Szeman appreciate a contemplation about literature’s role in the narrative construction of the numerous discourses or “fictions” of globalization. Accordingly, they assert that “one of the first things to realize about globalization is
that its significance can only be grasped through its realization in a variety of narrative forms, spanning the range from accounts of the triumphant coming-into-being of global democracy to laments about the end of nature; literature no doubt has a role to play in how we produce these often contradictory narratives about globalization.” Moreover, processes and practices of literary theory and criticism that frame discussions of the literary are recognized to have a principal role in the discussion about a literature of globalization. It is also maintained that with such a query about the literature of globalization we should contemplate on the possibility of the existence of a literature outside the framework of national literature and the possible critical tools to understand such literature. Commenting upon the discipline of postcolonialism, O’Brien and Szeman then make an analogy:

Postcolonial may in fact have functioned best as a spatiotemporal term that not only produced political analyses of colonial and postcolonial discourses, but also forced a profound reconsideration of those discourses and movements that seemed to exist at a distance from imperialism; the constitutive role of imperialism in British modernism is highlighted precisely by its general refusal to think or represent this central facet of British experience. In one sense, then, one could say that from the high point of European imperialism to the end of the Cold War all literature was postcolonial literature. In a similar way, posing the question of the relationship between literature and globalization should make us realize that all literature is now global, all literature is a literature of globalization.

It is with reference to Gikandi’s essay that O’Brien and Szeman view the primary question from a new angle. They maintain that “notwithstanding literary criticism’s arrogation of the field of globalization studies to itself, as observed by Gikandi in this issue, globalization and literature are concepts that seem to sit uneasily with one another. Discussions of globalization and culture rarely deal with literature, but focus instead on those mediums that transmit culture electronically,
which are imagined as having an especially powerful and even determinate impact on social and individual identities: film, television, telecommunications, and the Internet. In the renewed attempts by states around the globe to defend national cultures, a fence is rarely erected at the border to keep foreign literature from contaminating the social body. Like the term Anglophone, literature, too, seems archaic in some respects. Is it pointless to worry about literature or literary criticism, as it lacks the broad social effectivity of electronic forms of culture? This anxiety is in some measures relieved when it is asserted that “even if it does not have an obviously dominant role to play in the global imagination, literature remains a significant place in which this imagination is produced and represented, and a site where it is possible to gauge the shifting valences of culture in relationship to those other political, social, and economic realities that globalization most commonly names.”

O’Brien and Szeman then continue to review the relationship of literature to globalization (and vice versa) as variously sketched out in different essays that are provided by Nicholas Brown, Peter Hitchcock, Simon Gikandi, Timothy Brennan, Rosemary Jolly, Paul Sharrad, Sneja Gunew, and Caren Irr. Simon Gikandi’s essay, for instance, is reviewed as it “suggests that the substance of the relationship between Anglophone literature/culture and globalization may be less – or at the very least different – than what it appears. Gikandi asks the provocative question, How did the literary critic become the custodian of a postglobal culture in the academy? In his essay, he explores the problems that arise in connection with reading globalization through English literature, beginning with the overly optimistic assumption, bolstered by postcolonial theory, that globalization represents the end of the nation-state and the proliferation of cultural relationships characterized by difference and hybridity.”

