Globalization, Cultural

K. N. Rankin, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

© 2009 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Glossary

Articulation A joining together of diverse elements in the constitution of societies structured in dominance; a Gramscian interpretation of articulation is engaged here, which involves, as Stuart Hall has noted, a focus on the production of meaning through practice such that the connection or link must be positively sustained by specific processes and can under some circumstances be overthrown, leading to new connections – rearticulations – being forged.

Conjuncture The notion of conjuncture comes from Antonio Gramsci who sought to develop a method of moving from abstract Marxian laws of economic development to concrete analyses of 'current relations of force'. As Stuart Hall has argued in bringing Gramsci's work to bear on contemporary issues, a conjunctural analysis involves both a materialist premise, that the analysis of political and economic structures must be grounded in their material conditions of existence; as well as a historical premise, that the specific forms of these relations cannot be deduced *a priori* from abstract economic laws, but must rather be made historically and spatially specific.

Flexible Accumulation The regime of accumulation characteristic of post-Fordism, involving methods of production that are considered flexible, such as flexibly deployed labor, easily programmable machines, and just-in-time production.

Frankfurt School A group of radical scholars who established critical theory as a central trajectory of 'Western Marxism', and who were associated with the Institute of Social Research founded in Frankfurt, Germany in 1923.

Historical Materialism An analytical method associated with Marxism rooted in a premise that social relations are grounded in their material conditions of existence and emerge out of concrete historical developments.

Post-Fordism A collection of workplace practices, modes of industrial organization, and institutional forms identified with period since the mid-1970s, following the era referred to as Fordist – and commonly understood to extend to associated modes of social regulation.

Postmodernism Emerging first in architecture, a theoretical orientation that expresses skepticism toward modernist universalisms, especially metanarratives that privilege the vantage point of the artist, theorist, or observer, and favors instead a popular eclecticism in theory, art, philosophy, and social science.

Post-Structuralism A theoretical orientation that rejects the formalism of structuralist linguistics and its epistemological subject.

Practice Theory A field of anthropological inquiry which consolidated in the 1970s and 1980s around a common interest in exploring the 'processes' through which cultural systems are produced and reproduced, and how they change – and which is associated with the work of Pierre Bourdieu and Marshall Sahlins.

Introduction

The term 'cultural globalization' evokes images of malnourished children drinking coca cola in impoverished agrarian settings, of satellite television broadcasting MTV and American sitcoms in remote Himalayan villages, and of the consumption of 'exotic' novelties – Thai food, flamenco dance, African music – in metropolitan centers all over the world. The study of cultural globalization is motivated variously by a worry about the colonization of cultural life by capitalism, a celebration of the cultural hybrids that emerge as people, images, ideas and money traverse the globe, and an expectation that 'culture' itself could become a site of resistance to prevailing ideologies and conditions. As such, cultural globalization as an object of academic study emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s, during a period of rapid functional integration of economic activities across the globe, but in which 'the economic' was perceived to be an inadequate lens for assessing experiences of disjuncture and entanglement, as much as the symbolic, ideological and discursive dimensions of global interconnectedness. It was taken up with particular vigor in cultural studies, where the emphasis has been on representational politics, as well as in anthropology and geography, which have tended rather to explore some of the contradictions between the production and experience of cultural globalization.

'Circulation' and 'flow' are the fundamentally geographic metaphors engaged in academic and popular venues alike to capture the movement – of people, ideas, money, cultures, and information – that constitutes cultural globalization. As anthropologist Anna Tsing has noted, circulation and flow replace the metaphor of 'penetration' once used on the critical left to characterize the incorporation of peripheral regions into the capitalist world system; while penetration evokes the

violence of rape, circulation and flow evoke more benign images like blood coursing through the body. Their use signals a shift in focus from production to exchange and consumption as constitutive domains of globalization in an era of post-Fordist flexible accumulation. It also signals the turn in human geography and across the social sciences to 'culture' as a category of analysis, as circuits and flows index interconnections among peoples, places, and ideas – relationships forged at least in part through negotiations over meanings, values and beliefs, as well as through social networks and associations. These metaphors have served a range of contradictory claims about the politics of globalization – that it frees people and capital from restrictive regulation; that the rapid expansion of communications technology gives more people access to information; and that the cultural disjunctures associated with movement ultimately present a challenge to American cultural hegemony.

Despite this apparently indiscriminate celebration across the ideological spectrum, it is possible to distinguish a range of epistemological framings and moral valuations in the geographic and related literatures on cultural globalization. This article aims to tease out these differences by presenting a typology of approaches to the circulation metaphor and their attendant representations of 'the cultural' and 'globalization'. One approach emphasizes the flow itself – what is being circulated, where, how, and to what effect. Within this epistemological rubric, we can find moral valuations that are both positive (in the form of postmodern celebrations of difference) and negative (in Frankfurt School-type alarm about the Americanization or standardization of culture and the destruction of local differences). A second approach considers instead the political–economic conditions of circulation. Here the emphasis is on closing the space between the economic and the cultural by considering the economies of cultural globalization and the cultures of economic globalization. The prevailing normative interpretation in this scenario is critical – for example, lamenting the commodification of the aesthetic or chronicling the alternatives to capitalism in people's everyday practices around the world. But considerable normative ambiguity remains, insofar as this epistemological framing can also be deployed in the service of neoliberal capitalism – by, for example, injunctions to 'get the institutions right', promote social capital, strengthen civil society, and so on.

The article argues that more sound normative footing can be found in a third approach, which challenges the unity of the circulation metaphor and the implication of 'the global' and 'the cultural' in a reductive binary logic. Drawing on the explicitly Gramscian concepts of the conjunctural and the hegemonic, the articulation approach traces historically and geographically specific processes of spatial interconnection. In so doing, it rejects the abstract determinisms and inexorable forces so frequently conjured up by notions of 'cultural globalization', to chronicle the distinctive cultural forms of capitalism taking shape in different regions of the world. It adopts an explicitly critical stance along the Marxian lines of seeking to understand the world in order to change it. The article is organized into three sections, which discuss each of the three approaches, followed by a concluding section that considers the implications of the favored 'articulation' approach for methodology and political praxis in human geography.

