ARTICULATING THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURAL STUDIES

edited by Ann Cvetkovich and Douglas Kellner

POLITICS AND CULTURE 5

ARTICULATING THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

POLITICS AND CULTURE

Avery Gordon and Michael Ryan, *editors*

Politics and Culture is a serial publication that publishes material from a diverse number of disciplinary perspectives, from literature to law, from anthropology to political science, from cultural studies to sociology. The serial is concerned with the political significance of cultural forms and practices as well as with the cultural character of social institutions and political formations.

5

POLITICS AND CULTURE

ARTICULATING THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

Globalization and Cultural Studies

edited by

ANN CVETKOVICH

DOUGLAS KELLNER

Politics and Culture

Contents

PART ONE
THEORIZING THE GLOBAL
AND THE LOCAL

PART TWO
CULTURAL STUDIES AND
THE LOCATIONS OF CULTURE

PART THREE
TRANSLOCAL CONNECTIONS

ARTICULATING THE GLOBAL AND THE LOCAL

Introduction: Thinking Global and Local

ANN CVETKOVICH & DOUGLAS KELLNER

As globalization confronts local traditions throughout the world, influencing all levels of social life, arguments concerning tensions and conflicts between global and local forces traverse contemporary theory. Both modern and postmodern theorists argue that the world today is organized by increasing globalization, which is strengthening the dominance of a world capitalist economic system, supplanting the primacy of the nation-state by transnational corporations and organizations, and eroding local cultures and traditions through a global culture.[1] Marxists, advocates of worlds-systems theory, functionalists, Weberians, and many other contemporary theorists are converging on the position that globalization is a distinguishing trend of the present moment. Even some advocates of a postmodern break in history argue that developments in transnational capitalism are producing a new global historical configuration of post-Fordism, or postmodernism as a new cultural logic of capitalism (Harvey 1989; Soja 1989; Jameson 1991; Gottdiener 1995). In significant modern and postmodern social theories, globalization is thus taken as a salient feature of our times.

Yet an equally wide range of theorists have argued that the proliferation of difference and the shift to more local discourses and practices define the contemporary scene and that theory and politics should shift from the level of globalization and its often totalizing and reductive macrotheories to focus on the local, the specific, the particular, the heterogeneous, and the microlevel of everyday experience. Indeed, a wide range of theories associated with poststructuralism, postmodernism, feminism, and multiculturalism focuses on difference, otherness, marginality, the personal, the particular, and the concrete over more general theory and politics that aim at more global or universal conditions.[2]

Dichotomies, such as those between the global and the local, express contradictions and tensions between crucial constitutive forces of the present moment; consequently, it is a mistake to overlook focus on one side in favor of exclusive concern with the other (rejecting the local and particularity, for instance, in favor of exclusive concern with the global, or rejecting the global and all macrostructures for exclusive concern with the local). Our challenge is to think through the relationship between the global and the local by observing how global forces in-

1

fluence and even structure ever more local situations and ever more strikingly. One should also see how local forces and situations mediate the global, inflecting global forces to diverse ends and conditions and producing unique configurations for thought and action in the contemporary world.

Indeed, in many diverse fields and disciplines, theorists are beginning to consider how global, systemic, and macrostructures and forces interact with local, particular, and micro-conditions and -structures. Such dialectical optics attempt to theorize the intersection of the global and the local, how they interact and mediate each other, and the new constellations being produced by their current interactions. In this way, one overcomes the partiality and one-sidedness of undialectical theories that fail to perceive the ways that the global and the local interact so as to produce new social and cultural constellations.

Analogous to the question of conceptualizing the interactions of the global and the local on the level of theory, debates have emerged over the proper locus and focus of politics today. Some theorists argue that global and national problems require macrostructural solutions; others argue that the proper sphere of the political is the local and the personal, not the global or national. Postmodern theories of power, for instance, have stressed how power inhabits local, specific, and micro realms, ignored by modern theories that located powers in centers such as the economy, the state, or patriarchy. Postmodern politics urges local and specific actions to intervene in discursive sites of power ranging from the bedroom to the classroom, from prisons to mental institutions.[3]

Here too the old modern and new postmodern politics seem one-sided. Power resides in both macro *and* micro institutions; it is indeed proliferating with new configurations of global, national, regional, and more properly local forces and relations of power generating new conflicts and sites of struggle ranging from debates over "the new world order"—or disorder as it may appear to many—to struggles over local control of schools or the environment. Rethinking politics with these conditions in mind thus requires thinking through the complex interconnection of the global and the local. Theorizing the configurations of the global and the local also requires developing new multidimensional strategies ranging from the macro to the micro, the national to the local, to intervene in a wide range of contemporary and emerging problems and struggles. The following paragraphs will attempt to contextualize the need to think together the global and the local, and the studies collected in this book will exemplify this project.