The concern of Liam Connell’s essay, “Global Narratives: Globalization and Literary Studies” (2004) is to elaborate a prefatory account of how globalization can be understood as a textual characteristic. He says: “While mindful of Susie O’Brien and Imre Szeman’s caution against searching for ‘a literature of globalization’, I draw short of their conclusion that ‘all literature is a literature of globalization.’ The point is not to demonstrate that certain types of texts ‘explicitly thematize the processes of globalization’; the point is to demonstrate how these processes are thematized and what this indicates about the ways that globalization has restructured the concept of internationalism, with particular reference to the notion of difference.”
further adds that the major question for literary studies is how all political, economic and social descriptions of globalization are made relevant for an analysis of textual material. He criticizes that “most of the attempts to address this question have tended to treat texts as objects of globalization (as commodities capable of being circulated in global markets or as the shibboleths of geographically dispersed group identities) rather than as narratives capable of signifying globalization in ways that can make it meaningful.”224 Emphasizing on the importance of the ways through which narratives of globalization might operate, Liam Connell corroborates that globalization should be understood as a mode of narrating certain economic or political transformations rather than being seen as the reflexive expression of certain forms of economic and political convergence. He further adds that “a criticism of globalization is a criticism that seeks to identify how texts narrate the concepts of worldliness, convergence and universalism within the frame of a supposedly intensified internationalism.”225 Commenting upon Paul Jay’s argument which suggests that we are witnessing a postnational phase of English literature as a series of cosmopolitan and diasporic writers enter into its field of study, Connell seeks more clarification when he infers that Paul Jay’s sense (that English literature developed along the lines of a political map) is somewhat misleading.

Turning back to Paul Jay’s contributions on the topic, it is noteworthy to mention that in his recent attempt, Global Matters: The Transnational Turn in Literary Studies (Literary Studies after Globalization),226 he challenges the idea that the transnational turn in literary and cultural studies can simply be linked to recent developments related to globalization. Here he asserts that “this turn has roots that run back through theoretical developments in the humanities and social and political movements outside of the academy that began in the 1960s.”227 Jay doesn’t comply with the debate over whether globalization is an economic or cultural phenomenon since “we cannot neatly separate economic from cultural commodities; when commodities travel, culture travels, and when culture travels, commodities travel.”228 At another part of his work, Jay delves into a more complex locale:

I will argue that an early center/periphery model for the study of globalization (one that sees power, commodities,
and influence flowing from urban centers in the West to a peripheral developing world) needs to be complicated. In fact, globalization is characterized by complex back-and-forth flows of people and cultural forms in which the appropriation and transformation of things – music, film, food, and fashion – raise questions about the rigidity of the center/periphery model. While the institutional infrastructures of economic globalization still tend to be defined by this center/periphery model, emerging forms of agency at the cultural level are beginning to loosen its hold. And of course, what we have increasingly come to recognize about the locations we study is that they are not fixed, static, or unchanging. We create the locations we study, and this recognition ought to encourage us to continue to remap the geographies of literary and cultural forms.²²⁹

Paul Jay also takes stand against the claim that the changes ushered in by the transnational turn in literary studies have led to a devastating fragmentation. He believes that “literary studies as a field has always in fact thrived. The field continually builds on the strength of new critical approaches and paradigm shifts, which may seem at first as though they are fragmenting the discipline when in fact they are renewing it. This is what has been happening as literary and cultural studies have taken a transnational turn; […] this turn is both a positive and an exciting one, promising new forms and expressions of coherence.”²³⁰ Paul Jay expresses that his main concern in this new book is to present a composite picture of the transnational turn in English (both inside and outside the academy) but this doesn’t mean that he is recommending some kind of privileged position in the study of cultural and literary forms of globalization. Also he doesn’t want to suggest that “global literature” is primarily being written in English:

The relationship of literary production to globalization is complex and multifaceted, irreducible by definition to literature produced in a particular language or constellation
of nations. [...] To study this relationship requires the careful analysis across historical periods of a transnational range of writers in a variety of languages from a variety of perspectives. Indeed, in the humanities we have historically had a number of different paradigms for studying literature in a transnational framework, principal among them being commonwealth studies, comparative literature, and postcolonial studies. [...] More recently, the discourses of multiculturalism, border studies, diaspora studies, and cosmopolitanism have been invoked in various ways to help underwrite a transnational approach to literary studies. 231

In order to develop some models for the reading and analysis of fiction that is both a product of and engaged with the forces of globalization, Paul Jay then selects and reviews seven texts which are produced in the context of globalization. 232 The literary texts studied in the book are: Arundhati Roy’s The God of Small Things (1997), Vikram Chandra’s Red Earth and Pouring Rain (1995), Mohsin Hamid’s Moth Smoke (2000), Kiran Desai’s The Inheritance of Loss (2006), Zakes Mda’s The Heart of Redness (2000), Zadie Smith’s White Teeth (2000), and Junot Diaz’s The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao (2007).

