

**Scholte, J. (2005): *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstroke: Palgrave Macmillan.**

#### **Chapter 4 – Explaining globalization**

Having developed a definition of globalization and tracked a history of the trend, this book's analysis can proceed to the no less thorny issue of explanation. Why and by what dynamics has the spread of transplanetary (including supraterritorial) connectivity occurred? What has made globalization happen? This question is crucial not only to satisfy intellectual curiosity, but also to inform policy action. In order to anticipate possible future courses of globalization and to shape those processes in desired directions, it is necessary to understand the forces that have generated the development and brought it to its present position. Viable explanation provides grounds for sound prediction, prescription and action. Given this crucial importance of explanation, it is surprising – and disappointing – to find that existing research on globalization has given this matter comparatively little attention. In fact, the present book is one of relatively few in the burgeoning literature on globalization that devotes a chapter specifically to explaining the trend. Most other works have tended to make only passing and fairly unspecific reference to conditions such as capitalism, modernity, technological change, or US hegemony as forces behind globalization. Many accounts have not explicitly addressed issues of causation at all. Of course no explanation of globalization can be completely adequate, but that unavoidable shortfall does not justify skirting the question. Much as there are multiple possible definitions and periodizations of globalization, so too there are multiple explanations on offer. Some accounts have, methodologically, a more materialist character, locating the forces that produce globalization in economics and ecology. Other explanations take a methodologically more idealist approach, putting the emphasis on cultural and psychological causes. In addition, the various theoretical frameworks advance different accounts of the key actors, structures and historical dynamics that have generated globalization. The diverse perspectives also highlight different core issues and (implicitly if not explicitly) promote different interests. Accordingly, each type of explanatory framework tends to point towards different sorts of policy prescriptions. The first part of this chapter reviews a broad menu of available theories for explaining globalization. In turn a succession of subsections examine liberalism, political realism, Marxism, constructivism, postmodernism, and feminism. Each of these six perspectives is found to provide distinctive insights towards an explanation of globalization, but all are also limited by excessive parsimony. That is, in each case the analytical need to simplify is taken to the point of oversimplification, where the explanation offered is unsustainably narrow. Too much is left out. The second part of the chapter synthesizes key insights from the various theoretical frameworks in a multifaceted social explanation of globalization. This eclectic approach attributes the growth of transplanetary connectivity to interrelated impulses from the realms of production (namely, certain turns in capitalist development), governance (namely, various enabling regulatory conditions), identity (namely, particular ways of asserting being and belonging), and knowledge (namely, certain logics of rationalist consciousness). By this argument it is not one variable that has generated globalization, but a complex interplay of several forces (cf. Held et al., 1999; Waters, 2001; Urry, 2003). Nor is causation held to flow in one direction with respect to globalization. The trend is treated here as both explanandum (something to be explained) and explanans (something that explains – or at least contributes to an explanation of other trends). The present chapter considers the 'explanandum' side: namely, how circumstances in the areas of production, governance, identity and knowledge have combined to produce globalization. Conversely, subsequent chapters in Part II of the book examine the 'explanans' side: namely, how the geographical shift to greater globality has influenced developments in the four other spheres.

Contending theories In principle globalization can be explained in a host of different ways. Any of the main schools of social and political theory can offer a story of why transplanetary connections have

developed, and why global relations have proliferated with particular speed and intensity in recent history. The various approaches are surveyed below to give a sense of the possible range of explanations, before the second half of the chapter elaborates a more specific account that is adopted for this book's analysis. The review that follows distinguishes six main types of social explanation for globalization: liberalism, political realism, Marxism, constructivism, postmodernism, and feminism. Each of these approaches is seen to take a different perspective on:

- the central issue for investigation in respect of globalization;
- the material and/or ideational generators of global social relations;
- the key actor(s) that have propelled globalization;
- the principal structure(s) that have produced globalization; and
- the core dynamic(s) of history that have driven globalization.

What follows is a very general survey. The accounts of the various schools of thought are highly compressed and simplified. Only the basic premises of each approach are identified and assessed. Other writings have elaborated much more sophisticated versions of the various positions. The more limited purpose in the present context is to offer a summary overview of the range of possible explanations of globalization, as a prelude to setting out the explanatory framework that informs this volume. More detailed treatments of contending perspectives can be found in theory textbooks (e.g., Baylis and Smith, 2005: pt 2; Burchill et al., 2005). Nor is the sixfold typology of theories laid out below complete. This review covers the main social explanations of globalization. A more comprehensive survey could in addition consider environmentalist theories that focus on the ecological dynamics of globalization (Lovelock, 1979) and spiritual approaches that explore globalization in relation to the metaphysical (Rifkin, 2003). More restrictedly, this chapter limits its range to accounts that explain globalization in terms of social action and social structure. The sixfold categorization of explanations presented here is also overly neat. Many scholars and writings do not fit precisely and consistently into one or the other school of thought. Instead, lots of researchers take inspiration

inspiration from more than one approach and/or shift their positions over time. Moreover, many thinkers adopt less explicit and/or more nuanced stances on core premises than the stark positions that are presented here. The tenets of contending perspectives are expressed below as blunt ideal-types in order to emphasize contrasts between different possible points of view. In practice accounts of globalization often do not fall obviously and wholly under one of the six headings. Likewise, there is plurality within each type of explanation distinguished in the following paragraphs. For example, while all political realists focus on the struggle for power among states, some examine this contention in terms of hegemony, while others frame interstate competition in terms of the balance of power. Similarly, there are numerous variations on the Marxist theme of class relations within the capitalist mode of production. In recognition of this diversity, headings below describe each approach in the plural (i.e., liberalisms, postmodernisms, feminisms, etc.). Liberalisms Liberalist explanations of globalization tend to see the process as a market-led extension of modernization. This type of approach is generally taken by people who are interested in maximizing human progress through the pursuit of currently dominant models of 'development', with an emphasis on economic growth and liberal democracy. Most mainstream accounts of globalization – including those that promote neoliberalist policies of the kind described in Chapter 1 – adopt some variant of liberalist explanation. Most other perspectives on globalization develop their alternative explanations largely out of critiques of liberalism. From a liberalist position globalization is, at the most elementary level, a result of 'natural' human desires for economic welfare and political liberty. As such, increased

transplanetary connectivity is ultimately derived from human drives to maximize material well-being (through markets) and to exercise basic freedoms (as guaranteed by publicly accountable government). For liberalists globalization is an outcome of people's strivings to escape poverty as well as to achieve civil and political rights. On a liberalist account it is inherent in market dynamics and modern democratization that these forces should eventually interlink humanity across the planet. On top of these assumed primordial human motivations for wealth and freedom, liberalist explanations generally highlight two sorts of conditions as being necessary for the realization of globalization. First, technological advances – particularly in the areas of transport, communications and information processing – are

required to effect transplanetary connections physically. Second, suitable legal and institutional arrangements must be in place to enable markets and liberal democracy to spread on a transworld scale. As technological innovation is mainly the work of engineers, liberalist social researchers generally focus their studies on institutional circumstances that further or hinder globalization (cf. Keohane and Martin, 1995; Keohane, 1998; Ruggie, 1998). Hence liberalists investigate issues such as: the effects of different state policies in promoting or hampering globalization; whether regional institutions act as stepping stones or stumbling blocks to globalization; the construction of global governance arrangements to support global markets and global human rights; the role of market self-regulation in advancing globalization; and the organization of firms and civil society associations for effective global action. Given these emphases, most liberalist explanations of globalization have emanated from the fields of Business Studies, Economics, International Political Economy, Law, and Politics. Indeed, most work on globalization in these disciplines has taken a broadly liberalist approach. In addition, some economic geographers and economic sociologists have developed market and institutionalist analyses of the development of global production and global governance (e.g., Dicken, 2003). Work of the so-called Stanford School of world society theory on global modernity has also fallen in a broadly liberalist frame (Boli, 2006). Liberalist accounts of globalization have not generally been advertised with this label. Whereas many political realists, Marxists, constructivists, postmodernists and feminists have declared their affiliation with those respective theories, most adherents of liberalism have taken this approach without calling it such. In most cases readers have to infer this perspective from the types of arguments that the author in question advances. Liberalism has ranked as the principal orthodox account of globalization, with particular support from circles of power. Liberalist explanations have underpinned the neoliberalist prescriptions that are favoured in mainstream policy circles. To the extent that liberalist attributions of globalization to market forces, technology and institutions have had widespread acceptance as 'commonsense', scholars taking this line of argument have faced less pressure to specify, verify and justify their approach compared to researchers who adopt more critical perspectives. To their credit, liberalist explanations have helpfully highlighted the importance of technological change and institutional arrangements in promoting globalization. Transplanetary connectivity could not have accelerated and intensified as it has over the past half-century in the absence of air travel, advanced telecommunications, digitization, and so on. Liberalists have also astutely stressed the necessity of constructing institutional infrastructure to support globalization. Transworld relations have not appeared spontaneously, but have required conducive regulatory circumstances of inter alia technical standardization, administrative harmonization, translation arrangements between languages, laws of contract, and guarantees of property rights. That said, liberalist explanations also have several major limitations. For one thing, these accounts do not probe further to ask what social forces lie behind the creation of technological and institutional underpinnings for globalization. It is not satisfactory to attribute these developments to 'natural' human drives for economic growth and political liberty. After all, such strivings have been manifestly absent from many sociohistorical contexts. If, as seems empirically to be the case, these impulses in their current pronounced form are