Flows-and-Impacts Approach

The crudest versions of the flows-and-impacts approach express a worry about the export of American mass consumer culture around the world. Framed in this way, the research problem becomes one of specifying the 'cultures of globalization' as well as determining the impacts of cultural globalization on various peoples and places. Attempts to specify an essential global culture generally focus on the diffusion of ideologies of consumption through communications and information media, and an attendant convergence of cultural styles as Western 'values' of consumerism are embraced around the world. Thus, geographers have speculated on how increased access to mass media has set in motion a trend toward individualization, rooted in the growing importance of material consumption for expressions of individual identity. Anthropologists have likewise attempted to specify a 'culture of neoliberalism' featuring consumption as a primary determinant of identity, the eclipse of social class as a relevant social category, and the emergence of race, gender, and age as key principles of identification and mobilization. Such cultural homogenization theses also find expression in much of the literature on the cultural industry which laments the incorporation of increasing domains of cultural life into webs of capitalist organization. Not even the aesthetic remains as a sanctuary from the economic colonization of culture. A corollary to this line of thinking is to speculate about the dilution of traditional 'local' cultures, for example, the decline in significance of territorially based group identity in the wake of processes of individualization.

Now, it is certainly reasonable and necessary to pay attention to the ways in which corporate capital aims to diffuse certain consumerist practices as elements of mass culture – eating fast food, dressing fashionably, pursuing the exotic, and so on. But, as many cultural geographers have pointed out, cultural homogenization theses too easily elide the production of dominant cultural ideology – consumerism – with historically and geographically

contingent cultural practices – consumption as a process of meaning-making and social reproduction situated in relation to class processes and associated power relations. It is one thing to say that the neoliberal project of the 1980s sought to make private, market-based choice central to social life, quite another to claim that it succeeded in producing economically 'rational' subjects. Perhaps the most significant danger of the elision between the production and practice of culture lies in the way it echoes, even fuels, some extremely regressive cultural nationalisms prevalent in many parts of the world today. Claims being made in many postcolonial states about the cultural essence of the nation rest on similar arguments about the threats to local cultural distinctiveness posed by the colonizing force of Western culture. Much violence has been committed in the name of resistance to Western cultural imperialism, not least the rolling back of core liberal rights and protections against (particularly gender) discrimination. The cultural homogenization thesis also perpetuates the familiar common-sense binary of the global-local, whereby the 'local' is not only opposed to the 'global' in an essentialist manner, but also contained within it. As such, it denies agency to the people who are assumed to passively and uncritically absorb the ideologies and lifestyle positions of corporate-controlled media, along with fetishizing information technology by attributing it with transformative powers.

The more interesting geographic work in the flows-and-impacts genre asks about how dominant cultural representations are 'indigenized' in particular times and places. Anthropologist Arjun Appadurai has been particularly influential among cultural geographers, for his formulation of the 'disjunctive global economy of culture' constituted by nonisomorphic flows of people, technology, images, money, and ideas. The landscapes formed by the intersection of these flows – which he designates as ethnoscapes, technoscapes, mediascapes, financescapes and ideoscapes – in turn constitute the 'imagined worlds' for historically and geographically situated peoples and groups. Global flows connect people in far-flung lands, but not in a linear or predictable fashion; they are fragmented, irregular, move in many different directions, and look different from different locations and perspectives. In so doing they constitute multiple, distinctively 'non-Western' capitalist and postsocialist modernities. Appadurai thus moves beyond static center-periphery models to emphasize relationality and interconnectedness and poses a challenge to the notion of globalization as unfolding teleology. In this way his work resonates with, and in fact informs, much of the work on transnationality in cultural geography, which has similarly engaged relational theorizing to consider how transnational cultural flows forge connections across and between entities formerly theorized as discrete and autonomous – thus dispensing with rigid state-centric narratives of globalization processes. Studies of consumption in cultural geography and related disciplines have also taken their cue from Appadurai, to examine 'the social life of things' – how the commodities that are flowing change physically and symbolically as they move through global space, to what ends they are used, and how they create new meanings wherever they go. In this way, commodities themselves provide a lens for exploring interconnections between locations and movements, as well as the politics of consumption.

The focus here on how people find meaning in and respond to globally circulating forms of material culture (as well as migration, technology, finance, and ideology) suggests that the 'impact' of cultural globalization is not homogenization, but rather fragmentation, not smooth transmittal but disjuncture. An emphasis on indigenization would seem to suggest that the deepening of local particularities is in fact a defining characteristic of cultural globalization – and indeed many of the contributions to Frederic Jameson and Masao Miyoshi's *Cultures of Globalization* are committed to documenting the vitality of indigenous languages, peasant political movements, ritual revitalizations, and other local emergences of difference as constitutive dimensions of globalization. Paradoxically, these emergences may be motivated by elite consumption in global cities of the North and South, as much as by articulated resistance to cultural nationalisms or cultural imperialisms.

A related, more explicitly post-structuralist interpretation of fragmentation attributes a subversive quality to the cultural mixing that transpires particularly in the 'liminal spaces of in-between' (as in, in between cultures, communities, or nations). 'Hybridity' is the designation that cultural critic Homi Bhabha attaches to such processes – suggesting that they entail a progressive appropriation and rearticulation of dominant cultures. Processes of transculturation, creolization, and hybridization that transpire most vigorously at the margins or in liminal spaces of cultural contact, that is, have the potential to destabilize cultural purities, subvert categorical oppositions (e.g., local/global), and create the conditions for cultural reflexivity. A related set of arguments posits cultural globalization as entailing eclectic contacts and borrowings that encourage the proliferation of new cultures – representing culture as impure and disorderly combinations, in contrast to its hegemonic representations as isolated and regulated tradition. We have here a view of the world as fundamentally decentered and a claim that cultural hybrids themselves constitute a critique and subversion of cultural imperialism and attendant forms of domination.

