CHAPTER THREE

Globalisation

3.1   Introduction

In the previous chapter where the "tourism as industry" and the "tourism as social force" conceptualisations were introduced, the context of the marketisation brought about by the neoliberal era was pivotal to the discussion. While a brief outline of the nature of the hegemony of the market was provided along with some impacts such events have had on the tourism phenomenon this chapter explores such issues more fully. This chapter examines the topic of globalisation in order to establish a context for understanding the contemporary tourism sector. It begins by tracing how the conceptualisation of globalisation emerged from the modernisation and development discourse that characterised the twentieth century. The phenomenon of globalisation is then investigated by a brief exploration of the literature on globalisation in the economic, political and cultural arenas. This review reveals the complexity and multifaceted aspects of globalisation. However, concurring with the viewpoints of several analysts of globalisation (including Gill, 1995; McMichael, 1998; Sklair, 2002), it is proposed that it is capitalist globalisation that matters most because of its import and impact upon the contemporary global order. It will then be suggested that Sklair's analysis of the "sociology of the global system" (2002) with its focus upon

the dynamics of capitalist globalisation offers a useful tool for this analysis because his is a comprehensive and coherent explanation which can be used to tease out some of the implications and impacts of marketisation on tourism and the alternatives to this phenomenon. Additionally the Indigenous analysis of global order proposed by Stewart-Harawira (2005a, 2005b) offers an insight into possible visions of alternative globalisation which complement those developed by Sklair (2002) and underline the need to develop an eco-humanist vision. Together these theorists offer insights into capitalist globalisation that can be effectively employed to analyse corporatised tourism and its alternatives in a way not done to date.

3.2   Historical outline

The history of globalisation is contested by scholars (Holton, 1998) with some claiming an ancient pedigree while others view it as a more recent and modern phenomenon. Some analysts argue that globalising trends can be found in the earliest eras of human history. For instance, an exploration of the history of migration, the spread of the world's religions and the earliest networks of human trade would provide insights into the beginnings of interdependencies that were the precursors to contemporary globalisation. Perhaps the extreme end of the spectrum on the early start to globalisation would be occupied by development analyst Andre Gunder Frank (1996) who in his analysis of the "world system" claims that its inception and development can be traced back a minimum of five thousand years. He argues that such a long lineage challenges the "Eurocentric" analyses of the contemporary world system and globalisation by reminding us of preceding civilisations (including Chinese, Indian and Islamic) and their influence on the

development of the world system (1996). In a similar vein, Held claims "there have been many phases of globalization over the last two millennia including: the development of world religions, the Age of Discovery and the spread of empires" (Held, no date). Cohen and Kennedy refer to a period of "proto-globalisation" when empires and religions spread widely in pre-modernity (2000, p. 42).

Other analysts of globalisation refer to globalisation in its modern form and trace its development to the period of European colonisation beginning in the 1600s (Hoogvelt, 1997; Robertson, 1992). As first the Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch pushed the limits of the known world, the idea quickly followed of the need to form colonial outposts to convert, civilise, exploit and engage in trade. This extension of global ties reached its historical apex with the British empire traversing the globe from the motherland to Kenya, Canada, the Caribbean and Hong Kong. But the global ties fostered at this time were only slightly akin to the globalisation of today as the colonial system involved a tight system of imperial trade practices which divided up the world into trade blocs each connecting a European metropolitan power to various dependent colonies to the exclusion of others. This period saw all parts of the globe contacted, penetrated and impacted by the force of European technology, ideology and raw energy, but it remained for the future for these contacts to give way to more complex webs of interdependence that became the foundations for the phenomenon of globalisation described here.

Other analysts however contend that globalisation has more recent roots. Stephen Gill in his discussion of globalisation as a "political project" (1999), sets its inception in the 1870s when the economies of North America and Europe pursued policies of

the free flow of capital and a fixed exchange rate system based on the gold standard.[1]

Although this system collapsed with the Great Depression (see Gill, 1999), it clearly

demonstrated attributes of the interconnectedness of a globalised economy. In fact

its collapse reinforced this impression as the economic depression spread throughout

the economies of the world (see Rothermund, 1996).

3.3 Modern antecedents to globalisation: Modernisation and development

By the mid-twentieth century, the technological and economic achievements of key

countries in Europe and North America, attained through the processes of

industrialisation,[2] led to a widespread acceptance of a modernisation perspective.