peculiarly modern, then researchers need to delve more deeply into the structures of contemporary society for the conditions that have prompted the technological and institutional bases of globalization. Other theories considered below seek in different ways to do this. A second significant shortcoming in liberalist explanations is their culture-blindness. These accounts locate the causes of globalization in material conditions of technology and institutions, without exploring the socially and historically situated life-worlds and knowledge structures that have promoted these technological and institutional developments. Instead, liberalist accounts tend to suppose that culture (and cultural diversity) do not matter in determining when, where and how globalization occurs. People everywhere are assumed to be equally amenable to and desirous of increased globality in their lives, when this is plainly not the case. A third critical failing in liberalist explanations of globalization is their inadequate attention to power. These arguments do stress that firms compete for markets and that interest groups compete for benefits. However, liberalists ignore the importance of structural power inequalities in prompting globalization and shaping its course. Liberalist explanations therefore have little or no regard for entrenched power hierarchies between states, classes, cultures, sexes, races, etc. Yet even the most cursory glance indicates that globalization has been steeped in such structural inequalities and associated political struggles.

Political realism Where liberalist accounts underplay questions of power, political realists put struggles for power at the heart of their explanations of globalization (e.g., Gilpin, 2001). Political realism is the traditional power politics understanding of international relations. This approach is generally adopted by researchers who are interested in questions of state power, the pursuit of national interests, and conflict (including warfare) between states. Political realists assume that territorial sovereign states are the principal actors in world politics. Proponents of this approach further presume that states are inherently acquisitive and self-serving, making for inevitable competition as their insatiable appetites for power clash. To manage this unavoidable interstate conflict, some political realists have advocated the use of a balance of power, where any attempt by one state to achieve world dominance is countered by collective resistance from other states. Other political realists have suggested that a dominant state can bring stability to world order if this so-called 'hegemon' maintains international rules and institutions that both advance its own interests and at the same time contain conflicts between other states. In the vein of hegemonic stability theory, globalization can be explained as a way that the dominant state of the day – in the case of recent history the USA – has asserted its primacy and concurrently created an environment of controlled competition among states. On this account large-scale contemporary growth of transplanetary connectivity has allowed the US state to promote its national interests and further its power. By implication, globalization would recede if and when it was no longer in the interest of the US state to sponsor the process, or if and when the US state lost the resource dominance that underwrites its hegemonic status. No published account has systematically explained globalization on quite these lines, but the general logic of hegemonic stability theory has featured in some analyses of post-1945 US foreign policy (Kennedy, 1987; Nye, 1990). In another variant of political realism, globalization could be explained as a strategy in the contest for power between several major states in contemporary world politics. On this line of argument, transplanetary connectivity has advanced as the governments of Britain, China, France, Japan, the USA and other large states have exploited the potentials of global relations to bolster their respective power positions. Such states have aimed to attract global firms into their jurisdiction to strengthen the domestic economy and have supported global expansion by firms based in their jurisdiction to gain influence over other states. Likewise, political realists would say, strong states have in the pursuit of power developed global military capabilities, promoted their currencies as global monies, and drawn in global migrants to raise their country's human capital. Political-realist explanations of globalization have the merit of highlighting issues of power and power struggles, something that liberalist accounts tend to ignore. Power politics perspectives also helpfully draw particular attention to the role of states in generating global relations. As such, political realism

usefully counters unsustainable suppositions in some quarters that globalization is antithetical to and undermines territorial states. Political realism also rightly stresses that states have not been equal in globalization, with some being dominant and others subordinate in the process. On the other hand, political realism arguably takes the emphasis on power too far. The theory's politics-centrism suggests that everything in globalization comes down to the acquisition, distribution and exercise of power. Not surprisingly, proponents of this approach are found almost exclusively in the fields of International Relations and Politics. Yet globalization also has cultural, ecological, economic and psychological logics that are not reducible to politics. Globalization is also about the production and consumption of resources, about the discovery and affirmation of identity, about the construction and communication of meaning, and about humanity shaping and being shaped by nature. To be sure, culture, ecology, economics and psychology are bound up with power relations: these other aspects of social relations are anything but apolitical. However, they are also more than political and require consideration in their own right, too. The state-centrism of political realism is also a weakness, inasmuch as this approach tends to neglect the importance of other actors in generating globalization. Within governance circles, for example, it is not only national governments that have provided the regulatory frameworks for transplanetary connections, but also substate authorities, macro-regional institutions, global agencies, and private-sector bodies. Nor is it viable to explain the globalizing activities of nongovernmental actors like firms, civil society associations, and households wholly in terms of the pursuit of national interest and the assertion of state power. When going global these other types of actors have followed motivations and exerted influences that are partly – and sometimes quite substantially – autonomous from the policies of country governments. Similarly, political realism oversimplistically reduces power relations in the creation of transplanetary spaces to a question of state hierarchies. The primacy of the USA and other major governments has certainly helped to stimulate contemporary globalization, to orient the process in particular directions, and to skew the benefits of increased transworld connectivity in favour of dominant states. However, additional types of power relations – for example, on lines of class, culture and gender – have also affected the course of globalization. These other structural inequalities cannot be adequately explained as an outcome of interstate competition. Power politics among states has no doubt had implications for hierarchies in globalization between managers and workers, between various world religions, and between men and women. Yet there is more to these other social dynamics than conflict between major states. After all, class inequality, cultural hierarchy, and patriarchy predate the modern states system. Marxisms Marxist theories offer explanations of globalization that bring one of these other power structures to the fore, namely, class relations. Marxism is the principal political economy critique of liberalist orthodoxy. This approach is adopted by researchers who are principally concerned with modes of production, social exploitation through unjust distribution, and social emancipation through the transcendence of capitalism. Marxist arguments about globalization have emanated from all fields of social enquiry, albeit most especially from Geography, Politics and Sociology (Bromley, 1999; Rupert and Smith, 2002; Rosenberg, 2005). Marxists explain the expansion of transplanetary relations as an outcome of the capitalist mode of production. Karl Marx himself presciently anticipated the growth of globality when he wrote in *Grundrisse* that 'capital by its nature drives beyond every spatial barrier' to 'conquer the whole earth for its market' (1857–8: 524, 539). Thus on Marxist accounts globalization happens because transworld connectivity enhances opportunities of profit making and surplus accumulation. In particular, say Marxists, globalization is a strategy that enables the capitalist, bourgeois, accumulating class to increase its resources and power over the labouring, proletarian, exploited class. Marxists reject both liberalist and political realist explanations of globalization. On Marxist accounts, the technological advances that enable globalization have not been propelled, as liberalists argue, by 'natural' human drives for economic growth, but by historically specific impulses of capitalist development. Likewise, say Marxists, the legal and institutional infrastructures that