Reservations about accounts of fragmentation, indigenization, hybridization, and the like have centered on their generally positive moral valuation and political naivitée. In an effort to overcome essentialist interpretations

of culture as tradition or barrier to change, such accounts end up celebrating flow itself. Geographer Katharyne Mitchell has been among the most cogent critics of post-structuralist interpretations of transnationalism and cultural globalization – suggesting that the tendency to attribute a progressive politics to cultural expressions of in-betweenness results in neglect of the oppressive socio-economic forces that often underlie conditions of hybridity and transnational flow. As she puts it, "[i]n an era of global capitalism, the heralding of subject positions 'at the margins' too often neglects the actual marginalization of subjects" – the poverty, under-employment, ambivalent citizen status, cultural misrecognition, and social ruptures that are common to the 'experience' of migration and other conditions of in-betweenness. Imputing a progressive politics of intervention to the subjects of cultural hybridity, moreover, overlooks the ways in which those 'on the margins', themselves can play a role in reproducing both socioeconomic and cultural forms of injustice in the margins.

In fact, it can be said that the flows-and-impacts approach in general suffers from too-narrow interpretations of culture and geographic scale that ultimately leave unchallenged neoliberal assertions of market triumphalism at 'the end of history'. For however much it seeks to deterritorialize culture, the proposition that once immobile 'local' places are now transcended by 'global' flow suggests that there are still, as Anna Tsing puts it, some local people stuck inside local situations – and belonging to stagnant 'local cultures'. The more nuanced interpretations of flow do of course move beyond popular representations of the local as the stopping point of global circulations, where global flows are unquestioningly consumed and incorporated. But, as Tsing has argued, even the concept of hybridity relies on an understanding of the local as the place where global flows fragment and become something place-bound and particular. Such invocations of the 'global' and the 'local' produce an understanding of geographic scale as essentially fixed and hierarchal domains in which particular processes are consigned to specific levels. As geographer Gillian Hart points out in a series of important essays on development, they also play into disabling discourses of globalization that reinscribe a series of related hegemonic binaries. In addition to active/passive, male/female, colonized/colonizer, production/consumption, public/private, economy/culture, these include dichotomous understandings of time and space in which time is treated as a primary analytical category while space appears as a passive container. The effect is to naturalize hegemonic forms of economic globalization that currently prevail and are taken for granted as producing outcomes in particular places. Within this epistemological framing, the fundamental analytical move is limited to chronicling the 'impacts' of globalization on places and people. In the cultures of economies approach, to which we now turn, the case is made instead for a more nuanced interpretation of agency and causality by deconstructing in particular the economy/culture dichotomy.

Cultures-of-Economies Approach

Some of the most persuasive and interesting remedies to the limitations of the flow approach to cultural globalization can be found in the subfield of economic geography. Formerly narrow representations of the economic in terms of modes and forces of production (determining the organization and experience of social life) gave way in the 1990s, to an appreciation of the social embeddedness of economic processes. At that conjuncture, geographers were responding not just to post-structuralist critiques of reductive economisms within academia (some of which, it must be said, reflect a serious misreading of Marxist political economy, and on the contrary galvanized some persuasive illustrations of historical materialism as a method for cultural interpretation, such as David Harvey's *Condition of Postmodernity*). They were also taking their cue from nonacademic sources: from, as geographer Phil Crang has suggested, the shift in popular radical politics away from concerns with socioeconomic redistribution to a focus on representational politics aimed at remedying cultural forms of injustice; and also from the ways in which the capitalist economy began to define itself through culture – seeking, for example, to create the institutional conditions for innovation, learning, knowledge sharing, and so on. The turn to 'the cultural' in economic geography thus marked a new interest in discursive constructions and processes of meaning making as constitutive of economic practice. 'The cultural' moved from a derivative and secondary category of analysis to take center stage alongside 'the economic' in a more relational approach to understanding economic life. For our purposes of reviewing geographic approaches to cultural globalization, these developments are significant because they brought economic geographers into the business of documenting not only the political–economic conditions of global cultural flows, but also the ways in which culture, construed in this processual sense, contours global economic processes.

One formulation of these relationships seeks in effect to specify the intersection of 'the cultural' with 'the economic', the two-way mutually constitutive interrelations between constructed economic and cultural spheres. Thus, for example, in a seminal study on the *Spatial Divisions of Labor*, Doreen Massey chronicles the reciprocal relationship between public and private investment in South Wales and key cultural characteristics – namely, geographically and historically specific forms of patriarchy, masculinism, Methodism, trade unionism,

and corporatist community life. Rather than merely chronicle the impact of direct investment on localities, she explores how changes in industrial geography are contoured by embedded social and political struggles. Studies of global commodity chains have similarly foregrounded the significance of consumption for capitalist expansion and for tracing links among spatially dispersed histories. This work has antecedents in anthropology where there is a longer history of documenting the ways in which 'local' cultural practices contour particular moments of integration into global economic processes; an exemplary study in this regard is Sidney Mintz' *Sweetness and Power*, a historical ethnography of the emergence of a taste for sugar among the working class in Britain and its relationship to the dramatic rise of sugar cane production in the Caribbean colonies. Even the globalizing finance sector, often taken to be a purely 'economic' domain, has been subject to this sort of cultural analysis. Given the significance of personal interaction, discourse and interpretive skills in the conduct of financial intermediation, geographers such as Linda McDowell began in the 1990s to analyze the cultural practices of employees – how they perform gender, class, ethnicity, and so on – as well as the places of doing business and the discursive strategies engaged.