The involvement of literature and globalization also bears a rather problematic issue within its sphere. The uncertainty that if, in practical terms, there are certain passwords to the world of literary globality; in other words, some questions are raised about any definite formulations for a literary text in qualifying to get the etiquette of global. In her attempt to find the important factors that make it possible for a novel to go “globe-trotting,” Shashi Deshpande 233 mentions some essentials, the most basic of which is the selection of a language that a great number of readers can read it and quite expectedly English is the one. Further, the explanations presented by the writers about the context of their text; customs, references, cultural or local qualities need clarification to some extent; there should be some strategies in selecting points of reference:
[...] to be global there has to be just enough of the unfamiliar to make it seem exotic and only such of the unfamiliar as can be explained and understood by a varied readership. Being in English is obviously not enough; to be accessible to a large readership, the novel has to be shaped for that readership, the unexplainable removed, the awkward stumbling blocks put aside.  

Of course, Deshpande asserts that familiarity with the locale of the text is not the only point of entry for the global reader. A kind of identification with the issues, with the characters, with their predicaments and ideas are vital too. Having access to Western agents and publishers is considered as another must by Deshpande for any book to become global since in such a big business of publishing “it is only the big publisher who can sell books on a global scale. And it is only the agent who knows what this publisher wants, only the agent who can shape the author’s material for such a publisher.” The migration of writers, intellectuals and scholars from all over the world to Western capitals and universities and their new opportunity to give validity to the writings from their own countries is also an important factor for paving the way to globality, maintains Deshpande. And finally the most essential factor of globalization according to Deshpande is marketing, which she criticizes the way it is done nowadays to sell books the same as consumer goods. Of course, this is not the only negative aspect of globalization in literature that she disapproves of as she refers to the known terms such as ‘cultural imperialism,’ ‘third-world literature,’ and ‘standardization.’ Later she draws more attention to dominant function of national and regional identities, “an intrinsic human sense of rootedness” and emphasizes on the role of literature which “more than any other cultural expression, carries the identity of a people.”
2.4. The Theoretical Framework as Applied to the Selected Works in this Study

Up to this part of the study, an account of the globalization’s origin, definition, and history, its major players, and the cultural, social, and literary aspects of globalization have been presented. Also, there have been brief references to some recent developments related to the topic. For the next step there will be concentration on the ways and modes through which the selected texts in the study relate to globalization as one major aim of this study is to show that if there is any convergence between these texts, globality and globalization.

2.4.1. Theoretical Framework

As it has been mentioned earlier, Anthony Giddens is one of the scholars who has made remarkable contributions to the process and discipline of globalization. In one of his interviews, Giddens divides the discussions over the themes of globalization into two epochs. The first phase remains in the late nineteenth century. “There’s the old globalization debate, which is about whether or not our world is different, for example, from the late 19th century. The late 19th century had a lot of technical change: You had an open market place. You had trading in currencies. You didn’t have too many established borders between countries. People didn’t need passports for a lot of travel. So a lot of people said, well, it’s just a reversion to the 19th century. That debate is now over.”

Giddens reassures us then that the current phase of globalization is not just a repetition of the late 19th century. No longer just an academic debate, the second globalization debate is now much more tangible as people from all walks of life react to its effects in different parts of the world. He characterizes the next phase:

The second globalization debate is not about whether it exists; it’s about what globalization is, what its consequences are, and what kind of framework we can develop for the world to accommodate it. It’s plainly had a lot of positive developments in producing a more
interdependent world. We have to learn to harness those things, and we have to shift away from the kinds of political positions that were dominant for the last few years, and we have to produce a politics which allows us to create an inclusive society locally, nationally, and globally, and to harness these processes for the betterment of human beings.\textsuperscript{238}