facilitate globalization have emerged not so much to spread market efficiency across the planet, but to serve the logic of surplus accumulation on a global scale. Meanwhile Marxists dismiss liberalist talk of 'freedom' and 'democracy' as being not real impulses behind increased transplanetary connectivity, but a legitimating ideology for exploitative global capitalist class relations. Similarly, for Marxists, state policies and inter-state struggles for power are not, as political realists claim, the actual drivers of globalization, but rather expressions of deeper forces of capitalism and class struggle. Dominant states may be exercising power when they promote globalization, but they do so in the service of capital rather than in some notional 'national interest'. Like liberalism and political realism, Marxist explanations of globalization have appeared in a variety of guises. More traditional Marxist arguments have focused on the growth of transplanetary circuits of capital through global companies and global commodity flows, accompanied by the consolidation of transworld networks among the capitalist class and transworld fragmentation among the working class (cf. Burnham, 1997; Harris, 1998–9; Pijl, 1998; Tabb, 2001). Meanwhile so-called neo-Marxists in dependency and world-system theories have examined capital accumulation on a global scale more on lines of core and peripheral countries than in terms of bourgeois and proletarian classes (cf. Wallerstein, 1979; Chase-Dunn, 1989; S. Amin, 1997). What some have dubbed 'neo-Gramscian' accounts have highlighted the significance of underclass struggles to resist globalizing capitalism: not only by traditional labour unions, but also by new social movements of consumer advocates, environmentalists, peace activists, peasants, and women (cf. Cox, 1987; Gill, 1993; Gills, 1997; Mittelman, 2000). Marxist approaches offer important contributions to understanding globalization. Attention to capitalism and class relations takes explanations of growing transplanetary connectivity beyond liberalism and political realism to some of the deeper social forces that have generated relevant technological advances, institutional developments, and state strategies. Marxist accounts of capital and class also reveal a great deal about social power relations and the generation of inequality in a globalizing economy. Yet, much as political realism focuses too narrowly on state hierarchy, the Marxist focus on class stratification likewise presents an overly restricted account of power. Other relations of dominance and subordination have also operated in globalization on lines of state, culture, gender, race, sexual orientation, (dis)ability and more. These additional structural inequalities and violences certainly intersect with and are affected by class relations. However, the workings of US hegemony, west-centric cultural domination, masculinism, racism, heterosexism and ablism are not reducible to class dynamics within capitalism. Thus weak states, aboriginals, women, people of colour, sexual minorities and disabled persons have found good reason to form cross-class solidarities in their respective struggles for emancipation and social justice. Class is a key axis of power in globalization, but it is not the only or always the most important one. Likewise, it is too simplistic to explain globalization solely as a result of drives for surplus accumulation. Capitalism accounts for a lot in globalization, but far from all. For example, people have not undertaken global communications and global travel only to feed surplus accumulation, but also to explore identities and investigate meanings. People have not acquired global consciousness solely to supply capitalism with a mindset conducive to transplanetary accumulation, but also owing to various other secular and religious promptings. People have not developed global weapons and pursued global military campaigns only for capitalist ends, but also due to inter-state competition, masculinist behaviour, and militarist cultures that predate capitalism. In particular, Marxism is limited by its methodological materialism. The approach is often characterized as one of 'historical materialism' and 'political economy', where ideational aspects of social relations are treated as outcomes of, with no autonomy from, the mode of production. Yet it oversimplifies matters to suggest that culture and psychology are reducible to political economy, that structures of identity and knowledge are wholly results of, and entirely subordinate to, those of production and governance. To take one example, nationalism as an identity structure has shaped capitalism as well as vice versa. Likewise, aesthetics and language are more than byproducts of accumulation. In short, while capitalism has played a key part in

generating globalization, social forces are more multidimensional, complex and interesting than a narrow historical materialism posits. Constructivisms In contrast to the methodological materialism of liberalist, political realist and Marxist explanations of globalization, a range of other accounts have taken methodologically idealist approaches. In these cases, transplanetary connectivity is said to have arisen because of the way that people have mentally constructed the social world with symbols, language, interpretation, and so on. From ideational perspectives, globalization has resulted from particular forms and dynamics of consciousness. For methodological idealists, patterns of production and governance are second-order structures that derive from deeper cultural and socio-psychological forces. Such accounts of globalization have come especially from the fields of Anthropology, Humanities, Media Studies, and Sociology, although idealist arguments have also influenced some researchers in Geography, Politics and even Business Studies. One type of ideational explanation is constructivism, an approach that has been popular particularly since the 1990s among International Studies scholars in North America and Western Europe who wish to develop an alternative perspective to liberalism and political realism (Adler, 2003; Barnett, 2005). As the theory's name suggests, constructivism concentrates on the ways that social actors 'construct' their world: both within their own minds and through inter-subjective communication with others. In particular, constructivists examine how inter-subjective communication generates common understandings of reality, shared norms for social behaviour, and notions of group identity and solidarity. Conversation and symbolic exchanges lead people to construct ideas of the world, rules for social interaction, and ways of being and belonging in that world. Constructivist research to date has not focused on explaining globalization; however, such an account can be extrapolated from existing works and the general premises of the theory. These would suggest that transplanetary connectivity has increased as people have reimagined society on transworld rather than, or in addition to, country-national-state lines. By following inter-subjective dialogue down new avenues, people would develop global-scale understandings of social units, social rules and social identities. These mental reorientations would in turn underpin a larger process of economic and political globalization. Constructivist theory offers a helpful corrective to materialist explanations of globalization by affirming that social geography is a mental experience as well as a physical fact. The growth of transplanetary connections is indeed facilitated to the extent that people conceive of themselves as inhabiting a global world and as sharing values and interests with others spread across the continents. Moreover, this mental reorientation to global identities and solidarities would seem to result at least in part from inter-subjective social-psychological dynamics of forming 'in' and 'out' groups of 'us' and 'them'. National, class, religious and other identities respond in part to material conditions like state power and capital accumulation, but group affiliations also depend on inter-subjective construction and communication of shared self-understandings. Yet constructivist explanations can also go too far down the road of methodological idealism. In this case a social-psychological reductionism unacceptably ignores the significance of economic and ecological forces in shaping mental experience. What is needed is an explanation of globalization that recognizes the significance of knowledge and identity but at the same time interlinks ideational influences with material social forces. Moreover, like liberalism, constructivist explanations are limited by their neglect of issues of structural inequalities and power hierarchies in social relations. With this apolitical tendency, constructivism fails to appreciate that individuals who engage in inter-subjective communications invariably do so under conditions of structural domination and subordination. As often as not, the construction of social reality occurs in a context of political struggle and as an expression of resistance. To take one obvious example, national identities in the South developed largely through opposition to colonial rule.

Postmodernisms In contrast to constructivism, other ideational explanations of globalization do highlight the significance of structural power in the construction of identities, norms and knowledge. For shorthand convenience these approaches are here grouped under a single label of 'postmodernism'. However, others have pursued this broad genre of argument under the names of

'poststructuralism' and 'postcolonialism'. Whatever the precise appellation, these perspectives understand society first of all in terms of knowledge power: that is, how power structures shape knowledge; and how certain knowledge structures support certain power hierarchies. For example, one leading exponent of postmodernism, Michel Foucault, has posited that each epoch is marked by a prevailing episteme, or mode of knowledge (1966). This reigning structure of understanding (or 'discourse') determines what can and cannot be known in a given socio-historical context: i.e., what passes as 'truth' and 'real'; and what dissolves as 'mythical' and 'imagined'. For postmodernists the dominant framework of knowledge in 'modern' society is rationalism. This mode of understanding emphasizes the earthly world, the subordination of nature to human control, objectivist science, and instrumentalist efficiency. Modern rationalism breeds a society obsessed with economic growth, technological control, bureaucratic surveillance, and discipline over desire. Moreover, say postmodernists, the rationalist mode of knowledge has an inherent expansionary logic that leads it through processes of cultural imperialism to subordinate if not destroy other epistemologies. Only a few postmodernist writings have focused on the problem of globalization per se (e.g. Luke, 1995; Ó Tuathail, 1996; Dirlif, 1997; Ling, 2000; Cameron and Palan, 2004). Extrapolating from the general premises of the theory, however, globalization could be understood as a process whereby western rationalism imposes itself across the planet on indigenous cultures and other non-modern life-worlds. Different authors in this genre have linked knowledge power in the modern (globalizing) world with racism, sexism and US hegemony (Said, 1978; Campbell, 1998; Chowdhry and Nair, 2002). With their emphasis on modes of knowledge as power, postmodernist and postcolonialist arguments succeed in incorporating ideational elements into explanations of globalization while also keeping questions of politics to the fore. Postmodernist theories highlight the significance of modern rationalist epistemology as a mindset that has been vital to the techno-scientific advances and bureaucratic institutions that have made globalization possible. Like Marxism, then, postmodernism helps to go beyond the relatively superficial accounts of liberalism and political realism to the deeper social conditions that have prompted globalization. That said, postmodernist explanations also have their limitations. Where Marxist accounts of globalization are restricted by their methodological materialism, postmodernist arguments are constrained by their methodological idealism. Predominant discourses have most certainly had far-reaching impacts on economy and ecology, but the notion that these material forces can be reduced to modes of consciousness seems unsustainable. Again, what is wanted is an explanation that interconnects ideational and material forces rather than looking to one or the other. Feminisms For their part, feminist accounts of globalization have brought gender relations to the fore. Whereas other theories have identified the principal dynamics behind the rise of transplanetary and supraterritorial connectivity in terms of technology, state, capital, identity or discourse, feminists have put the spotlight on the social construction of masculinity and femininity. That is, the roles and behaviours assigned to biological sex are held to mould the overall social order and significantly to shape the course of history, including the spread of globality. Feminist perspectives on globalization are adopted by researchers whose main concerns lie with the status of women, particularly the structural subordination of women to men. These arguments stress that women have tended to be marginalized, silenced and violated in global communications (e.g., lower Internet access), global migration (e.g., abused domestics and sex workers), global finance (e.g., limited availability of credit), global organizations (e.g., few leadership positions), and global wars (e.g., rape on the battlefield). Feminist approaches to globalization have appeared across all fields of social studies and humanities, albeit perhaps most frequently in Politics and Sociology (Duggan and Dashner, 1994; Wichterich, 1998; Peterson and Runyan, 1999; Signs, 2001; Peterson, 2003; Rai, 2004). Many feminist arguments have come as corrective supplements to other theories rather than as fully fledged explanations of globalization in their own right. Thus, for example, feminist liberals have urged that more attention be given to the inputs of and consequences for women in respect of the laws and institutions that govern