Globalization: Economy/State/Culture

The term *globalization* is often used as a code word that stands for a tremendous diversity of issues and problems and that serves as a front for a variety of theoretical and political positions. It might serve as a substitute term for modernization and thus continue as a legitimating ideology for the westernization of the world, obscuring cultural differences and struggles. Globalization might replace

concepts such as imperialism, therefore displacing focus on the domination of developing countries by the overdeveloped ones or on national and local economies by transnational corporations. Yet a critical globalization theory can inflect the discourse to point precisely to these phenomena and can elucidate a series of contemporary problems and conflicts.

In view of the different concepts and functions of globalization discourse, it is important to note that the concept is a theoretical construct that varies according to the assumptions and commitments of the theory in question. We use the term to describe the ways global economic, political, and cultural forces are rapidly penetrating the earth in the creation of a new world market, new transnational political organizations, and a new global culture. The expansion of the capitalist world market into areas previously closed to it (i.e., in the communist sphere or developing countries that attempted to pursue their own independent line of development) is accompanied by the decline of the nation-state and its power to regulate and control the flow of goods, people, information, and various cultural forms. Globalization involves systematically overcoming distances of space and time and the emergence of new international institutions and forces.

Globalization is not, however, an entirely new phenomenon. There have, of course, been global networks of power and imperialist empires for centuries, accompanied by often fierce local resistance by the colonized entities. National liberation movements disrupted colonial empires of power and created a "third way" between the capitalist and communist blocs, especially in the period after World War II, marked by the success of a large number of anti-imperialist revolutions. But as we approach the end of the twentieth century, it would seem that neither decolonization nor the end of the cold war has loosened the hold of transnational systems of domination.

Globalization also involves the dissemination of new technologies that have tremendous impact on the economy, polity, society, culture, and everyday life. Time-space compression produced by new media and communications technologies are overcoming previous boundaries of space and time, creating a global cultural village and dramatic penetration of global forces into every realm of life in every region of the world. New technologies in the labor process displace living labor, make possible more flexible production, and create new labor markets, with some areas undergoing deindustrialization (e.g., the rust belt of the Midwest in the United States), while production itself becomes increasingly transnational (Harvey 1989). The new technologies also create new industries, such as the computer and information industry, and allow transnational media and information instantaneously to traverse the globe (Morley and Robins 1995). This process has led some to celebrate a new global information superhighway and others to attack the new wave of media and cultural imperialism.

Yet the very concept of globalization has long been a contested terrain described in conflicting normative discourses that provide the concept with positive, negative, or ambivalent connotations. It is perhaps the early theorists and

critics of capitalism who first engaged the phenomenon of the globalization of the capitalist system. Not surprisingly, the defenders of capitalism, such as Adam Smith, saw the process positively, whereas Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels had more critical perceptions. Producing one of the first major discourses of globalization, Smith saw the European "discoveries" of the Americas and the passage to the East Indies as creating a new world market with highly significant consequences. Smith wrote:

> Their consequences have already been great; but, in the short period of between two and three centuries which has elapsed since these discoveries were made, it is impossible that the whole extent of their consequences can have been seen. What benefits, or what misfortunes to mankind may hereafter result from these events, no human wisdom can foresee. By uniting, in some measure, the most distant parts of the world, by enabling them to relieve one another's wants, to increase one another's enjoyments, and to encourage one another's industry, their general tendency would seem to be beneficial. To the natives, however, both of the East and West Indies, all the commercial benefits which can have resulted from these events have been sunk and lost in the dreadful misfortunes which they have occasioned. These misfortunes, however, seem to have arisen rather from accident than from any thing in the nature of those events themselves. At the particular time when these discoveries were made, the *superiority of force* happened to be so great on the side of the Europeans, that they were enabled to commit with impunity every sort of injustice in those remote countries. Hereafter, perhaps, the natives of those countries may grow stronger, or those of Europe may grow weaker, and the inhabitants of all the different quarters of the world may arrive at that equality of courage and force which, by inspiring mutual fear, can alone overawe the injustice of independent nations into some sort of respect for the rights of one another. But nothing seems more likely to establish this equality of force than that mutual communication of knowledge and of all sorts of improvements which an extensive commerce from all countries to all countries naturally, or rather necessarily, carries along with it (Smith 1962, Vol. 2, 141).