According to Giddens:

> The key idea of modernisation theory is that the 'underdeveloped' societies remain trapped within traditional institutions, from which they have to break free if they are to approach the economic prosperity achieved in the West… 'underdevelopment' can only be overcome by the adoption of modes of behaviour based upon those found in existing industrialised societies (1986, p. 29).

Modernisation theory was based on a conceptualisation of progress that developed

from 18th and 19th century rationalism that posited that if traditionalism were

superseded by modernism with its technologies and efficiencies, then the economic

benefits would accrue to other peoples.[3] Thus modernisation theory clearly set a

---

[1] This period could be called the first wave of globalisation. However, with his longer timeline, Robertson sees it as the third phase and calls it the "take-off phase" (1992, p. 54).

[2] In many European countries, such advances were based not only on industrialisation but also on the exploitation of the labour and resources of colonies which enabled the industrialisation process to succeed, an unacknowledged point among most proponents of modernisation.

[3] Cohen and Kennedy list key aspects of modernity that started in the 17th century and accelerated in the 18th and 19th centuries as "the growth of a questing spirit, a strong leaning towards the purposive

global divide between the industrialised, "modern" states of the first or developed world and the yet to be developed states of the third or underdeveloped world. This marked the beginning of the development agenda which arose in the aftermath of World War II as the European colonisers struggled with their own rebuilding after the ravages of war, and the Americans rose to global power.[4]

As the states subject to European colonisation began to assert their right to self-determination and break the colonial shackles, the issue of development was set centre stage with marked urgency, and modernisation theory was subject to formidable challenge and criticism. For example, Giddens claims that the premises founding modernisation theory are false and that it "has served in some degree as an ideological defence of the dominance of Western capitalism over the rest of the world" (1986, p. 138). Various voices have spoken out about more appropriate paths to development or have critiqued the developmental consequences of modernisation. One source of critique came from the dependency theorists who were influenced by Latin American structuralist thinking arguing that both external and internal structural forces led to developing countries being kept in a state of "dependency" within the international economic order (Todaro, 1997). Economist Andre Gunder Frank who was one of the founders of the dependency school of thought described the development project under modernisation as:

---

pursuit of material and social 'progress', rationality, industrialization, urbanization and the triumph of the nation state" (2000, p. 378).

[4] Frank (1996) states that the support of the development agenda must be understood in the political context of the rise of American hegemony and concern with the spread of communism as the Chinese revolution followed upon the earlier Russian one. Frank claims "developing a more harmless alternative [to communism] became a matter of greatest urgency for the newly hegemonic United States" (1996).

> Development became increasingly equated with economic development, and that became equated de facto if not de jure with economic growth. It in turn was measured by the growth of GNP per capita. The remaining 'social' aspects of growth [equals] development were called 'modernization'. Development meant following step by step in our (American idealized) footsteps from tradition to modernity (1996).

Following years of witnessing the effects of the "development" agenda particularly in Latin America but also in other areas of the developing world and trying to reconcile these with development theories, Frank posited a theory of the "development of underdevelopment". He argued that for developing countries "continued participation in the same capitalist world system could only mean continued development of underdevelopment" as their integration into the world economy was on capitalist terms and delivered the benefits to external investors (1996). As Britton succinctly described it: "'dependency' involves the subordination of national economic autonomy to meet the interests of foreign pressure groups and privileged local classes rather than those development priorities arising from a broader political consensus" (1982, p. 334). To avoid the pitfalls of dependency, some advocated autonomous development based upon import-substitution and nationally-driven industrialisation which has been described as "inward-oriented development" strategies (Brohman, 1996, p. 49). However, such strategies were subject to heavy fire from neoclassical economists who recommended developing countries concentrate not on developing their own industrial sectors but instead export primary commodities in a global trading network operating according to the market rules of comparative advantage (Brohman, 1996, p. 49). With the rise of neoliberalism and in particular the interventionist policies of structural adjustment of the IMF and World Bank, "outward oriented development" strategies have become the order of the day and almost all of the world's nations are tied into the global trading regime (Brohman, 1996).

While imperialism, modernisation, developmentalism and globalisation might be treated as entirely separate phenomena by some authors, Hoogvelt's study of globalisation characterises them all as interconnected phases of capitalist development and expansion (1997, pp. 16-17). Her typology sees four phases:

- 1500-1800 mercantile phase; transfer of economic surplus through looting and plundering, disguised as trade;
- 1800-1950 colonial period; transfer of economic surplus through 'unequal terms of trade' by virtue of a colonially-imposed international division of labour;
- 1950-1970 neo-colonial period; transfer of economic surplus through 'developmentalism' and technological rents;
- 1970- post-imperialism; transfer of economic surplus through debt peonage (Hoogvelt, 1997, p. 17).