globalization. Feminist takes on political realism have highlighted male dominance of state power and the masculinist character of inter-state competition and war. Feminist contributions to Marxist research have emphasized the pervasive gendered character of surplus accumulation, for example, with low-paid female sweatshop work and unpaid female domestic work. Feminist postmodernism has identified a close relationship between masculinism and rationalist knowledge, while feminist postcolonialism has highlighted the subordination of women in imperialist contexts. In these different ways, much feminism has advocated an 'add-gender-and-stir' approach to other theories. Certain other feminist arguments have made gender relations themselves the principal causal force in social relations. On these more radical accounts, patriarchal subordination of women and masculinist behaviour patterns are the primary forces that have generated other social structures such as capitalism, the state, nationalism and rationalism. By a radical feminist logic, the growth of transplanetary connections would also be driven in the first instance by masculinist strivings and patriarchal oppressions. Feminist accounts of globalization have provided welcome antidotes to the gender-blindness that has generally afflicted other perspectives. Everyday experience makes plain that people in global as in all other spaces act partly in accordance with socially constructed sex roles. The 'private' sphere of the household and intimate relations is obviously as integral and influential in most people's lives as the 'public' sphere of the workplace and citizenship. The reproductive economy is clearly as central to the sustenance of social relations as the productive economy. Yet 'malestream' research on globalization (and social life generally) has tended to render these crucial matters invisible. That said, feminist explanations can overplay the significance of gender relations, much as political realism can overemphasize inter-state competition and postmodernism can overstress knowledge power. Arguments concerning masculinism and patriarchy can clarify a great deal about the causes, courses and consequences of globalization. However, the gender reductionism of a radical feminism that roots everything surrounding transplanetary connectivity in social constructions of sex roles seems overly simplistic. Hence, much as Marxist preoccupations with class inequality can breed neglect of other types of social subordination, so feminist focus on gender hierarchies can distract attention from other important oppressions, for example, on lines of culture and race.

An eclectic synthesis The preceding assessment of six ideal-type social theories has identified a number of possible explanations of globalization. Each approach highlights certain forces that could contribute significantly to the large-scale growth of transplanetary connectivity in contemporary history: technology and institution building in the case of liberalism; national interest and inter-state competition in the case of political realism; capital accumulation and class struggle in the case of Marxism; identity and knowledge construction in the case of constructivism; rationalism and cultural imperialism in the case of postmodernism; and masculinism and the subordination of women in the case of feminism. On the other hand, each perspective is also limited by reducing the dynamics of globalization to just one or two principal causes.

The approach in the present book is to synthesize insights from several theoretical frameworks in a multifaceted explanation of globalization. In a word, the perspective adopted here understands globalization as part of a socio-historical dynamic involving five interrelated shifts in macro social structures. One trend – the growth of transplanetary and supraterritorial connectivity – is interlinked with four other developments: a shift from capitalism towards hypercapitalism in respect of production; a shift from statism towards polycentrism in respect of governance; a shift from nationalism towards pluralism and hybridity in respect of identity; and a shift from rationalism towards reflexive rationality in respect of knowledge. The resultant account of globalization is not amenable to conventional theory labels. The argument draws substantially from liberalism and political realism regarding the significance of states and other governance arrangements, from Marxism regarding the importance of capitalism, from constructivism regarding the relevance of

identity patterns, from postmodernism regarding the role of knowledge power, and from feminism regarding the pervasive significance of gender relations. The approach developed here, therefore, does not fit a textbook category. Rather, the explanation weaves together insights from these perspectives to form a distinctive (and in some eyes no doubt peculiar) outlook. The notion of 'weaving together' is key here. In other words, none of the five highlighted trends (with respect to geography, production, governance, identity and knowledge) is regarded as the original source of the other four. Each is taken to be simultaneously cause and effect of the others. Globalization is argued to be concurrently both an outcome of and an input to other core aspects of contemporary social change. The rest of this chapter indicates how developments around production, governance, identity and knowledge have combined to generate large-scale globality. Then Chapters 5 to 8 consider how, conversely, intense globalization has contributed to changes (as well as continuities) in the four other areas.

Forces of production in globalization The contemporary rapid growth of transplanetary and supraterritorial social connections has resulted partly from economic conditions. More specifically, globalization has unfolded in the context of certain turns in capitalist development. Although this book does not advance a Marxist argument that globalization can be understood entirely in terms of capitalism, no explanation of this shift in geography would be complete without significant attention to the capitalist mode of production. Capitalism characterizes a social order where economic activity is oriented first and foremost to the accumulation of surplus. In other words, capitalists (who might be individuals, private firms, publicly owned enterprises, or other collective actors) attempt to amass ever-greater resources in excess of their survival needs. Capitalist production contrasts on the one hand with a subsistence economy (where no surpluses arise) and on the other hand with profligacy (where any surplus is immediately depleted through luxury consumption). Under capitalism surpluses are invested in further production, with the aim of acquiring additional surplus, which is then reinvested in still more production, in the hope of obtaining still more surplus, and so on. A capitalist economy is thoroughly monetized. Marx in this light characterized money as 'the universal commodity' of capitalist social relations (1867: 89). Money greatly facilitates accumulation, particularly since surpluses are easily stored and shifted in this fungible form. In addition, the manipulation of value by means of monetary calculations (including prices, wages, interest charges, dividends, taxes, currency revaluations, accounting formulas, etc.) offers abundant opportunities to transfer surplus, especially from the weak to the powerful. Since most parties in a capitalist order are seeking to accumulate to one degree or another, this mode of production involves perpetual and pervasive contests over the distribution of surplus. Such competition occurs both between actors (individuals, firms, etc.) and along structural lines (of class, gender, race and more). Some of the struggles are overt, for example, in wage disputes. Other conflicts remain latent, for instance, when many poor people in the South are unaware that much of their country's limited surplus value is being transferred to wealthy people in the North through the repayment of global debts. These and countless other experiences have shown historically that capitalism tends to breed exploitation and other inequities unless deliberate countervailing measures are implemented. Surplus accumulation has transpired in one way or another for many centuries, but capitalism is a comparatively recent phenomenon. When accumulation occurred in earlier times, it was temporary, limited, and involved only small circles of people. Not until the past several hundred years has capital become an 'ism', reigning as a foremost and ubiquitous framework of production over large populations for sustained periods of time. From beginnings in Western Europe around the fifteenth century, capitalism spread to all continents over the next half-millennium (albeit to different degrees). Today the structural power of capitalism is such that most people across the planet regard surplus accumulation as a 'natural' circumstance and can scarcely imagine, let alone enact, an alternative mode of production.