Smith thus envisaged the emergence of a world market system as one of the most important features of modernity that would eventually benefit the entire world. Although perceiving the injustices of unequal relations of power and force, Smith generally appraised the globalization of the world market as "beneficial." With characteristic honesty, he cited the "misfortunes" of the process of colonization but optimistically believed the injustices of the process might be overcome. In "The Communist Manifesto," Marx and Engels followed Smith in seeing the importance of the globalization of the capitalist market, although, of course, they differed in their evaluation of it. Following the optic of Smith, they claimed:

> Modern industry has established the world market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. . . . [The] need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere. . . . The bour-

geoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian nations into civilization. . . . In a word, it creates a world after its own image (Marx and Engels 1976, 486ff).

Both the classical liberalism of Smith and classical Marxism see capitalism as a global economic system characterized by a world market and the imposition of similar relations of production, commodities, and culture on areas throughout the world, creating a new modern world system as the capitalist market penetrates the four corners of the earth. For both classical liberalism and Marxism, the bourgeoisie constantly revolutionized the instruments of production and the world market generated immense forces of commerce, navigation and discovery, communications, and industry, creating a new world of abundance, diversity, and prosperity:

> In place of the old wants, satisfied by the production of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations. 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 (Marx and Engels 1976, 488).

The preceding passage points to the resources and positive results of the world market that provide the basis for a higher stage of social organization. But in the Marxian vision, the globalization process is appraised more ambiguously. For Marx and Engels, the world market produced a new class of industrial proletariat that was reduced to abstract labor power, rendered propertyless, and had "nothing to lose but its chains" and a world to win. Marx and Engels believed that the industrial proletariat would organize as a revolutionary class to overthrow capitalism and produce a new socialist society that would abolish poverty, inequality, exploitation, and alienated labor, making possible the full development of the individual and a more equitable division of social wealth. They also envisaged the possibility of a world global crisis that would generate world revolution, enveloping the earth in a titanic struggle between capital and its opponents. Working class revolutionaries would be resolutely internationalist and cosmopolitan in the Marxian vision, seeing themselves as citizens of the world rather than members of specific nations.

Curiously, the Marxian theory shared the illusions of many market liberals that the development of a world system of free trade would eliminate nationalism and the nation-state, with both downplaying their importance, in a new world economic system—be it capitalist or communist.[4] Both Smith and Marx present colonization and the globalization of the market society as inevitable and as the basis of material progress. Both recognize the injustices of the process for the victims

of colonization and the use of violence and superior force to subjugate non-Western culture, but both are sanguine about the process and draw distinctions between "barbarian nations" and civilizations that ultimately present globalization as a "civilizing process"—this would indeed emerge as one of the dominant ideologies of imperialism (which the Marxian tradition otherwise opposes).

Indeed, globalization has also had important political implications. As Giovanni Arrighi documents, colonization benefited successively the Italian city-states, Holland, and England, which accrued political power and, in the case of England, world empire through their role in trade, the establishment of colonies, and finance and industry. In the aftermath of World War II, the United States emerged as a dominant global power and at this time world-systems theory described "the creation of a system of national states and the formation of a world-wide capitalist system" as "the two interdependent master processes of the [modern] era" (Tilly 1984, 147). Both Marxism and world-systems theory stress the importance of the rise to global dominance of a capitalist market economy that is penetrating the entire globe, while world-systems theory stresses the equal importance of a system of national states.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union and its satellite nations—which provided the bulwark of a global alternative to a capitalist market system—the capitalist market is now largely unopposed by any system of nation-states, including those that emerged out of opposition to colonial domination, with few corners of the world able to resist the global flow of capital and its products. Indeed, a world market economy disseminates throughout the planet fantasies of happiness through consumption and the products that allow entry into the phantasmagoria of consumer capitalism. A world financial market circulates capital in international circuits that bind together the world in a global market dominated by the forces and institutions of finance capital. Capitalist modernization circles the globe, producing new products and fashions while eroding tradition and national economies and identities.

Global economic change often has tremendous local impact. Whole regions are devastated with the shutting down of industrial production, moved to regions with lower wages and less government regulation. Such deindustrialization has created vast rust belts of previously prosperous industrial regions, as in the case of Flint, Michigan, which suffered major economic decline with the closing of General Motors automobile plants, documented in Michael Moore's film *Roger and Me*.[5] Automation, computers, and new technologies have eliminated entire categories of labor; corporate reorganization has abolished segments of management, producing vast unemployment. More than ever, the world economy is bound together so that hurricanes in Japan or financial irregularities in Britain influence the entire world.

Consequently, globalization involves "the intensification of world-wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (Giddens 1990, 64).