In his attempt to provide a better understanding of the nature of globalization, Giddens avers that “globalization is not primarily economic. It’s not solely driven by the global marketplace. It’s actually about what we’re doing now. The driving force of the new globalization is the communications revolution. And if you want to put a technological fix on it, the turning point would be the late 1960s and early 1970s, the first time when there was an effective communications satellite sent up above the earth that made possible instantaneous communication from one part of the world to another.”\textsuperscript{239} He also acknowledges the role of computerization and emphasizes that such marvelous technological transformations have changed more or less the whole of late 20\textsuperscript{th} century history. Of course, he also beware us to remember that technology isn’t unilinear and it doesn’t drive itself, that future isn’t unilinear as history moves dialectically.

In addition to such great concerns of Anthony Giddens with the much debated catchphrase of globalization, what is much in focus and cited by other researchers is Giddens’ definition of the term globalization itself which has been referred to in the middle of this chapter. As the definition sustains, the interaction of the happenings from local or distant locations around the globe has occurred due to the escalation of worldwide social relations – which is, in part, because of the communication revolution.

Among many scholars who have constructed their own idea and analysis on the basis of Giddens’ notion, as it has been mentioned earlier, we shall refer to Ernst Grabovszki who believes that “globalization also means the intensification of literary relations and of communication including that of artistic, i.e., literary communication and production.”\textsuperscript{240} Furthermore, Grabovszki considers seven important parameters as involved in the framework of his empirical approach to the
situation of globalization and world literature. The role and function of literary institutions, the problematics of the development of electronic media and the cultures of information with regard to their technical and content development in their global and regional settings, and the monopoly of media giants are some of those considerations. Here he reaffirms that the new media, especially the internet and World Wide Web highly influence the model of literary communication. Regarding such impact on world literature and the study of literature within the context of globalization, Grabovszki expresses key points to be noticed amongst which we refer to some: “The author is no more an author of “texts” in the traditional sense but has the possibility to add audio-visual and/or pictorial elements (“clips”) to his/her “text” on account of the World Wide Web’s technical spectrum. [Also in some cases] the participants in the process can become its (co-)authors. […] In many instances, in literary production collective authorship replaces the single author associated with his/her proper name and work. This alteration of authorship has an impact on both the form and the content of creative texts. […] With the use of hypertext, the web text itself is subject to a formal – and content-related – reshaping. Reading hypertexts requires a different way of reading than reading books in the traditional tactile mode. We can distinguish between linear reading (books and printed texts) and structural reading (“texts” electronically linked to other “texts”). […] The internet and the World Wide Web as well as other digital media require new abilities and skills from the reader and this also has an impact on the process of reading.”

For the final step, Ernst Grabovszki draws his conclusions on the basis of the mentioned aspects in the modes of influencing the world literature. With the impact of new media, he predicts, an abundance of literary production will occur:

[… ] literature obtains an additional public as well as individual dimension by means of the digital sphere. A consequence of this impact is a democratization of literary production in a range of its processes extended to not only the economics of production but also to the creative process of the production of the primary text and further extends to its scholarship and criticism. On the other hand – and this is a consequence of this democratization – there is much text
in the internet and on the web which most likely would have never been published in the traditional printed form precisely because of the change in the processes of production and adjudication. Therefore, the democratization of literary production and distribution means an increase of the quantity – although not necessarily the quality – of literature.\textsuperscript{242}