Capitalism has spurred globalization in four principal ways: related to market expansion, accounting practices, asset mobility, and enlarged arenas of commodification. Regarding the first point, Marx and Engels wrote over 150 years ago that 'the need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe' (1848: 39). Many firms have indeed pursued global markets as a means to increase their sales volume. Greater turnover at a given rate of profit obviously yields larger aggregate profits. Moreover, higher production runs to supply global markets can bring significant economies of scale and thereby raise profit margins. Capitalist enterprises have thus had major incentives to develop transworld distribution and sales networks for global products. To make transplanetary markets possible, capitalism has spurred much technological innovation in communications, transport and data processing as well as developments in global organization and management. Second, capitalism has encouraged globalization inasmuch as global accounting practices offer major opportunities to enhance accumulation. For example, managers can vary and alter prices in a coordinated fashion across transplanetary domains so that overall company profits are maximized. Indeed, higher profit margins at mature market locations can allow a firm to cover the temporary losses that might be involved in establishing new sites at whatever other points on earth. A transworld pricing strategy can thereby yield greater overall profits in the medium and long term. In addition, manipulations of global accounting have given capitalists the possibility to concentrate profits at points of low taxation within transplanetary spaces. In territorialist circumstances, surplus was generally confined to a particular state jurisdiction, and the capitalist was compelled to work within its tax regime. However, by moving into the cyberspace of electronic finance, capital can readily escape such territorial bounds. Profits that have in practice been achieved, say, in Italy can through the ruses of so-called 'transfer pricing' be made to appear on the balance sheet of a Luxembourg subsidiary with offshore taxation status. Likewise, 'hinkwis' ('high net worth individuals') may significantly reduce their tax charges by registering their assets at offshore financial centres rather than in their country of residence. Third, capitalism has promoted globalization owing to the opportunities for enhanced accumulation offered by global sourcing. Capitalist interests are well served when firms can place their production facilities wherever on Earth the needed resources are most easily accessed and the costs are lowest. Indeed, the fear of seeing globally mobile corporate assets go to more attractive sites can induce territorially bound workers and governments to temper demands regarding their share of surplus value vis-à-vis business. In particular, global mobility has provided capitalists with an escape from the reduced rates of profit that accompanied corporatist arrangements in the OECD countries by the late 1960s (cf. Marglin, 1988). True, in the mid-twentieth century corporatist compromises between big business, organized labour and country government – epitomized in the Keynesian welfare state – secured capitalism in the North by reducing overt class conflict at a time when socialism was gaining unprecedented strength across much of the planet. However, this stability was bought at a price of progressive taxation, considerable social insurance charges, and fairly tight guarantees of wide-ranging workers' rights. In these ways corporatism reduced the scope for accumulation by companies and investors. In contrast, contemporary globalization has allowed big business to retrieve an advantaged position over government and labour, inasmuch as capital thereby gained far greater transplanetary mobility than the other two parties (Kurzer, 1993). Transworld relocations – or merely the threat of such departures – have rebalanced the trilateral bargain heavily in favour of large capital. Many workers and governments have felt constrained to lower wages, corporate taxation, business regulation, and various public expenditures on social security. In broadly similar ways, globalization has offered capitalists a way to counter the strategies of socialism and economic statism that rose in much of the South during the mid-twentieth century. In the wake of large-scale decolonization, many states in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America took initiatives to control capitalist development within their jurisdictions. These governments expropriated many assets and often introduced centralized state planning of the country's economy. Some voices in the

South even called for reparations from the North as compensation for past capitalist-imperialist exploitation. However, increased transplanetary mobility has given big (mainly North-based) capital a means to counter these efforts at a major redistribution of world wealth. Indeed, apart from the major exception of China, little remains of state socialism today in either the South or the East. Fourth and finally, capitalism has spurred globalization insofar as the commodities that circulate in transplanetary spaces have offered major additional opportunities for surplus accumulation. In other words, global communications, global travel, global monies, global financial instruments and global consumer goods have done more than enhance the possibilities for accumulation through primary production and traditional manufacturing. In addition, the information, communications, finance and consumer sectors have offered vast potentials for further accumulation in their own right. Indeed, telephone systems, Internet operations, foreign exchange dealing, global retail chains and the like have often generated high profits. Thus, as is further elaborated in Chapter 5, the very process of expanding global spaces has been a boon to capitalism, so that globalization has been integral to the emergence of what can be termed 'hypercapitalism'. The preceding points should not be read to imply that every global capitalist venture has yielded the expected windfalls. On the contrary, 'going global' has hurt many corporations and investors who believed that this strategy offered a short, one-way street to superprofits. Global financial and information industries in particular have experienced enormous volatility over the past quarter-century, including major losses for some players. Nevertheless, hopes of enhanced accumulation have continued to stimulate accelerated globalization, and (as is detailed in Chapter 5) many of those capitalist dreams have been substantially realized. So capitalism clarifies a lot about why and how respatialization through globalization has occurred. As David Harvey has said, 'Capitalism cannot do without its spatial fixes' (2000: 54). A former social order marked by territorialist geography, statist governance and nationalist identity well served an earlier day of commercial and industrial capitalism. However, a different spatial framework with considerable global aspects better serves the current phase of capitalist development. That said, capitalism has not generated contemporary globalization by itself. For one thing, global capitalism has depended on regulatory arrangements and identity frameworks that have enabled surplus accumulation through transplanetary spaces. In addition, the capitalist mode of production has depended on the concurrent existence of a rationalist mode of knowledge that creates the secular, anthropocentric, instrumentalist mindset through which capitalism thrives. In short, as stressed earlier, the various principal forces behind globalization have been co-dependent. Forces of governance in globalization As just noted, a mode of production cannot operate in the absence of an enabling regulatory apparatus. Social relations are always marked by governance mechanisms of some kind, even if the rules are sometimes loose, variable or implicit. There is no such thing as an unregulated social context, and no social change takes place in the absence of rules that stimulate, facilitate and confirm the transformations. Hence globalization could not unfold without governance arrangements that promote the process, and an explanation of the trend must be sought partly in the regulatory realm.

The term 'governance' is subject to many different understandings (Rhodes, 1997; Pierre, 2000; Hermet et al., 2005). In the present context the word is taken to mean regulation in a generic sense; thus governance refers to processes whereby people formulate, implement, enforce and review rules to guide their common affairs. Much governance happens through government, in the sense of regulatory activities through local and national public authorities. However, governance can entail more than government. Governance can extend beyond state and substate institutions to include suprastate (macro-regional and global) regimes as well. Moreover, governance can span private regulatory mechanisms along with public sector arrangements. Hence governance goes beyond government to cover the full scope of societal regulation. Society might be considered to have a 'mode' of governance (a general way of making, implementing, enforcing and reviewing rules), much

as it has a mode of production (a general way of extracting, processing, distributing and consuming resources). Moreover, just as a mode of production may change over time (say, from feudalism to capitalism, or from early to advanced capitalism), so the prevailing structure of governance can also alter through history. Indeed, as is discussed at length in Chapter 6, globalization has transpired in conjunction with a shift from a statist towards a polycentric mode of regulation. Whereas statism concentrates the construction and application of social rules in centralized national territorial governments, polycentrism disperses regulation across multiple substate, state, suprastate and private sites, as well as dense networks that interlink these many points of governance. Hence it is perhaps not accidental that the words 'globalization' and 'governance' have entered common usage roughly simultaneously over the past two decades. Inasmuch as 'government' tends to be associated with the state, this notion does not apply comfortably as an umbrella term for the polycentric condition of multi-scalar and diffuse regulation. The vocabulary of 'governance' works better as a generic concept that covers statism, polycentrism, and other modes of regulation. To be sure, the end of statism in recent decades has by no means entailed the end of the state. On the contrary, much of the regulation that has advanced contemporary globalization has emanated from states. Confounding the assumptions of many commentators, including those cited in Chapter 1, globalization and the state have been anything but mutually contradictory. On the contrary, most transplanetary relations would not have developed – or would have grown far more slowly and ponderously – if state policies had not encouraged globalization (Panitch, 1996; Weiss, 1998). Even many neoliberalists like staff of the IMF and the World Bank have in the past decade come to acknowledge the importance of the state for an effectively functioning global economy (Dhonte and Kapur, 1997; World Bank, 1997). Globalization and the state have thus been quite compatible and indeed co-dependent in contemporary society. (That said, the growth of global relations has in several important respects tended to alter the character of the state, as is elaborated in Chapter 6.) State regulation has furthered globalization in four principal ways: provision of infrastructure; liberalization of international transactions; guarantees of property rights for global capital; and sponsorship of global governance arrangements. At the same time, in keeping with emergent polycentrism, states have not provided the entire regulatory infrastructure for accelerated globalization; hence the following discussion also notes contributions from macro-regional, transworld, and private regimes. Regarding infrastructure, state programmes have supplied much of the initial transport, communications and organizational bases for transplanetary links. In the nineteenth century states (including colonial administrations) supported or themselves undertook the construction of most key canals and harbour facilities for expanded global shipping. In the twentieth century states built most airports and sponsored most early airlines. States provided many of the initial telecommunications networks, while the US military laid the foundations for the Internet in the third quarter of the twentieth century. States have furthermore advanced the organizational infrastructure of globalization by legalizing and often also actively promoting the operations of thousands of global companies, global civil society associations, and (as elaborated below) global governance institutions. Regarding the liberalization of cross-border money and financial flows, most states have in recent decades relaxed or abandoned foreign exchange controls, thereby greatly facilitating global movements of currency. As of 2004 a total of 158 states had accepted Article VIII of the IMF, under which they undertake not to impose any restrictions on payments related to cross-border trade in goods and services (IMF, 2004). Dozens of states (starting with the USA in 1974 and the UK in 1979) have also removed restrictions on capital movements in and out of their jurisdictions (Helleiner, 1994; Kapstein, 1994). On the other hand, states have thus far balked at proposals to amend the IMF Articles of Agreement to require all members of the organization to remove statutory controls on cross-border capital flows. Likewise, although the OECD has promoted liberalization of capital movements since its inception in the early 1960s, intergovernmental negotiations through that body in 1995–8 towards a Multilateral Agreement on