Especially during the period of the cold war arising after World War II, the system of modern nation-states divided into two camps—capitalist and socialist—producing a shifting series of alliances and conflicts influencing countries from Vietnam to Nicaragua. During this period, nations either pursued the capitalist or socialist model of development or in the case of some so-called Third World nations, attempted to forge their own paths of development. As the term suggests, the so-called Third World nations created by decolonization were often considered less important to global affairs than the conflict between the world superpowers. Moreover, the dominant binaristic cold war model provided a convenient rubric for economic, political, and cultural intervention into Third World affairs, dividing the world into a global field of conflict between the two superpowers with much of the planet caught in the middle.

But with the collapse of the communist system, this period of history came to an end and during the 1990s the capitalist market model of globalization has become dominant and practically uncontested.[6] The analogue of such economic globalization is said to be the triumph of democracy throughout the world with its discourse and institutions of a pluralistic system of checks and balances with parties, elections, and human rights (Fukuyama 1992). For some decades, indeed, democracy has been interpreted as the necessary accompaniment and/or condition of capitalism (Walt Rostow, Milton Friedman, Francis Fukuyama), while a tradition of critical theory documents the tensions and conflicts between democracy and capitalism.[7]

And yet the decline of the power of the nation-state produces a new geopolitical matrix in which transnational organizations, corporations, and forces challenge national and local sites of power and influence. In the wake of political developments such as decolonization, the end of the cold war, the formation of new trade agreements and political unions, and the rise of global transnational capitalism, national borders have shifted, resulting in the increased power of transnational institutions. Accompanying such momentous political changes are the increasing prominence of world trade, financial speculations and investment, and global cultural forces that operate outside the confines of the nation-state as a discrete entity (Held 1995).

In addition to the development of a new global market economy and shifting system of nation-states, we consider the rise of global culture especially salient during the present moment. Accompanying the dramatic expansion of capitalism and new transnational political organizations is a new global culture, emerging as a result of computer and communications technology; a consumer society with its panorama of goods and services; transnational forms of architecture and design; and a wide range of products and social forms that are traversing national boundaries and becoming part of a new world culture. Global culture includes the proliferation of media technologies that veritably create Marshall McLuhan's dream of a global village in which people all over the world watch political spectacles like the Gulf War, major sports events, entertainment programs, and ad-

vertisements that relentlessly promote capitalist modernization (Wark 1994). At the same time, more and more people are entering into global computer networks that instantaneously circulate ideas, information, and images throughout the world, overcoming boundaries of space and time.

Global culture involves promoting lifestyle, consumption, products, and identities. Transnational corporations deploy advertising to penetrate local markets, to sell global products, and to overcome local resistance; moreover, expansion of private cable and satellite systems have aggressively promoted a commercial culture throughout the world. In a sense, culture itself is being redefined, for previously local and national cultures have been forces of resistance to global forces, protecting the traditions, identities, and modes of life of specific groups and peoples. Culture has been precisely the particularizing, localizing force that distinguished societies and people from each other. Culture provided forms of local identities, practices, and modes of everyday life that could serve as a bulwark against the invasion of ideas, identities, and forms of life extraneous to the specific local region in question. We argue that culture is an especially complex and contested terrain today as global cultures permeate local ones and new configurations emerge that synthesize both poles, providing contradictory forces of neocolonization *and* resistance, global homogenization and new local hybrid forms and identities.

The problematic of culture had been excluded from many previous forms of globalization and modernization theory that tended toward economic, technological, or political determinism. Our studies will highlight the importance of culture and in turn will call on cultural studies to focus on globalization and the dialectic of the global and the local that provides the matrix for the studies collected in this book. It is curious indeed how classical liberalism, Marxism, and modernization theory neglected culture and local forms of social association, positing the inexorable advance of the modern economy, technology, and politics, which would supposedly level out and homogenize all societies and cultures, producing a world global culture. Capitalism with its world market and communism with its international socioeconomic system and political culture were supposed to erode cultural differences, regional particularities, nationalism, and traditionalism. Thus, both classical liberalism and Marxism promoted or predicted globalization as the fate of the world: For capitalist ideologues, the market was going to produce a global world culture, whereas for Marxism the proletariat was going to produce communism that would eliminate nationalism and create a communist international without exploitation or war. Both saw the significance of national borders being eliminated and both seriously underestimated the endurance of nationalism and the nation-state.

Missing from both Marxist and liberal models has been an understanding of how race, ethnicity, and nationalist sentiment might intersect with class to produce local, political struggles with complex causes. Indeed, since the late 1980s there has been a resurgence of nationalism, traditionalism, and religious fundamentalism alongside trends toward growing globalization. The explosion of re-

gional, cultural, and religious differences in the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia—as well as explosive tribal conflicts in Africa and elsewhere—suggests that globalization and homogenization were not as deep as its proponents hoped and critics feared. Culture has thus become a new source of conflict and an important dimension of struggle between the global and the local. National cultures have produced confrontations between Serbs, Muslims, and Croats; Armenians and Azerbaijanis; Mohawk First Nation peoples and Quebecois; and in South Africa struggles between the Umkatha tribe and the African National Congress (ANC). Thus, both culture and nationalism turned out to be more enduring, deeper, and more fundamental than expected, and clashes between conflicting national and regional cultures continue in a supposedly globalized world.