Others, most notably David Harvey, have maintained that the intersection between the economic and the cultural is rather more unidirectional. While not denying the significance of culture for the expansion of global capitalism, the argument in *The Condition of Postmodernity* – arguably one of the most widely influential books published in geography – is that in the last instance, the economic is determining: the postmodern (cultural) condition can be traced to the spatial and temporal dynamics of capitalism. This polemical tract was in fact written in response to Jean-Francois Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition* (1979), which aimed to dispense with modernist metanarratives of determination and ontology in favor of a populist eclecticism and deconstructivist stance. Harvey argued that the expansionist requirements of capital led in the 1980s to the dismantling of the Fordist economy and introduction of more flexible regimes of accumulation relying on global telecommunication and other means to reduce barriers of space by the speeding up of time. These increasingly polarizing and debilitating forms of capitalism have produced the cultural experiences of hybridity, pastiche, and disorientation so often characterized, and celebrated, in postmodern theory as the 'cultures of globalization'. Indeed, postmodern epistemology itself can and must be theorized in relation to these economic conditions of possibility – and the injustices of our times can only be confronted through this sort of historical materialism.

Within cultural studies these commitments find expression in work that takes as its problematic the export of American consumerism as a mode of daily life, but goes beyond simple homogenization arguments to consider the politics of cultural globalization. Frederic Jameson has been at the forefront of efforts to trace how the free movement of American culture (construed here as cultural industry, sectors of cultural production within which value depends on symbolic rather than utilitarian attributes – movies, music, fashion, television, and so on) subverts artistic production and spells the commodification of the aesthetic everywhere (including in America). In a contribution to *Cultures of Globalization*, he suggests that the problem with cultural homogenization theses is that they conflate 'the economic' and 'the cultural' as the cultural, and thus overlook the fact that American mass culture is fundamentally an economic enterprise. By way of example Jameson chronicles the concrete provisions worked out in global and regional trade agreements that secure American dominance and hegemony, such as the removal of subsidies to national film as 'unfair competition' or the opening of quota barriers on film in countries around the world.

An analogous investigation could be made of the political–economic circumstances surrounding the publication of this encyclopedia, with an eye to the ways in which academic publishing, too, is controlled by corporate interests. For the producers and consumers of academic knowledge it is common to view such publications as platforms for critical debate – and indeed critique about the polarizing modalities of capitalism. Rarely does one pause to consider the ways in which academic publishing (and thus scholarship) is imbricated in these very processes. The recent activity of a subsidiary of Reed Elsevier – publisher of this encyclopedia along with several key geography journals – has provided grist for such reflection within the community of critical and political geographers. That subsidiary, Reed Exhibitions, had included within its portfolio exhibitions of Defence Systems & Equipment International (DSEI), the world's biggest weapons fair. The stark proximity of critical geographical scholarship to a company with links to the arms trade prompted a heated debate on the Critical Geography listserv and in the pages of *Political Geography* in the first half of 2007 about the moral perils entailed in the commodification of academic knowledge. Those discussions raised the spectre of the many complex and contradictory ways that academia, and indeed Geography, is linked to the military and defense industries. They also revealed the political force academics can wield when they galvanize public attention. In a June 2007 news release, Elsevier announced its intentions to exit the defence exhibitions sector, in response to the 'very real concerns' of 'growing numbers of important customers and authors'.

In the case of the film industry, Jameson argues, this sort of morally ambiguous, if not repugnant, corporate

control has substantively constrained content – drastically compromising posibilities for filmic experiments in imagining radically different social alternatives to this one we now live under. Thus, the triumph of Hollywood is not merely an economic triumph, it is also a political one. Unfortunately, Jameson moves too reductively from lamenting the role of American mass culture in quelling political innovation to lamenting its role in breaking up entire cultural systems in other parts of the world with the allure of Hollywood film and the consumerist way of life it represents. Like Harvey, he is certainly on the firmest ground when he focuses on the economic basis of cultural production, and here the work of both Jameson and Harvey offers some clear direction for radical praxis and counter-hegemonic strategy. For consumerism and postmodernism are revealed in their work not as free-floating abstract values, but as ideologies – views of the world – that are grounded in capitalist relations of production and concretely produced in particular historical and geographical conjunctures. The task then becomes one of identifying, and challenging, the political–economic conditions for their production – the trade agreements, capital market structures, legal systems, barriers to local ownership and innovation, and so on. Once these relationships are established, moreover, key hegemonic formulations can be refuted, such as the imputed causal relationship between free markets and political democracy. If consumerism is really a form of manufactured consent, 'free choice' in the market might in fact be shown to repress rather than foster political participation.

Of course, the standard critique leveled against materialist accounts of cultural globalization such as Jameson's or Harvey's is that they posit a too-easy chain of determination from capitalist political economy to cultural forms and experience. Limiting one's reading of cultural forms to only those aspects that might be economically determined means that other bases of subject and cultural formation, such as ideologies and experiences of race and gender, may be missed. Another tack within the cultures-of-economies approach has been to focus instead on the economic rationality of culture (as opposed to its determination). This is a move which forces a productive reconceptualization of culture not as fixed signs and symbols with assigned meanings and values, but in terms of what people do. This interpretation may be located within the anthropological field of practice theory, which consolidated in the 1970s and 1980s around a common interest in exploring the 'processes' through which cultural systems are produced and reproduced, and how they change. Particularly influential in geography has been the work of Pierre Bourdieu, who in his writing on aesthetics and the 'economics of practice' is concerned not so much with the colonization of people's hearts and minds by corporate interests, as with engaging economic concepts to explore the role of cultural practice in reproducing (or transforming) existing social structures. Among those of unequal status, for example, gifting and other modes of reciprocity generate affective bonds that obfuscate – and cement – social hierarchy, and as such they constitute a kind of symbolic capital, if not symbolic violence. Likewise, practices of aesthetic appreciation articulate acts of self-expression with processes of social reproduction. Crucially, the articulation of cultural practice with processes of social reproduction extends across transnational and global space. In their formulation of the 'translocal village', for example, Selvaraj Velayutham and Amanda Wise consider how South Indian Tamils residing in Singapore maintain strong social ties with fellow caste members in their village of origin. Through returns, remittances, flows of obligations and the replication of village practices in Singapore, a moral economy of obligations is expanded spatially across national borders. This transnational social field is perpetuated through regimes of affect – guilt and shame are mobilized, coercively, to reproduce, in a spatially expanded form, the endogamous caste practices of cross-cousin marriage, kin networks, and ritual obligations. Without abandoning a concern with social justice, then, such representations give greater emphasis to questions of agency and subjectivity in global cultural processes than we find in the more structuralist accounts of Jameson and Harvey.