Similarly, Waters views capitalism and modernisation as strongly interrelated:

> Capitalism… cloaks itself in the mantle of modernization. It offers the prospect not only of general and individual increases in the level of material welfare but of liberation from the constraints of tradition. This renders modernization as unavoidable and capitalism compelling (1995, p. 36).

Frank, whose discussion is development focused, sees globalisation in terms of an evolution from nationalist development (whether capitalist or socialist) to "one world development" as all countries are urged to pin their development hopes on the one global market (1996).

This brief and cursory discussion indicates the heritage of globalisation from its antecedents of modernisation and development agendas. Prior to the era of modernisation, developing countries had viable traditional subsistence sectors even while many of them were tied into colonial trading regimes. With the advent of modernisation coinciding with the historical decolonisation movement, development

became the key focus of concern as developing countries were urged to abandon traditional sectors, seek "development" and follow the model set by both European and American modernisers. Although dependency theorists challenged the viability and validity of the modernisation project and various paths to development were explored, including inward and outward development strategies, the rise of neoliberalism since the 1980s firmly geared developing countries to seeking development through engagement in external trading arrangements. This expanding network of global trading arrangements, as we shall see presently, has been one of the key drivers of the globalisation process.

3.4   Globalisation

It is perhaps arguable how globalisation came to the forefront of public discourse since the 1990s; including whether it was the development of "global" environmental consciousness of the "planetary environment" (Scholte, 2000, pp. 83-86; Waters, 1995, p. 103), the instantaneousness of communication achieved through the technology of the internet (Scholte, 2000, p. 74), the development of a global trading regime (Scholte, 2000, pp. 76-77) or all of these things. But since that time, globalisation has captured the attention of the public and academia. The term "global babble" has been used to describe the cacophany of views and the ensuing lack of rigour in the discourse on the issue of globalisation (Abu-Lughod, 1991). There can be a variety of reasons for this tendency including the novelty of the topic, the highly multidisciplinary nature of the issue and the variety of sources of comment ranging from the popular media to academia and partisan sources.

Hirst and Thompson query the reality of globalisation in their work entitled

Globalization in question:

> The literature on globalization is vast and diverse. We deliberately chose not to write this book by summarizing and criticizing this literature, in part because that would be a never-ending enterprise given the scale and rate of publication on the topic, but mainly because we concluded that the great bulk of the literature was based on untenable assumptions (1996, p.3).

This analysis follows their precedent in selectively examining the literature. It investigates a range of texts following particular themes that characterise the globalisation literature. One of the difficulties confronting an analyst of globalisation literature is that many of the analyses use the term simultaneously as a descriptor for such diverse phenomena as global capitalism, the proliferation of new information technologies, the growing dominance of "Western" civilisation, or trends towards global integration (see Scheuerman, 2002). It is therefore imperative to address the literature with some critical attention to context.

3.4.1 The sceptics versus the globalists

Any discussion of globalisation must contend with the fact that not everyone agrees that globalisation is happening and even if it is, that it is a significant phenomenon. Held and McGrew (2000) introduce their edited volume on globalisation by characterising the current diversity in the discussion as a debate between the "sceptics" and the "globalists". The "globalists" are characterised as "…those who consider that contemporary globalization is a real and significant historical development" while the "sceptics" are characterised as "…those who conceive it as a primarily ideological or mythological construction which has marginal explanatory

value…" (Held & McGrew, 2000, p. 2). Hirst and Thompson exemplify the mould of the "sceptics" and their work *Globalization in question* is one of the classic texts in the literature on globalisation (1996). In this work, they propose what characteristics a global economy would possess in its ideal form, compare it to current circumstances and conclude that, as has been true since the late nineteenth century, the current system is an "inter-national" economy (meaning an economy governed by the policies and actions of nation-states who have not been superseded by transnational actors) (1996, pp. 1-16). As cautioned before, it is important to gauge the context of the analysis and Hirst and Thompson's work is conditioned by their purposes. Theirs is an economic analysis which is predicated on gauging where power lies in contemporary economics - whether with nation-states or with transnational actors. Their analysis seeks to overturn the myth that nations-states are fettered in their actions by globalising forces. This can be a valuable strategy whereby the leaders of the nation-states deflect criticism and shirk responsibility for difficult outcomes from globalisation that their citizens must endure (Hirst & Thompson, 1996). Hirst and Thompson therefore do not deny that globalising processes are occurring but wish to counter the efforts of those that would overstate the case.