It is also in the realm of culture that globalization is most visible and apparent. Global media and information systems and a world capitalist consumer culture circulate products, images, and ideas throughout the world. Events such as the Gulf War; social trends and fashions; and cultural phenomena such as Madonna, rap music, and popular Hollywood films are distributed through global cultural distribution networks and constitute global forms of popular culture. This global culture, however, operates precisely through the multiplication of different products, services, and spectacles targeted at specific audiences. Consumer and media industries are becoming more differentiated and are segmenting their customers and audiences into more categories. In many cases, this involves the simulation of minor differences of fashion and style as significant, but it also involves a proliferation of a more highly differentiated culture and society in terms of an ever-expanding variety and diversity of cultural artifacts, products, and services.

However, there has also been a significant eruption of subcultures of resistance that have attempted to preserve specific forms of culture and society against globalization and homogenization. Indeed, subcultures have been a major focus of cultural studies since the 1970s when new subjects of political resistance were found in youth subcultures and the subcultures of women, gays and lesbians, blacks and ethnic minorities, and other groups that have resisted incorporation into the hegemonic mainstream culture. Cultural studies has explored both mainstream hegemonic cultures and oppositional subcultures. It has focused on articulations of class, race, gender, sexual preference, ethnicity, region, and nation in its explorations of concrete cultural configurations and phenomena.[8] And as our research indicates, cultural studies has also taken on a global focus, analyzing how transnational forces intervene in concrete situations and how cultural mediations can inflect the sway of such global configurations.

Culture, Identity, and Hybridization

The problem of identity has come to the forefront of attention in recent times. On one hand, as a form of resistance, emphasis on national and individual identity has emerged as a response to homogenizing global forces. On the other hand,

ever-proliferating globalization produces new configurations of identity—national, local, and personal. The flow of products, culture, capital, and information is accompanied by flows of people and emigration (see Hall 1991; Lash and Urry 1994, 171ff.). A transnational diaspora from every continent involving vast migrations of peoples and individuals produces the conditions for new transnational hybridized cultures and identities. Salman Rushdie's collection of stories *East, West* (1994) describes the new hybridization of cultures and identities and the conflicts and choices globalization forces on individuals in search of identity and values. After receiving a British passport, one of Rushdie's Indian characters tells how the document allows him to make more choices and have more freedom than previously.

> But I, too, have ropes around my neck, I have them to this day, pulling me this way and that, East and West, the nooses tightening, commanding, *choose, choose.*
> I buck, I snort, I whinny, I rear, I kick. Ropes, I do not choose between you. Lassoes, lariats, I choose neither of you, and both. Do you hear? I refuse to choose.[9]

As the preceding passage indicates, even individual identity is more and more a question of articulating often conflicting cultural elements into new types of hybridized identity that combine national cultures with global ideas and images. Gurinder Chadha's 1994 British Film Institute documentary *I'm British, but . . .* depicts the various hybridizations between immigrant Asian youth and various regions of Great Britain with some of the young people interviewed describing themselves as Scottish-Asian, or Welsh-Pakistani, or English-Indian—always with one or another form of hybrid identity. In many countries, there is a struggle over cultural identity. In the 1980s in the United States for example, the term African-American increasingly came to replace black, although as Michael Hanchard points out (1990), the term African-American is a transnational term that should encompass many identities created by the African diaspora, not just U.S. citizens. Rap artists even appropriated the tabooed term "nigger" as a badge of in-group identification and to signify the denigration of people of color in a white-dominant culture.

The confluence of global culture with local and national culture is appraised quite differently. For some, a global media culture provides new sources for pleasures and identities that redefine gender, new role models and fantasies, and new cultural experiences. These lead to the fragmentation of old identities and subjectivities, and the constructions of new identities out of the multifarious and sometimes conflicting configurations of traditional, local, national, and now global forces of the present time. From this perspective, the intersection of the global and the local is producing new matrixes to legitimize the production of hybrid identities, thus expanding the realm of self-definition. And so although global forces can be oppressive and erode cultural traditions and identities they can also provide new material to rework one's identity and can empower people to revolt against traditional forms and styles to create new, more emancipatory ones.