Investment (MAI) failed to establish a general 'free flow' principle under which states would not discriminate between capital of foreign and domestic origin. Instead, national governments have concluded thousands of bilateral investment treaties (BITs) that collectively have had broadly the same effect as an MAI (UNCTAD, 2004: 6). A host of other state measures have also encouraged the growth of global finance. For example, numerous national governments have amended legislation to allow nonresident ownership of bonds and equities on securities markets within their jurisdiction. In addition, scores of states have since the 1980s established rules to permit entry into their country of global banks and global securities firms. The proliferation of offshore finance facilities has likewise required states to construct enabling statutory frameworks. As previously indicated in Chapter 3, states and/or substate governments have also created hundreds of offshore manufacturing sites; thus many companies have opted for global production partly because of the regulatory bait laid by country and provincial authorities in EPZs. States' liberalization of cross-border trade has also encouraged the growth of global production and global markets. It is clearly harder to pursue global commerce when government-imposed tariffs, quotas, licensing procedures, technical standards, subsidies and other regulatory measures favour intrastate over cross-border transactions. Already some trade liberalization in the second half of the nineteenth century aided the early development of global products. Then high protectionism in the second quarter of the twentieth century discouraged further growth of transplanetary markets (outside intercontinental colonial empires, that is). Thereafter eight rounds of multilateral negotiations between 1948 and 1994 under the GATT reduced average import duties on manufactures from over 40 per cent to only 3 per cent. More recently, the WTO regime has encouraged states also to liberalize cross-border trade in agriculture and various service sectors. Other state-led trade liberalization conducive to global production, exchange and consumption has occurred through regional agreements. The past half-century has witnessed the creation of multiple regional free trade areas (FTAs), customs unions, and (in the case of the EU) a common market. FTAs are regional associations of states with zero-tariffs between the member countries. These schemes have appeared in – or are currently projected for – most of Europe, the Americas, South Asia, South East Asia, Southern Africa, and elsewhere. Particularly in Europe, FTAs and customs unions (the latter involve the introduction of a common external tariff as well as the abolition of internal tariffs) have greatly encouraged global investment. Along with infrastructure projects and liberalization measures, a third general way that states have advanced globalization has been through guarantees of property rights for global capital. Legally enforced support of ownership claims has of course been integral to capitalist development for several centuries, and the globalization of accumulation processes has constituted no exception. Firms would be far less inclined to invest in multiple jurisdictions across the planet if host states did not erect and uphold property laws that protected business and investor interests. Whereas many governments undertook nationalizations and expropriations of corporate assets in the third quarter of the twentieth century, the tendency since the 1980s has been to shower companies with legal protections and to privatize the greater part of state enterprises, often transferring the ownership to global capital. States have also encouraged the globalization of capital by constructing multilateral regimes that guarantee intellectual property rights (IPRs) such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, and designs. In the late nineteenth century, governments erected global agreements like the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883), the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (1886), and the Madrid Agreement for the International Registration of Marks (1891). In more recent times, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) has seen the annual number of applications for global patents rise from under 3,000 in 1979 to over 54,000 in 1997 (HDR, 1999: 67). The 1994 Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) strengthened guarantees of IPRs in global markets through the WTO. Meanwhile two intergovernmental treaties concluded at the end of 1996 have extended copyright law to cyberspace. Developments around IPRs illustrate a fourth manner that states have sponsored a regulatory

environment that is conducive to globalization, namely, through the creation of transworld governance mechanisms. For reasons elaborated in Chapter 6, transplanetary and supraterritorial links cannot be administered through territorially based arrangements alone. Globalization also requires significant elements of global governance: that is, rules and permanent regulatory bodies with a transworld scope. Most of these global regimes (covering inter alia communications, conflict management, ecology, finance, health, human rights and trade) have been established through intergovernmental agreements. With time, bodies like the Bretton Woods institutions and the United Nations agencies have acquired some autonomy from their member states. Nevertheless, most global governance has emerged and grown through states and inter-state relations, and it is hard to see how it could have done otherwise. True, as elaborated in Chapter 6, some important contemporary global governance has developed not through the publicsector, but through private institutions like the International Securities Market Association (ISMA) and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). However, this market-based governance has required at least the acquiescence of states, and often it has had their active encouragement, too. Once in place, transworld governance institutions have greatly furthered globalization through standardization. Needless to say, transplanetary connectivity has been facilitated to the degree that people across the earth have come to operate with similar bureaucratic, legal and technical arrangements. For example, the ITU has issued hundreds of recommendations governing technical standards in electronic mass media and telecommunications, running to more than 10,000 pages in all. Meanwhile the International Organization for Standardization has published over 10,000 measures covering pretty well all areas of technology (UIA, 1998: 1093). The Warsaw Convention of 1929 (amended in 1955) has prescribed a transworld format for airline operations, while the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has overseen global rules for air navigation, inter alia to prevent in-flight collisions. The OECD has promulgated a Model Tax Convention to further the standardization of bilateral tax treaties that have proliferated with the globalization of capital. Several private-sector associations like the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB) and the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) have since the 1970s developed global guidelines for corporate accounting and auditing. The International Organization of Securities Commissions (IOSCO), created in 1983, has promoted transplanetary standards for stock and bond markets, while the International Association of Insurance Supervisors (IAIS), formed in 1994, has done the same for the insurance business. Starting in 1996, the IMF has coordinated major initiatives to set global frameworks for the calculation and presentation of macroeconomic statistics. The WHO has promoted regulatory harmonization in the area of disease control, while other parts of the UN system have overseen the codification of universal standards of human rights. In sum, then, a host of measures especially from states – but also from regional, transworld, and private regulatory institutions – have together provided a major governance input to globalization. The construction of a supportive legal infrastructure has not been the sole cause of globalization, but the trend could not have developed without this administrative grounding. This is not to say that every regulation in contemporary history has favoured the growth of transplanetary connectivity. Certain state actions have inhibited globalization, for example, with bans on Internet software, harassment of transworld civil society activities, and discouragement of global capital flows. Moreover, state restrictions on immigration have rarely been as tight as at the start of the twenty-first century. However, the balance of relevant regulation has greatly favoured globalization. Indeed, states and other governance bodies have been heavily constrained to establish regulatory arrangements that facilitate the expansion of global social spaces. Conditions in respect of capitalism (discussed above), together with circumstances related to identity and knowledge (discussed below), as well as the sheer momentum of global respatialization itself, have put policymakers under considerable pressure to provide supportive frameworks of rules. Given the strength of these other forces, it seems highly unlikely that regulators could have blocked most or all globalization had they wished to do so. Even governments with strong reservations about

globalization have succumbed to at least a partial accommodation of the trend. Thus, for example, the King of Bhutan no longer outlaws television (as he once tried to do), and Fidel Castro's Soviet-style regime has actively promoted global tourism for Cuba. To this extent the question has been less whether regulators would enable globalization and more what kind of regulatory frameworks they would erect to govern the process. Contemporary policymakers cannot deny the growth of transworld relations, but they do have a variety of options for shaping the trend in certain directions rather than others. What of the particular role of the US state in generating contemporary globalization, given the significance that some political realist theories attach to the role of a hegemon in world politics? US governments have often played a pivotal role in the regulatory developments described above. For example, US administrations were key proponents of the establishment of the UN, the Bretton Woods institutions, the OECD, and the GATT/WTO. The US state has also actively supported the creation of macro-regional regimes that have facilitated globalization, especially in Europe and the Americas. In addition, the very name 'Washington Consensus' identifies where pressure for liberalization of global trade and finance has been strongest. The political culture of US foreign policy has also had several historically entrenched traits that especially encourage the development of global connectivity (Thorne, 1992). For instance, the metaphor of the melting pot suggests that all of humanity has crossed the planet to realize the American dream. Looking outward, prevailing US myths have affirmed that America is an exceptional society with a mission to bring liberty and prosperity to every corner of the earth. Where ideological persuasion has failed, the US state has had unequalled military resources to further its favoured path of globalization by force of arms (Mosler and Catley, 2000).