Some analysts occupy a middle ground that global tendencies co-exist with national (as well as regional and local) tendencies. Holton (1998) claims that although the nation-state proves resilient, "...the 'national' and the 'global' are in many ways complementary rather than necessarily conflicting social forces" (1998, pp. 6-7). Researchers have noted the apparently contradictory trends of globalisation and localisation (see Holton, 1998; Lash & Urry, 1994; Nederveen Pieterse, 2000;

Rosenau, 1996). The general recognition is that as forces of globalisation increase in power, there is a concomitant fractiousness which appears as nationalism, particularism or localism. This is evident in such examples as the ethnic violence which devastated Yugoslavia, the separatist movement of Quebec and the rise of religious challenges such as Islam which Huntington says will lead to a "clash of civilizations" with the forces of "Westernization" (1993).[5] Holton provides an interesting argument which suggests that this dualism of the global and the local may be because culture is more resistant to globalisation than the economy so therefore particularism embeds itself in cultural identity (1998).

However, there are many who are certain that globalisation is occurring and they provide some insights into the ways that it manifests itself in contemporary societies. Some of the more general explanations of globalisation will be discussed initially followed by more detailed analysis of globalisation as manifested in the economic, political and cultural spheres.

3.4.2 Theoretical thinking on globalisation

Because the topic of globalisation is vast, diverse and multifaceted, different analysts have approached the topic in different ways. Some analysts have their own very focused theories through which they seek to elucidate specific contemporary phenomena which can yield only limited insights set by the terms of their analysis.[6] Others are formulating macro-discussions which are intended to traverse the full

---

[5] Many authors of this vein point out that Fukuyama's (1992) heralding of "the end of history" at the close of the Cold War was surely premature. Fukuyama's thesis was that the tide of democracy and trade was so overwhelming on the world's nations, that the end of the Cold War spelled the demise of the conflict-driven nature of international relations.
[6] For example, Harvey's "time-space compression" (1989), Bhabha's hybridity (1986) and Barber's "McWorld" (1996).

terrain of globalisation theory and explain it as a field of study.[7] However, as will be

glaringly apparent in the following pages, examining globalisation literature is much

like looking at the beautiful images cast by the kaleidoscope: at one moment one

looks through the lens to obtain a clear configuration that is spellbinding only to shift

the focus mechanism to arrive at an equally mesmerising but entirely different

configuration.

There are many concise definitions of globalisation which focus upon various aspects

of its manifestation. Some of these conceptualisations include: global consciousness,

global interdependence and a set of globalising trends. Roland Robertson is a key

contributor to the globalisation debate and he has discussed both global

consciousness and the physical aspects of globalisation that create interdependence.

He argues that globalisation:

> …refer[s] both to the compression of the world and the intensification of
> consciousness of the world as a whole… both concrete interdependence and
> consciousness of the global whole… (1992, p. 8)

As a result, Robertson sees the potential of globalisation as the possibility of the

entire world becoming a single place. However, as Waters is at pains to point out,

Robertson means by this that the world is more united through the processes of

globalisation, not necessarily more harmonious or integrated (Waters, 1995, p. 42). [8]

Similarly, Giddens claims:

---

[7] See Cohen & Kennedy (2000), Held and McGrew (2000) and Waters (1995).
[8] Waters notes about the globalised world, "While it is a single system, it is riven by conflict and
there is by no means universal agreement on what shape the single system should take in the future"
(1995, p. 42).

> Globalization can… be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa (1990, p. 64).

Relevant transformations include: communications technologies such as the internet and satellite telephones which place distant regions in instantaneous contact; transportation technologies such as jumbo jets which facilitate globetrotting tourists and business people; financial systems allowing 24 hour global trading so that capital moves instantaneously and stock markets are constantly surveilled; and ecological impacts of global relevance including global warming and depletion of the ozone layer.

Intuitively, we know that the current state of globalisation has not resulted in the development of a single global community. Therefore it is important to understand that globalisation, as Waters emphasises, is in process and not an achieved state; it is "a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding" (1995, p. 3).[9]

Gill argues that globalisation can be viewed as a set of trends:

> When most people hear the word 'globalization' they often think of a set of mega-trends and processes creating a more interlinked and integrated world. Phrases like 'the global village', 'the information society' and 'one world, ready or not!', all convey the sense that globalization is an accelerating, evolutionary process, where innovations in transport, science and technology, economics and communications increasingly link the fate and the future of humankind (1999, p. 1).