For some theorists, this allegedly postmodern heterogeneity is positive, but for others it makes it easier to manipulate fragmented selves into consumer identities, synthetic models produced by the culture industries. From this perspective, the fragmentation and even dissolution of traditional identities result in superficial changes of fashion and style that reconceive identity in terms of looks and attitudes as opposed to fundamental commitments, choices, and action.[10] New postmodern selves who go from moment to moment without making fundamental choices or commitments live on the surface, lost in the funhouse of hyperreal media images and the play of floating signifiers, themselves becoming mere images and signifiers in the postmodern carnival.

Most of the new global populars that produce resources for identity come from North American media industries, thus from this perspective globalization becomes a form of Americanization. Figures of the global popular such as Rambo, Madonna, Beavis and Butt-Head, gangsta rappers, and other figures from U.S. culture produce seductive models for new identities that find their adherents all over the world. But precisely such global figures can be appropriated locally to provide new hybridized models of identity. Global culture is indeed disseminating throughout the world; new fashion, style, sexuality, and images are appropriated in many ways by individuals in specific local situations. But global models are confronted by national, regional, and traditional models in many parts of the world.

In Asian countries, such as Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, there are intense clashes among traditional, national, and global models of identity. Traditional culture and religion continue to play an important role in everyday life, and compromises and syntheses are often constructed between traditional and modernizing global forces. Likewise, on the level of culture, young musicians often combine traditional musical forms with contemporary transnational ones or produce specific forms like Chinese rap or Japanese heavy metal. And on the level of sports, countries like Japan play baseball but in ways that reinforce traditional Japanese values and structures. Such a synthesis and hybridization is highly uneven, however. Singapore uses authoritarian state measures to protect traditional culture; Japan uses more paternalistic measures to privilege national culture; and Hong Kong and Taiwan are more open and laissez-faire.

In Europe, Asia, and Latin America, for example, MTV is adapted to local conditions and produces new hybrid forms. Indeed, the defining characteristics of global media culture are the contradictory forces of identity and difference, homogeneity and heterogeneity, the global and the local impinging on each other, clashing, or simply peacefully coexisting—or producing new symbioses as in the motto of MTV Latino that combines English and Spanish: *Chequenos!*—meaning "Check us out!" Yet globalization by and large means the hegemony of transnational cultural industries, largely American. In Canada, for instance, about 95 percent of films in movie theaters are American; U.S. television dominates Canadian television; seven American firms control distribution of sound recordings in Canada; and 80 percent of the magazines on newsstands are non-Canadian.[11] In

Latin America and Europe the situation is similar: American media culture, commodities, fast food, and malls are creating a new global culture that is remarkably similar on all continents.[12]

Today, under the pressure of the dialectics of the global and the local, identity has global, national, regional, and local components, as well as the specificities of gender, race, class, and sexuality. Identity construction is thus heavily overdetermined, and the dialectics of the global and the local are producing new conflicts in which choices must be made concerning what features will define national and individual identity. This situation is highly contradictory with reassertions of traditional modes of identity in response to globalization and a contradictory melange of hybrid identities—and no doubt significant identity crises—all over the world. From this perspective, celebrations of or attacks against allegedly postmodern selves miss the dynamics of the conflicts between the global and the local, which problematize self-hood, create the need for new choices and commitments, and produce new possibilities for the creation of identities that could be empowering.

Indeed, seeing identity as a construct rather than as a given, as something to be made and created rather than as an essential bedrock of personality, can empower people to increase their range of choices and can challenge individuals to choose to create their own unique selves and communities. The problematic of the global and the local can thus produce new insights into the construction of identity and show how identity today is more complex. Not only is there a proliferation of postmodern reconstructions of identity through image, but once again, tradition, religion, and nationalism must be confronted as forces that remain fundamental to the contemporary world and that continue to play important roles in national and personal life. Expanded modernization and globalization also create, as Anthony Giddens and others argue, increased capacities for reflexivity that put in question both traditional and novel forms, sorting out positive or negative features—terms that will obviously be different for different individuals.

Rethinking identity requires openness to new forms of global identity or citizenship. If democracy is to play a genuinely progressive role globally, nationally, and locally, new ways must be created for citizens to participate in the different levels and dimensions that constitute their lives. In response to proliferating globalization, societies and individuals must rethink the problematics of democratization and the site and scope of democracy. Modern societies were predicated on the basis of a nation-state that would govern the area within its boundaries. Modern democratic theory gave citizens rights within their polis and, in theory at least, sovereignty over their common affairs—although there have been centuries of struggles over those rights and citizenship. But the space of both the nation-state and the power of its citizens are potentially undermined or are at least redefined in a new era of transnational corporations; a global information and media economy; supranational political and financial institutions; and the rapid penetration of national and regional boundaries by a cornucopia of prod-

ucts, services, and images from a global culture. Consequently, new modes of re-thinking politics and democracy are necessary to respond to the new configurations of the global and the local.