Commenting upon Geothe’s notion of world literature, Grabovszki posits that such a literature really finds its most relevant expression in the infinite digital space of today. He further adds that “the notion of the digital space gives rise to the \textit{democratization} and a \textit{decentralization} of the literary system (the primary text as well as its economics and business). However, this decentralization can also be understood in the postcolonial paradigm, although with an important distinction: a constituent aspect of postcolonial discourse is the tension between center and periphery. […] on the one hand, we have the implicit and explicit differentiation between a “home” culture and a culture of the “Other.” […] In new media and its digital space, there are no reasons for such tensions (on the surface?) except maybe between the digital and the “real” or non-virtual space in the sense of a systems theoretical understanding of social interaction. \textbf{In other words, within digital space there is no location of a centre or centers of a cultural or social kind. Consequently, world literature loses its determinable locations.}\textsuperscript{243} Accordingly, these effects take a much larger domain, as Grobovszki avers that, since the “text” and the “producer of the text” travel infinitely in the digital space, then they also become decentralized entities and hybrids “not belonging to any “nation” or even an imagined community because this travel is directed by data and information. “Note that digital space is characterized as a duplicate of real space by the use of the term \textit{netizen}, a “person” travelling in digital space but equipped with the same consciousness and the same rights as a \textit{citizen}. A netizen of digital space is able to be anywhere and the text itself – also literature, for example – is not located anywhere specifically either (although this is not as clear cut as that: the exact location of the web site where a text is “housed” and therefore controlled from may be an analogue of the library of tactile books). Importantly, this is a kind of literature that does not seem to stem from any national or cultural setting but comprises the world as a net,
and thus becomes a world literature in a new sense of the notion. At the same time, this type of “new” world literature is still written by authors with different cultural origins while digital space allows the same authors to produce a literature that contains a conglomerate of different cultural symbols travelling without discernable centers and locations.”

2.4.2. Methodology for Reviewing the Selected Works

As far as the methodology of this study is concerned, there will be a spectrum which contains more directly some of the ideas, concepts, disciplines and theories proposed by three scholars: Ernst Grabovszki, Shashi Deshpande, and Nico Israel. As a matter of fact, with the application of the theorems presented by these authorities we will have a theoretical framework. This means that the theoretical framework is shaped through these scholars’ relevant contributions on the context of relationship between literature and globalization which are already mentioned. In order to keep the unity of the assessments throughout the survey, within this framework each relevant concept or theory from these three pundits will take its appropriate level of significance in relation to each text. Accordingly Pankaj Mishra’s The Romantics and his travelogue Butter Chicken in Ludhiana: Travels in Small Town India and Milan Kundera’s The Joke and The Unbearable Lightness of Being, will be scrutinized by the prism made through this spectrum. As a practical tool for implementing this pattern on the selected works of the two writers, an eclectic approach will be exerted. This means that in order to explore the motif of globality in the selected works of Mishra and Kundera, it will be attempted to examine these texts by distinguishing intra-textual and extra-textual features of them. For the intra-textual scan, the present dissertation focuses on the textual characteristics such as the motifs, themes, characters, tones, images, narrations and so on. Accordingly, by inspecting such structural literary elements, this study tends to consider the relevance of globalization within these literary works. Certainly there will be an effort to find out if globalization is thematized in these texts as it might permeate into the events of the stories or into the lives of the characters. Moreover, by analyzing the extra-textual distinctiveness, the present study will examine the characteristics of the context in which the given texts are located such as the reception of the text, the influence of the text and the popularity of the text as far as possible. This in turn will help the researcher to discern
the location of these texts within the larger domain of globalization. Undoubtedly, a relative proficiency of the modes with which such texts are observed in relation to the phenomenon of globalization, will lead us to the better understanding that literary texts, with their themes and rootedness in the world, with their authorial inputs and readerly constructions are always larger and deeper than their specific references and apparent content.

It is noteworthy to say that as the *sine qua non* of the methodology remains the conviction that literature concretizes a kind of reality or truth about a given environment, a daily existence, a socio-cultural context, about given people, ordinary lives and transactions, then it will be attempted here to show that how in the selected texts both writers have artistically implanted *life* and its various aspects as their structural substance and polished it into a global motif. In the meanwhile it will be attempted to show what we mean by global and globalization in these texts, and also in what ways these works reflect contemporary crises of globalization, since they can be considered as narratives capable of signifying globalization in ways that can make it meaningful.
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