Others have sought to move beyond the structural coupling of distinct economic and cultural spheres, to consider how economic activity itself is always culturally constituted and spatially placed. Karl Polanyi is perhaps the seminal thinker in this regard. The key intervention in *The Great Transformation* was to dispute the premise in liberal economic theory that the self-regulating market is some naturally occurring 'pure' form of the market that can be achieved by removing all forms of political intervention. Rather, it is the product of historical experiments in creating markets for land, labor, and money – beginning, Polanyi argues, with the Enclosure Movement in the 1500s – and an impossible utopian project. If anything can be said to be 'naturally occurring', the argument continues, it is the countermovements for social protection that spontaneously arise in reaction to the profound havoc visited upon people when these domains of social life are subject to market forces. The empirical task then becomes one of examining how 'the economic' is instituted in different times and places, and, specifically within capitalist contexts, how countermovements for social protection are contained through particular constructions of market society. Within comparative political economy, these commitments have found expression in attempts to document the 'varieties of capitalism', the continued institutional divergence that can be found among advanced capitalist countries in the face of global

pressures for economic convergence. The emphasis here is on the 'institutional field' within which firms operate, including not only market competition, but also interactions among firms, institutions, labor, and market rules – a conjunction widely summarized as introducing 'culture' into political–economic analyses. A corollary argument, coming from sociology and in particular the work of Mark Granovetter, considers the extent to which firms are 'embedded' in cultural environments that are suitable (or not) for technological and organizational innovation – such as social networks through which tacit knowledge is transferred.

Economic geographers have weighed in on this discussion by expanding the scalar focus of the analysis and moving beyond an understanding of culture as 'local environmental milieu' to recognize the significance of meaning-making for constituting economic practice. For example, as Meric Gertler's work has consistently shown, national-scale regulation institutionalizes certain ways of viewing the economy which in turn structure firm practices, what counts as economically rational behavior and even what appear to be cultural traits, like cooperativeness or competition. At the scale of the firm, economic geographers have examined how such norms are institutionalized in particular constitutions of economic identity and space, such as through recruitment policies, disciplining discourses of organizational change, or the construction of gendered, raced, and classed time-spaces of production. The dynamics of (and obstacles to) change, about which the 'varieties of capitalism' approach is largely silent, must then be assessed in relation to the complex interactions among such scaled cultural articulations.

Before proceeding in a final section to elaborate the concept of articulation, one other direction economic geographers have taken the notion that economies are culturally constructed must be noted. Under the rubric of the 'diverse economies' project, J.K. Gibson-Graham has advocated engaging post-structuralist epistemologies to deconstruct dominant 'capitalocentric' representations of the economy in order to make way for counter-hegemonic reconstructions. *The End of Capitalism* (*as we knew it*) argues that the structuralist epistemologies underlying political economy reinforce capitalist hegemony by taking it for granted. Seeing capitalist hegemony as a dominant discourse rather than a social structure or systemic unity presents possibilities for creating competing discourses, a language of economic alterity to reflect both capitalist and noncapitalist practices that constitute diverse economies. What is perhaps most remarkable about this initiative has been the extent to which it has polarized economic geographers into camps of protagonists and critics. On the one hand, it has spawned conferences, edited volumes, special journal issues, and a diverse, all committed to the cause of economic alterity. On the other hand, it has provoked a vitriolic and defensive response by those who read Gibson-Graham to be naively and arrogantly seeking to bring down capitalism through discursive and theoretical finesse.

As her later book, *Postcapitalist Politics*, makes clear, the desired intervention is more modest and tentative than such critiques would suggest, and centers on an important insight about the role of economic subjectivity in political change processes. The point is that economic subjectivity is more complex than conventional class analysis allows; depictions of class as a group of unified economic subjects fail to grasp the multiple class processes in which individual subjects are always engaged – working in a capitalist firm, sure, but also likely doing unpaid housework, maybe participating in a babysitting club, hunting or picking berries to supplement food supply, and so on. Renaming class homogeneity as class heterogeneity makes it possible to take seriously the affective and emotional stances that attach to different subject positions, to appreciate, for example, how the feelings of despair and vulnerability associated with some forms of labor pose a real obstacle for generating economic activism. The point of documenting economic diversity through participatory means is in large part to change such debilitating modes of subjectivity and build a constituency for social change. Once people recognize the innovation and dynamism that already exist in their everyday economic practices, that is, they can undergo the 'ethical self-transformation' necessary to participate in collective processes of building 'intentional economic communities'. Freed in this way from hegemonic accounts and positionings, they can begin to view the economy not as an autonomous zone that impacts their lives, but as an 'ethical space for decision', within which all kinds of possibilities arise for engaging social surplus to replenish and expand the commons and the productive base. The hope that is vested in creating a language of economic diversity, then, has not so much to do with challenging capitalism by discursive fiat, as with interpellating alternative political subjectivities and enabling new forms of economic activism.