Theorizing the Global and the Local

Configurations of the global and the local constitute the economic, political, social, cultural, and even personal matrixes within which individuals increasingly live and die, define themselves, and experience the world today. The contributions collected in this book explore how discourses of the local, the particular, the everyday, and the situated are being transformed by new discourses of globalization and transnationalism, as used both by government and business and in critical academic discourse. The essays contribute to current discussions of globalization and local cultural transformations that describe the economics, politics, and culture of what appear to be dramatically new geopolitical maps of the present age. They explore the impact of the new forces of globalization on local and specific conditions and how local cultures and forces adapt to, appropriate, inflect, and rework global phenomena.

In particular, most of the contributors focus on the importance of culture, both in terms of articulations of global culture and its impact on specific situations, as well as on the ways local subcultures of resistance can preserve their specificities and uniqueness against global forces, or appropriate global forces and culture for their own ends. Contextualizing these essays, however, requires further reflection on the discourse of the global and the local and the complex problematics in which they are emerging as central in contemporary theoretical and political debates.

In attempting to conceptualize the terms of the global and the local it is first important to divest them of normative baggage, especially conceptualizations that would positively valorize one side of the equation and denigrate the other. For instance, it would be a mistake to theorize the global as merely homogenizing, universalizing, and abstract in some pejorative and leveling sense in opposition to a more heterogeneous, particularizing, and concrete local sphere. Such a discourse labels the global in advance as a purely negative and oppressive force while assuming that the local is more positive and commendable. Globalizing forces such as human rights can be progressive in some local contexts, and indeed the local has often been the site of the most oppressive, patriarchal, and backward forms of domination against which more global and universalizing forces have progressive effects in eroding domination and oppression.

One should be equally suspicious of purely positive and uncritical normative discourses of the global. In many mainstream social theories, the discourse of the global is bound up with ideological discourses of modernization and modernity, and from Saint-Simon and Marx through Habermas and Parsons, globalization and modernization are interpreted in terms of progress, novelty and innovation,

and a generally beneficial negation of the old, the traditional, and the obsolete. In this discourse of modernization, the global is presented as a progressive modernizing force; the local stands for backwardness, superstition, underdevelopment, and the oppressiveness of tradition.

With such highly charged terms, one needs to be very careful of their use and connotations. With these considerations in mind, we propose theorizing the global as that matrix of transnational economic, political, and cultural forces that are circulating throughout the globe and producing universal, global conditions, often transversing and even erasing previously formed national and regional boundaries. But the concept of the global also includes those constituents of class, gender, and race that cut across local differences and that provide fundamental axes of power and subordination, constituting the structures around which contemporary societies are organized. In particular, we oppose seeing categories such as gender as merely local, for such categorizations reproduce the dichotomies that, for instance, divide society into the private and the public and that often equate the feminine with the private, or local, as opposed to the public and global domain implicitly gendered as masculine. Discourses of the local or the specific can thus consign women to the margins, cut off from public culture, while forcing men to define themselves in terms of their roles within the public domain alone.

The personal and affective dimensions of cultural experience, the focus of many of the articles in this collection, have often been neglected because of the gendering of these domains as feminine, with the result that analyses of the global remain invisibly masculinist. Although the local and global might be understood as two different directions from which to challenge the viability of nationalism as a category of political, economic, and cultural analysis, they should not necessarily be understood on the quantitative or spatial model of a continuum between smaller (local) and bigger (global) spaces or places. Other grids of power and space, such as race and gender, can require a different way of conceiving the relations between the local and the global. For example, a gendered analysis of the relation between public and private spheres might question the mechanisms by which certain locations, such as the boardroom or the legislature, are considered more global in their impact than other sites, such as the bedroom or the kitchen.

One of the most eloquent analysts of this danger is Cynthia Enloe, who has discussed, for example, the role of marital and sexual relations in international politics in *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases* (1989). For Enloe, the local is an aspect of the global rather than a discrete or separate space. Global or international analysis must consider phenomena such as the marriages of national leaders, the birth control methods of women soldiers, and the culture of prostitution that flourishes around international military bases. In *The Morning After* (1993), Enloe demonstrates that militarism is crucially founded on ideologies of masculinity and hence grounded in questions of gender and sexuality. Those who proclaim a new global culture following the end of the cold war might consider the implications of her claim that the demilitarization of culture cannot take place merely

through the dissolution of national borders; a reconfiguration of the gendered and sexualized relations that sustain military culture, including intimate and personal relations, is also required.