However, recognizing the far-reaching influence of the US state in shaping contemporary globalization is not the same as arguing that US hegemony has been a necessary condition for, and primary cause of, intense growth of transplanetary connectivity since the middle of the twentieth century. US preeminence among states has deeply affected the type of accelerated globalization that has occurred over the past 50 years, but US primacy has not generated globalization itself. Other pervasive and deeply embedded forces in respect of regulation, capitalist production, identity dynamics and rationalist knowledge would in any case have generated the past half-century of large-scale globalization. However, globalization would have proceeded in different directions in the absence of a dominant US state. Likewise, as is stressed in Chapter 12, US policies will greatly condition the possibilities for more progressive future courses of globalization. Forces of identity in globalization Thus far this explanation of contemporary globalization has concentrated on political-economic forces; however, in keeping with the premise that a fuller explanation needs to synthesize material and ideational elements, the rest of this account highlights psychological and cultural dynamics at the core of globalization. The next paragraphs examine impulses to the growth of transplanetary connectivity coming from the area of identity construction, while the last section considers the significance of forces related to knowledge. As seen earlier in this chapter, many theories underplay (and in some cases utterly neglect) the role of identity in social life. However, people engage with one another in society not only to obtain resources and to exercise power, but also to discover who they are, where they belong, and what they might become. Understanding and affirming the self – both as an individual and as a group member – is a prime motivation for, and major preoccupation of, social interaction. People seek in social relations to explore their class, their gender, their nationality, their race, their religious faith, their sexuality, and other aspects of their being. Constructions of identity moreover provide much of the basis for social bonds, including collective solidarity against oppression. Notions of identity underpin frameworks for community, democracy, citizenship and resistance. In short, identity matters (a great deal). Society may be said to have a 'mode of identity' (a general way of defining and expressing who people are) alongside its mode of production and its mode of governance. Prior to the onset of intense globalization half a

century ago, the prevailing structure of identity was nationalism. (In this context 'nationalism' is not taken to mean unbridled patriotism, but a circumstance where people construct their being, belonging and becoming first and foremost in terms of national affiliation. The concept of nationhood is further elaborated in Chapter 7.) Like structures of production and governance, modes of identity change over time. As indicated in Chapter 7, globalization has unfolded in tandem with – both reflecting and reinforcing – a broad shift in the reigning framework of identity from nationalism towards greater pluralism and hybridity. Forces of identity have causal significance in social relations. Identity is not reducible to, and wholly an outcome of, forces of geography, production and governance. Certainly the rise of nationalism as the previously prevailing mode of identity was greatly encouraged by concurrently predominant patterns of social space (territorialism), economy (industrial capitalism), and regulation (statism). These four structures had strongly parallel logics in an earlier time. Similarly, the recent emergences of supraterritorial space, hypercapitalist production, and polycentric governance have spurred the contemporary turn towards more plural and hybrid identities. These four developments, too, have been largely complementary. However, identity cannot be wholly understood as an outcome of economics, geography and politics. Social-psychological processes also have dynamics of their own, and causality has simultaneously operated in converse directions, with identity having impacts on space, production and governance. Thus nationalism helped to promote territorialism, capitalism and statism in an earlier day, and more plural and hybrid identities have tended to feed more globality, hypercapitalism and polycentrism in recent times. Circumstances surrounding the construction of identities have promoted globalization in three main ways. First, national 'selves' have been substantially formed and sustained in relation to foreign 'others' within a transworld realm. Second, a number of nations have developed in part as transplanetary diasporas. Third, increased attention to various nonterritorial identities (like those based in faith, gender and race) has promoted the growth of supraterritorial social connections more generally. Regarding the first of these three influences, it is often mistakenly assumed that national identities have developed endogenously out of some primordial essence of a self-contained territorial home environment. Certainly the particular characteristics of each nation – its language, its customs, its art forms, its sensibilities, etc. – arise largely from local circumstances. However, the consolidation of such distinctive features into a large collective national identity has invariably occurred in the context of wider world contacts. In other words, inter-national relations have provided a core dynamic for the construction of nations themselves. The process of nation building has thereby drawn social relations into global realms. National identities have several striking inter-national qualities (Scholte, 1995: 191–4; Scholte, 1996: 567–71). For example, definitions of nationhood have always rested on claims to difference and uniqueness of one group vis-à-vis the rest of the humanity. National 'selves' have been constructed in terms of contrasts with external 'others'; the content of the national 'us' has invariably been defined in relation to the foreign 'them'. Thus nineteenth-century imperialism did much to consolidate nationalism in Western Europe. Indeed, national identities have characteristically been established through the exclusion of 'outsiders' in the rest of the world. Nationality has intrinsically been a question of privilege within an inter-national sphere. In addition, nations have generally emerged and/or been sustained in the context of self-protective reactions against interventions from afar. Thus inter-national warfare, commercial rivalries and cultural intrusions have spurred many a nationalist reaction. At the same time, many national campaigns have depended on support from inter-national sponsors in the broader world. For example, the USA with its Monroe Doctrine supported national assertions in Latin America during the nineteenth century. Similarly, Bolshevik Russia promoted national projects in Central Asia in the early twentieth century. Japanese occupiers advanced national programmes in the colonies of South East Asia during World War II. The UN has championed Timorese and other national self-determination struggles in recent decades. Contrary to many intuitions, then, the affirmation of national identities has on the whole actually spurred rather than slowed globalization. Nations have

only looked inward within the purported homeland to the extent that they have simultaneously looked outward to the wider (and eventually global) world. Nationality and globality have been largely co-dependent in the area of identity, much as the state and globality have been substantially mutually reinforcing in the area of governance. Indeed, many nations have spread across the planet in global diasporas (Cohen, 1997). Prominent examples include the Chinese and Palestinian nations. Although these diasporas have constructed their identities with reference to a particular territorial homeland, in fact they have existed as transworld networks. Diasporas have given impetus to globalization through their efforts to maintain connections with the country of origin as well as among various outposts across the planet. Thus, for example, the diaspora of Filipina care workers has played its part in deepening global finance with large-scale remittances to the home islands. Meanwhile associations like the World Union of Free Romanians have contributed to the globalization of civil society. Other impulses to the growth of transplanetary connectivity have come from the affirmation of supraterritorial identities. Constructions of the self and group affiliations in terms of age, class, gender, race, religious faith, and sexual orientation intrinsically transcend territorial place, distance and borders to encompass people dispersed across the earth. For example, the spread of world religions provided significant stimulus for prototypical globalization in previous epochs. Incipient globalization of the nineteenth and early twentieth century gained boosts from transworld working class solidarities of the socialist and communist internationals, transworld racial solidarities of Pan-Africanism and the White Commonwealth, and transworld women's solidarities in the first wave of feminism. In addition to these supraterritorial identities, recent accelerated globalization has had encouragements from global youth culture and transworld expressions of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender identities, as described further in Chapter 7. In several ways, then, forces of identity have operated alongside those connected with production and governance to promote a significant expansion of global relations in contemporary social life. In turn, the rise of diasporas and supraterritorial solidarities through globalization, together with the continuing importance of various forms of nationality, have contributed to a shift in the prevailing structure of identity from nationalism towards greater pluralism and hybridity. This aspect of globalization and social change is explored more fully in Chapter 7.