Articulation Approach

Approaches discussed in the previous section are all significant for their attempts to view 'the economic' in relation to 'the cultural', and thus for attempting to challenge the hegemonic binaries so commonly associated with discourses of globalization. Yet in practice they often foreground one domain over the other. Political economic analyses contribute crucially to our understanding of the material conditions of cultural flow, but in subsuming 'the cultural' to 'the entertainment

business' or a universal experience of time-space compression, such formulations evoke 'culture' in a secondary role to assist in the explanation of phenomena that are seen as primarily economic. Jameson, for example, addresses the production of consumerist ideology, but his analysis is limited to political–economic conditions of possibility and conflates too easily the production of ideology with the everyday practice of culture. This work thus overlooks a whole set of important questions about the way consumerist ideologies articulate social formations in particular time-space contexts. Likewise, expanded notions of economic subjectivity (à la Gibson-Graham) or the economics of culture (à la Bourdieu) go a long way toward revealing how power operates through culture, right down to the way people carry their own bodies, all of which certainly has important implications for the possibility of economic activism. But they, too, leave aside that point of intersection between the economics of practice and the politics of economies by eschewing political–economic questions about control over the means of production and the structures that support systemic inequalities. The point in reviewing these omissions is not to suggest that one might somehow add up the two sides of the coin (the economic and the cultural, the global and the local) in order to see the whole picture. It is rather to suggest that an entirely different epistemological stance is required, one that would seek to view the world more relationally from the outset, or, as geographer Gillian Hart puts it, 'to clarify diverse and interrelated trajectories of sociospatial change'. As this section elaborates, such epistemological distinctions matter, not just for the sake of theoretical precision, but also for how politics can be imagined and practiced.

The articulation approach thus begins, but only begins, with the premise that thinking about 'cultural globalization' requires thinking about how products whose value depends on symbolic attributes (like fashion, film, or music) have been commodified under regimes of flexible accumulation; and that 'the cultural industry' is deeply implicated in American imperialism and capitalist expansion today, along with its attendant exclusions, inequalities, and class processes. But that is not to assert a singular and inexorable transnational capitalist force encompassing farther and farther flung corners of the globe into its fold. An articulation approach points rather to more conjunctural questions about how conditions for capital accumulation are actively created and constantly reworked in particular historical and geographical contexts. The notion of conjuncture comes from Antonio Gramsci who sought to develop a method of moving from abstract Marxian laws of economic development to concrete analyses of 'current relations of force'. As Stuart Hall has so carefully argued in bringing Gramsci's work to bear on contemporary cultural–political dilemmas, it involves a materialist premise, that the analysis of political and economic structures, such as the cultural industry, must be grounded in their material conditions of existence; as well as a historical premise, that the specific forms of these relations cannot be deduced *a priori* from abstract economic laws, but must rather be made historically and spatially specific. From here we can pick up again Polanyi's formulation about the social and political constructedness of capitalist 'free' markets, to ask how are markets in cultural products constituted in particular space–time conjunctures – for example, through, global trade agreements, as Jameson elaborates; how and who are the winners and losers selected; and how, crucially, are countermovements for social protection anticipated, managed, and contained?

To understand fully such processes of capitalist market formation, however, requires achieving not only an economic and political unity, but also, as Gramsci argued, a moral and intellectual unity, involving the coordination of the interests of (some) subaltern groups with those of (some) dominant groups. In his reformulation of Lenin's idea of hegemony, Gramsci was concerned largely with the cultural processes by which such alliances among differently positioned social groups are built to form the political constituency for a particular market formation. The death of local film industries around the world cannot be achieved singlehandedly by Hollywood; it has of course required a range of state, multilateral, corporate, and civil society actors heralding from different national-political contexts and seeking to promote a particular configuration of film production and exchange; and to understand how it could be sustained politically requires understanding the enormous appeal of Hollywood film and television to viewing audiences occupying widely varying class, ethno-cultural and spatial positions. Their addictions constitute a significant dimension of the sort of American cultural hegemony that concerns Frederic Jameson, and illustrate the role of strategic alliances in forging hegemony. As Hall suggests, the question then becomes, how are such alliances actively constructed and positively maintained in historically specific (and temporary) 'moments' in the life of a society? What sort of cultural work is entailed in winning over the hearts and minds of subordinate groups to particular capitalist formations so that relations of domination can be secured by consent, not coercion?

Cultural industries lend themselves particularly well to exploring the ways in which processes of meaning making conjoin with capitalist social relations to constitute the various capitalisms that have gone into the making of globalization. For these sectors make especially clear the connection between the production of symbolic value and the creation of the popular habits and spaces necessary to sustain profitable commodity exchange. Economic geographers have gone a long way in showing through studies of fashion, home furnishings, film, and so

on, how capital takes seriously and makes explicit the cultural work entailed in commodifying distinction and difference as a basis for economic profit. But this sort of relationality between economic practice and meaning making is not unique to cultural industries. The production and exchange of goods and services is always intimately bound up in the production of ways of doing and thinking. These ways of doing and thinking may contribute to the formation of historically and spatially specific hegemonic alliances insofar as they get taken up as practical common sense within particular social groups in particular space-time conjunctures (or they may not). And they will often have economic effects, in terms of patterns of consumer demand or the competitiveness of particular firms, regions, commodities, or services.