Without attention to categories such as the personal, the feminine, and the sexual, any discussion of politics—whether national, international, or transnational—will be lacking. It would be unfortunate if discourses of globalization and transnationalism continued to perpetuate the problems of discourses of nationalism given the challenges they offer to the debate about nationalism. In their introduction to *Scattered Hegemonies,* Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan (1994) evaluate the absence of feminist analysis in many global theories of postmodernity and postcoloniality and propose the use of the term "transnational" to "problematize a purely locational politics of global-local or counter-periphery in favor of what Mattelart sees as the lines cutting across them. As feminists who note the absence of gender issues in all of these world-system theories, we have no choice but to challenge what we see as inadequate and inaccurate binary divisions" (13). Without refusing the use of the terms "global" and "local," we also seek to challenge binaristic understandings of this dichotomy, especially as it is transformed by categories of gender and sexuality.

Many of the essays in this collection conceive of the local in ways that intervene against the tendency to map the local/global onto the dichotomy between the national and the transnational. Central to this effort is their concern with gender and sexuality and hence with the complexity of locations where those categories of identity and experience have been most immediately visible, such as the family. The local then, in contrast to the global, describes in our usage those constellations of conditions that are particular and specific according to country, region, tradition, and other determinants, such as the creation and preservation of local subcultures. Yet we would problematize absolute dichotomies and distinctions among these terms, as if they referred to discrete and separate domains of experience. Given that there have been centuries of colonization, there is no pure or "authentic" local that is untouched by global developments (Srebereny-Mohammadi 1993, 106ff.), so that the concept of the local itself is a discursive concept defined against its ideal type opposite.

Indeed, it is important to note that both the global and the local are cultural constructs and thus subject to discussion, debate, and development. Such terms are ideal types that delineate constellations of phenomena and in this case indicate opposing domains that are articulated into various configurations and constellations that include the features described in both dimensions. As noted, the local itself is a hybrid construct that is often formed out of regional, national, and even global forces. This is especially true today when there are few corners of the world immune from the viral forces of a global consumer and media culture and when global forces offer resources for local constellations.

Yet the concept of the global is also a theoretical construct, and there are serious debates concerning how to theorize it. Structuralists stress the importance of

fundamental and enduring economic, political, and cultural structures and insti-
tutions that organize contemporary life. Poststructuralists such as Arjun
Appardurai (1990), by contrast, characterize global culture as a series of "flows"
of people, technology, goods, money, and ideas, which exist in an often "disjunc-
tive" relation to one another. His model questions constructs of the global that
ascribe fundamental significance to the economy, even those models, such as
Fredric Jameson's, that focus on the "cultural logic" of late capitalism (1991).

Discourses of transnationalism and globalization emerge from a tradition of
describing capitalism, but certain forms of poststructuralism reject macrotheory
and attack previous discourses, arguing that new economic, cultural, and politi-
cal processes require new analytic models to describe them. In particular, among
critical and oppositional groups, interest in globalization has been generated not
only by the urgency of describing new developments in the history of capitalism,
of charting the economic underpinnings of the current geopolitical map, but by
the sense that in addition to the decline of the power of the nation-state, nation-
alism for many is no longer a political ideal.[13] Discourses of globalization and
transnationalism have helped to explain the fate of Third World nationalisms,
which initially provided the rubric for independence from colonial rule but sub-
sequently failed to galvanize economic or cultural prosperity. Masao Miyoshi
(1993), for example, argues that the spread of transnational corporations, in-
creasingly less tied to a single national identity, becomes colonialism under an-
other guise, thus challenging the implication of the term "postcolonialism" that
colonialism is over.

The concept we are proposing for mediating the global and the local is thus *ar-
ticulation*. Articulation describes how various societal components are organized
into an event such as the Gulf War or a phenomenon like Madonna. Madonna
has been able to market and publicize a set of images that appeal to diverse au-
diences all over the world, producing a global popular. Analysis of figures such as
Madonna is important not only because she reveals the global reach of media cul-
ture, but because she exemplifies how issues such as race and sexuality are in-
creasingly articulated through culture rather than politics in the narrow sense.[14]

The figure of Madonna is distributed through global media conglomerates and
received in specific contexts in which she is appropriated according to local con-
cerns, thus articulating in her reception an interconnection of the global and the
local. A global phenomenon like Madonna, however, can be articulated in highly
contradictory ways. Madonna wanna-bes all over the world imitate her style and
fashion moves and perhaps make her their role model. But this might serve to in-
tegrate young fans into the dominant system of style and fashion in the consumer
society or to rebel against dominant models to create their own style and look. It
may make her audience conform to dominant roles of beauty and sexuality or le-
gitimate revolt against middle-class norms that empower young women to define
themselves and choose their own pleasures, sexualities, and identities. "Madonna"
will therefore be articulated very differently according to the class, ethnicity, sex-