Forces of knowledge in globalization

Next to identity, other significant ideational spurs to globalization have come in the area of knowledge. The theoretical perspective adopted here agrees with those schools of social and political thought which maintain that the way that people know their world has significant implications for the concrete circumstances of that world. Hence globalization has occurred in part because of certain powerful patterns of social consciousness. Knowledge frameworks have a significance that is not reducible to forces of production, governance and identity. In short, the rise of globality could not transpire in the absence of mindsets that encourage such a development. Modern rationalism is a general configuration of knowledge that has greatly promoted the spread of global thinking and, through it, the broader trend of globalization (Boli and Thomas, 1999; Drori et al., 2003). This framework of knowledge has four main distinguishing features. First, rationalism is secularist: it defines reality in terms of the tangible earthly world, without reference to transcendent and divine forces. Second, rationalism is anthropocentric: it understands reality primarily in terms of human interests, activities and conditions (rather than, for example, in terms of ecological systems). Third, rationalist knowledge has a 'scientist' character: it holds that phenomena can be understood in terms of single incontrovertible truths that are discoverable by rigorous application of objective research methods. Fourth, rationalism is instrumentalist: it assigns greatest value to insights that enable people efficiently to solve immediate problems. When secular, anthropocentric, scientific, instrumental rationality reigns as the predominant knowledge structure, it tends to subordinate other ways of understanding and acting upon the world. Rationalism elevates one kind of 'making sense' over all others. Rationalists readily dismiss aesthetics, spirituality, emotion, and fantasy – or rather accept these and other 'irrationalities' only inasmuch as they complement, advance, or at least do not interfere with rational

knowledge. 'Irrationality' is not seen to contain any important truth in its own right. Indeed, rationalism is something of a (secular) faith. Rationalists maintain that science enables humanity to discover a single, definitive, objective truth about each phenomenon. This knowledge could then be applied to harness natural and social forces for human purposes. Techno-scientific rationality would thereby allow people to conquer disease, hunger, poverty, war, etc., and as a result to maximize the potentials of human life. The effects of rationalist knowledge are manifested in all that is regarded as 'reasonable' in modern society. For example, rationalism has prompted modern people to separate 'society' from 'nature' and to seek through scientific and technical means to subordinate natural forces for instrumental human ends. Secular, anthropocentric, instrumental calculations have also provided a knowledge framework for capitalist production and a cult of economic efficiency. A rationalist mindset has likewise underlain the power of 'objective' secular law in modern social relations and the pervasiveness of bureaucracy in modern organizations (governments, firms, civil society associations, schools, hospitals and so on). Rationalism has furthermore propelled the production of scientific knowledge through universities and think tanks. Like any social structure, rationalism is a product of history. It has arisen at particular times and places under particular conditions. True, instances of secular, anthropocentric, scientific, instrumental thinking can be found in various pre-modern contexts. However, a rationalist social structure – one that systematically marginalizes other forms of knowing – is distinctive of modern society. Rationalism first consolidated in the so-called 'Enlightenment' that took hold in the North Atlantic area during the eighteenth century. Enlightenment thought removed the label of 'knowledge' from myth, faith and other 'traditional' ways of understanding. Subsequently rationalism has been carried, particularly through colonialism and informal imperialism, to all corners of the earth. Rationalist thought has encouraged the rise of globality in several general ways. For one thing, this structure of knowledge has laid an ideational basis for the principal material causes of globalization. The reliance of capitalist production on rationalist knowledge has already been noted. In addition, rationalist frameworks of law and institutional organization have formed a backdrop for the regulatory frameworks that have encouraged globalization. Other impulses to create global social spaces have come from the logic of rationalism itself. For example, the secularism of rationalism has encouraged people to construct 'the whole' of their existence in terms of planet earth rather than, say, in terms of the divine. Indeed, before the sixteenth century 'maps' of 'the world' often depicted relations between people and their god(s) as well as, or instead of, some terrestrial realm. For a secularist mindset, truth comes in the form of earthly – indeed, global – principles that transcend the particularities of locality and prevail for humankind across whatever territorial distances and borders. A number of significant impulses to globalization have therefore come from efforts to discover transplanetary realities. This quest has motivated both so-called 'explorers' of earlier times and global travellers of recent generations. Rationalism encourages a belief that people can maximize knowledge when they access and understand the earthly world as a whole. Globalization can be seen, in part, as the pursuit of this secularist holy grail. Meanwhile the anthropocentrism of rationalism has directed social consciousness to the space occupied by humanity, namely, planet Earth. In an anthropocentric conception, the cosmos is seen not as a metaphysical realm of the gods, nor as a biosphere of interdependent life forms, nor as the localized domain of a particular tribe. Rather, the rationalist lens focuses on the space of homo sapiens, that is, on the planet as a single place. This conception of the Earth as the human home within the universe, too, has provided a crucial mental orientation for globalization. The scientism and instrumentalism of rationalism have also been conducive to globalization. Scientific knowledge is nonterritorial: the truths revealed by 'objective' method are purportedly valid for anyone, anywhere, anytime on earth. This objectivist orientation can feed expectations that certain products, regulations, technologies, art forms and the like can apply across the planet. Meanwhile territorialism (especially the hindrances of state borders) has frequently contradicted utilitarian notions of efficiency. For example, the instrumentalist logic of mainstream

economic analysis has held that territorial distance should be overcome and territorial borders should fall in order to achieve the most productive world division of labour. In a variety of ways, then, rationalist thinking has encouraged the growth of a global imagination and the various material transworld activities (communications, markets, travel, etc.) that global thinking promotes. For two hundred years, the Enlightenment mindset has in important respects opposed the principle of a territorial division of society. As Martin Albrow has succinctly put it, 'Reason knows no territorial limits' (1996: 32). Conclusion In sum, then, the perspective adopted in this book explains globalization as an outcome of multifaceted dynamics of social relations. Not every impulse of production, governance, identity and knowledge has advanced globalization. Moreover, conditions in some social settings have been more conducive to an expansion of transplanetary connectivity than others: e.g., the New York Stock Exchange as against subsistence farms in Uzbekistan. However, the balance of forces in contemporary society has heavily favoured the emergence of a more global world. Indeed, the explanation of globalization outlined above suggests that the growth of transplanetary connections between people is unlikely to reverse in the foreseeable future. The various dynamics of capitalism, state and other regulation, national and other identity construction, and rationalism are deeply embedded in large parts of contemporary society, including its most powerful quarters. In combination, these forces have generated enormous momentum for globalization. To be sure, as is particularly stressed in Part III of this book, policymakers as well as citizens at large have ample opportunities to affect the speeds, directions and consequences of growing globality. However, it is hard to see how political action could stop, let alone reverse, the powerful combination of forces that are currently assembled behind this reconfiguration of social space. Only a possible systemic ecological calamity would appear to stand in the way of continuing large-scale globality and considerable further globalization in the period ahead. The account of globalization presented here is admittedly complex. It explains contemporary globalization in terms of interrelations between four aspects of capitalism, capitalism, five features of state and other governance, three qualities of national and other identity construction, and four implications of rationalist knowledge. Such an approach violates the demands of conventional social science for parsimony. Why not, some critics might object, explain globalization more simply as the result of one main cause such as technology, or US power, or capitalism, or cultural imperialism?

The view adopted here is that more compact formulas of the kind covered in the first half of this chapter are oversimplified and omit more than is acceptable. Shorthand equations tend to offer highly partial explanations and illusory degrees of predictive powers. Moreover, in terms of theory–practice relations, policies and actions based on excessively narrow understandings of globalization can produce substantial harm through omission. Thus, for example, political engagement of globalization from perspectives like liberalism and Marxism has often wrought considerable cultural violence, however unintended, because these theories brush over issues of identity and knowledge. Meanwhile constructivist theories have generally been insufficiently sensitive to the power relations of social hierarchies, while the relative economic illiteracy of postmodernist approaches can have unhappy consequences for material welfare. In contrast, a more complex explanation that is alert to an intricate combination of multiple forces could encourage the development of more viable positive policies towards globalization. Indeed, this book's 'critical introduction' is meant to promote more secure, equitable and democratic courses of globalization. The approach developed above constantly turns the spotlight on insecurity, inequality and marginalization within globalization to date, in the hopes of fostering future globalizations that limit – or better yet overcome – these violences. Of course, some readers will find this critical theory to be insufficiently radical, or to be radical in the wrong ways. For example, eco-centric thinkers and activists may object that the approach taken here gives insufficient attention to globalization as a process of environmental degradation. Feminists may argue that gender relations should figure more centrally than they do in this account. Indigenous

peoples may regard the theory of globalization developed here as yet another manifestation of the imperialism of westernist-modernist-rationalist knowledge. Theists may reject the secularist character of the theory and its failure to grasp the possibilities that globalization offers for spiritual revival. Anarchists may say that the argument does not sufficiently challenge what they take to be the inherently oppressive nature of states and other bureaucratic governance frameworks. Admittedly, like any theory, this account embodies and furthers certain interests and values. The approach here tries to be ecologically aware while keeping the principal focus on social problems. It seeks to promote gender sensitivity while also keeping attention on other social hierarchies such as inequalities related to class, culture and race. The argument attempts to be reflexively rationalist: that is, to maximize the emancipatory potentials of modern knowledge while recognizing that modernity has tendencies towards ecological destruction, bureaucratic oppression, spiritual vacuum, and suppression of other life-worlds. To theists and anarchists one can only answer that, for better or for worse, the author has a secularist outlook and a faith in the potentials of formal public regulation to improve the human condition. Theory cannot but rest, in part, on the theorist's politics.