The limitations of a Gramscian framework lie in the way that the notion of hegemony construes subjectivity, by suggesting that people either consent to the exercise of power or they resist it. An analytic grounded in the work of Michel Foucault shares an interpretation of capitalist relations as a vehicle not just for extraction, but also for imparting ways of doing and thinking. And it too is concerned with how the exercise of power is achieved in the absence of coercion or force. But, as anthropologist Tania Li has argued in a study on the *Will to Improve*, within the field of power that he termed 'government' Foucault understood subjects to be formed by practices of which they may not be aware, and to which their consent is neither given nor withheld. And he highlighted the ways in which power enables as much as it constrains—through, as he succinctly put it, 'the conduct of conduct', the rationalities of rule, and assemblages of techniques that cultivate the conditions in which subjects live their lives. Thus it is not only modern markets that are socially constructed, but also modern subjects, and these are relational processes. One could explore the relationship between television advertisements aired during cartoons, or the practice of contracting soft drink vending machines in public venues such as schools or zoos, or even cultural products themselves, with the constitution of the consuming subject. Or how the idea and practice of the living wage was coproduced with the masculinist laboring subject within particular Fordist regimes of accumulation. Or the role of microfinance programs in community development programs all over the world in constituting the entrepreneurial subject. The Foucauldian notion of governmentality thus encompasses but decenters the role of the state in the practice of government, making room for other sorts of actors such as corporations, nongovernmental organizations, or labor unions to play a role in projects of rule. And it expresses well the temporary and provisional nature of such projects, which must be actively created and constantly reworked, and are always subject to critique and resistance by those whose conduct is being conducted.

Thus far we have been focusing on the production of globalization through hegemonic alliances and regimes of rule. And, as Hart has pointed out, it is easier to recognize the contingency and situatedness of globalization from the standpoint of its production than from the standpoint of its experience or reception. The articulation approach to cultural globalization also takes up the question of 'reception', but rejects top-down impact models of change by focusing instead on the interrelations between wide-scale macroeconomic and associated ideological processes with cultural practices and social formations (understood themselves as interrelated with state and economy) in particular regions of the world. Here again it may be useful to return to Bourdieu's understanding of culture as practices of meaning making that are inextricably linked to the material circumstances and dynamics of power within which lives are lived. Anthropologist Mark Liechty's study of consumer culture in Kathmandu offers a good example of how such an interpretation of culture might be engaged to investigate the articulation of globally circulating images and commodities with a particular economics of practice. In *Suitably Modern*, he describes how middle-class Kathmandu residents have since the lowering of import bans in Nepal in the 1980s been engaging commodity consumption as a marker of class distinction by participating in a rapidly expanding commoditized regime of value, in which personal prestige and identity are related to the control and display of possessions. Though many people describe the practices of 'doing fashion' or hosting extremely costly 'buffet-style' parties as intensely stressful, they feel they have no choice but to participate for fear of losing their place in a consumption-based prestige economy. For others such as low castes the new social currency of consumer goods presents opportunities for transcending low-status positions associated with previously salient forms of prestige such as caste.

Here we see how a global cultural economy of consumer goods gets harnessed to the imperatives of place-based cultural projects (in this case, projects of subject formation through class practice). The global mobility of cultural forms and products may have entailed processes of deterritorialization, the dislocation of culture from centers of cultural production (which, it must be emphasized, are multiple – Asian, European, Latin American, African, Middle Eastern as much as American). But, as anthropologists Inda and Renato Rosaldo have argued, consumer goods and other cultural forms are always reterritorialized through distinctive time-space contexts of consumption. Returning now to a Gramscian analytic, the question is, to what extent do such reterritorializations reinscribe existing hegemonic formations or create the conditions for moments of critical consciousness? In the Kathmandu case noted above, for example, we find a simultaneous deepening of class hierarchies and

loosening of caste-based modes of distinction. The feelings of frustration, even violation, that accompany middle-class peoples' embrace of consumer lifestyles provide grist for critical insight into the way their subjectivity as consumers is being constituted. But this critical consciousness has for the most part not catalyzed individual tactics of subversion or more potent and collective forms of resistance to the new commoditized regime of value. A Gramscian analytic thus demands a focus on how and why particular situated subjects do or do not mobilize to contest their oppression. With respect to these questions, the primary methodological act then becomes learning to read the modes of representation that convey contradictory consciousness and to identify the social and political forces through which countermovements for social protection are constituted in any particular historical–spatial conjuncture.

The articulation approach thus requires a processual and relational understanding of cultural globalization that explores how multiple forces come together in practice to produce particular dynamics or trajectories. The focus here on interconnections among multiple historical/geographical determinations in fact displaces 'globalization' as a suitable metaphor for understanding the historically specific collaborations that create distinctive cultural forms of capitalism. The term 'globalization' reinscribes local/global dichotomies and remains mired in an interpretation of history as teleological abstraction. In an articulation approach, all regions of the world are seen as both local and global. The emphasis, as Doreen Massy put it in her influential and important book, *Space, Power and Gender*, is on how places are set in the context of forces and relations that lie both within them and beyond them, and how therefore the particularity of any place must be recognized precisely through the specificity of the mix of interconnections to that 'beyond'. In this view, places are imagined not as bounded 'local' entities impacted by outside 'global' processes, but as open and porous networks of social relations, a large proportion of which are constructed not 'inside' that place but on a larger scale. The 'global' and the 'local' are just names we give to different aspects of these intersecting relations.

Conclusion: The Cultural Politics of Globalization

The goal in these concluding remarks does not summarize the argument presented thus far, but focuses specifically on the political implications of the three approaches to cultural globalization, and in particular on the political implications of the meanings they convey about the nature of globalization and of the cultural. The limiting and ambiguous politics of the flows-and-impacts and cultures-of-economies approaches will be noted briefly, with the remainder of the conclusion elaborating methodologies and political praxis associated with the articulation approach.

Within the flows-and-impacts approach we have noted that globalization is viewed as a process of flow from centers of economic and cultural production to diverse sites of reception around the world. And 'the cultural' is construed in rather essentialist and static terms as cultural signs and symbols, and the meanings and values associated with them; even if new cultural hybrids are produced at the margins and in liminal spaces, we are still talking here about culture as text. This approach lends itself to a range of moral valuations – the celebration of cultural difference, the fear of cultural homogenization, the embrace of opportunities entailed in the expansion of capitalist markets, or the critique of the ways in which globalization forces the periphery to integrate into the capitalist world system. The stance within the cultures-of-economy approach expresses a more consistent critique of capitalist relations of production and other systems of domination, and some of the work within it introduces an analytically more useful interpretation of culture as processes of meaning making. But it encompasses a range of views on how the economic articulates the cultural – as an intersection, a determination, a mutual embeddedness – with competing interpretations of the ideal sites and strategies for political change. And in its imputed separation of the economic from the cultural this epistemological framing is open to appropriation by more regressive normative agendas that would seek to claim culture as a 'resource' for deepening capitalist markets and subjectivities.

The articulation approach rests on firmer normative ground. It also takes up an interpretation of culture as processes of meaning making, but consistently seeks to ground such processes in situated material practices and their associated power relations. This commitment informs an understanding of globalization not as inexorable force, but as webs of interconnection among concrete places in the world, which are themselves constituted through social relations operating at multiple spatial scales. It also demands attention to the constellation of social relations and technologies of government through which dominant cultural productions are secured, as well as to the conditions in which particular situated subjects mobilize to contest their oppression. And it demands research methodologies suited to tracing how the playing out of social relations across scales constitutes, as Hart puts it, diverse and interrelated trajectories of social change, for the explicit purpose of drawing inferences about directions for political praxis.

Two recent critical ethnographies of global connection are worth mentioning in this regard. Cindi Katz' *Growing Up Global* (2004) draws a contour line that links

the fate of children growing up in the Sudan and the United States, as wide-scale capitalist processes articulate practices of social reproduction. While attending to the specificities of the two historical geographies, the suggestion here is that unexpected similarities in experiences as well as consciousness of economic restructuring offer common grounds for political response across scale and space – for, as she puts it, a countertopography of global capitalism. James Ferguson's *Global Shadows* (2006) offers a more disjunctive view of Africa's global interconnectedness: as he puts it, networks of political–economic connectedness span the globe but do not cover it; rather they hop over large (African) territories and populations to land in spatially dispersed centers of capitalist extraction. Such highly selective and nodal forms of global connection leave most Africans with only a tenuous connection to 'the global economy'. Both books exhibit a relational and conjunctural approach to geography and history. If the trajectories of connection and change they describe are unique to particular political–economic and cultural–political conditions, then alternative trajectories are always possible. But they must, as Hart suggests, be produced on a terrain given by concrete conjunctures of multiple scaled social relations.

Several considerations suggest themselves for moving from an analysis of practice to a praxis of politics. First, as Ferguson persuasively argues, is to recognize how cultural practice always indexes membership in different and unequal social groups. Thus measures to 'respect difference' that are the typical focus of a politics of recognition all too often contribute to exacerbating the lines of socioeconomic inequality. At the same time, the contours of inequality in particular space-time conjunctures are different; they are born out of distinct historical geographies. A second consideration then has to do with the challenge of finding commonalities within the differences, as Hart, Harvey, and others have argued, in order to develop a politics that is collective in its orientation, but that also remains sensitive to such irreducible distinctions. This involves, as Katz' notion of countertopography so powerfully evokes, thinking about how struggles in disparate places might unexpectedly link with one another. A final consideration must then attend to how subjectivity, sentiment, and critical consciousness are constituted under prevailing conditions – how a constituency for such a collective politics might form. As a Gramscian analytic makes clear, while capitalist processes may by definition create winners and losers, it is precisely the role of hegemony to make such arrangements appear natural and inevitable to adequate numbers of losers. The question then becomes, under what circumstances do those who are oppressed in particular socio-spatial arenas come to recognize the arbitrary foundations of the prevailing system and mobilize to change their situation? And how might those circumstances be facilitated? Such considerations are crucial for the project of imagining and building alternative political economies based on solidarities across interconnected historical geographies.

See also: Cultural Economy; Cultural Politics; Cultural Studies and Human Geography; Globalization and Transnational Corporations; Globalization, Economic.

Further Reading

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Crang, P. (1997). Introduction: Cultural turns and the (re)constitution of economic geography. In Lee, R. & Wills, J. (eds.) *Geographies of Economies*, pp 3–15. London: Arnold.

Ferguson, J. (2006). *Global Shadows: Africa in the New World Order*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2006). *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Katz, C. (2004). *Growing up Global: Economic Restructuring and Children's Everyday Lives*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Hall, S. (1980). Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance. *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*, pp 305–345. Paris: UNESCO.

Hart, G. (2002). Geography and development: Development/s beyond neoliberalism? Power, culture, political economy. *Progress in Human Geography* 26, 812–822. (See also Hart's two other Progress Report contributions in 2001 and 2004.)

Harvey, D. (1990). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Inda, J. X. and Rosaldo, R. (2002). *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jameson, F. and Masao, M. (eds.) (1998). *Cultures of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Li, T. M. (2007). *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development and the Practice of Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Liechty, M. (2003). *Suitably Modern: Making Middle Class Culture in a New Consumer Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Mitchell, K. (2003). Cultural geographies of transnationality. In Anderson, K., Domosh, M. & Thrift, N. (eds.) *Handbook of Cultural Geography*, pp 74–88. London: Sage.

Tsing, A. L. (2000). The global situation. *Cultural Anthropology* 15, 327–360.

Velayathum, S. and Wise, A. (2004). Moral economies of a translocal village: Obligation and shame among South Indian transnational migrants. *Global Networks* 5(1), 27–47.

Relevant Websites

http://www.communityeconomies.org
Community Economies.

http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2007/02/28/stuart-hall-globalization-cartographies-of-power/
Darkmatter - Post colonial Futures.

http://www.boell-meo.org/en/web/73.htm
Heinrich Böll Foundation.

http://www.globalization101.org/issue/culture
The Levin Institute.