---

[9] This is one weakness of Hirst and Thompson's sceptics argument (1996) who assess globalisation as an achieved state and find it wanting in their analysis. Waters' view, in contrast, sees globalisation as a globalising process.

Scheuerman argues that although there is a diversity of perspectives on globalisation, "…most contemporary social theorists endorse the view that globalization refers to fundamental changes in the spatial and temporal contours of social existence…" such that the realm of the local and the utility of the nation-state are called into question (2002). All three of the general definitions noted above are based upon the recognition that contemporary changes to the ways that humans relate in space and time have re-ordered our societies but beyond this, there is much variety in analysis. These differences reflect the various views on the sources, importance and the outcomes from these changes in spatial and temporal arrangements. Perhaps it is also indicative of the fact that there is a multiplicity of "globalisations"; as Giddens states "Globalization thus is a complex set of processes, not a single one. And these operate in contradictory or oppositional fashion" (1999, pp. 12-13). Three aspects or arenas of globalisation frequently partitioned and analysed include economic, political and cultural globalisation, which will now be briefly analysed.

3.4.3   Three arenas of globalisation

Perhaps one of the most pervasive perspectives on globalisation is the focus on the integration of the global economy. The economics link is so strong that at times the term global capitalism is used interchangeably for the term globalisation and vice versa despite the fact, as will be demonstrated presently, that globalisation has wider applications than its economic attributes (e.g. Hoogvelt, 1997). This confusion is caused by the fact that global ties created by such phenomena as global capital markets and globalised trading structures have fundamentally changed the relationship between states and markets such that an integrated economy seems to be under way.

One of the leading analysts of ***economic globalisation***, Kenichi Ohmae (1995),

presents a business perspective on globalisation. He argues that globalisation results

in the irrelevance of the state and the growth of regional powers such as the Chinese

regional economy (potentially including not only the prosperous free trade zones of

the Southeast coast and Hong Kong, but also Singapore and Taiwan) and the

European Union. He views globalisation as the creation of a borderless world

characterised by four flows: investment, industry, information and individuals (1995,

pp. 2-4).[10] He argues that states are no longer required to manage the market and

that they must resist the urge to intervene (such as taxing prosperous zones for social

redistribution) because if *laissez faire* policies are pursued the regional states can act

as "engines of prosperity" (1995, p. 4).

It could be argued that the attempts to formulate global trade rules through such

institutions as the WTO and agreements such as the General Agreement on Trade in

Services (GATS) and the failed Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) are

indicative of the formation of a wider economic globalisation. However, such a view

has suffered setbacks since the United States, one of the main state drivers of

economic globalisation, has resorted to conducting bilateral treaty negotiations with

such countries as Australia, Chile and China following the opposition of developing

countries to inequitable multilateral talks at the Cancun World Trade meeting in

2003.

---

[10] Though he does not discuss this, it would be more appropriate to identify individuals as either business people or tourists, rather than refugees or working class migrants who are much less free in their global movements even in this era of globalisation. In fact recent events reflect an increasing tendency to build walls to obstruct the free movement of low-skilled labour and refugees rather than implement free movement.

For analysts of *political globalisation*, one of the key concerns is the perceived receding role of the nation-state in a globalising world as the power of the nation-state is challenged in the management of its economy. As global trade expands, transnational corporations operate without the constrictions of borders, capital moves unrestricted and multilateral institutions such as the WTO organise macro-economic activities. Correspondingly the powers, duties and roles of the nation-states in the global community become reduced and restricted. The extent and effectiveness of the "undermining of the state" is crucial in the wider globalisation debate because the institution of a truly global order, rather than a merely international one, necessitates a reduction in the political authority and effectiveness of nation-state actors.

Held and McGrew claim "the exclusive link between territory and political power has been broken" (2000, p. 11). A variety of factors make it apparent that politics is no longer confined within the borders of the territorial state. These include the development of international governmental organisations (IGOs) such as the United Nations and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) such as Amnesty International; the development of international law through agreements and conventions such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child; developments of international authority above the powers of states such as the International Criminal Court; and the expansion of new social movements such that an international civil society could be said to be forming. According to Held and McGrew "in 1909 there were 37 IGOs and 176 INGOs, while in the mid-1990s there were nearly 260 IGOs and nearly 5,500 INGOs" (2000, p. 11). These IGOs and INGOs demonstrate webs of political action and interdependence that extend beyond state borders and challenge the sovereign authority of the territorial state.

But as Holton asks "how far does the global polity remain state-centred?" (1998, p. 109). While a response to this question remains open to debate in the complex global politics between states of various power and resource capacities, Held has provided an account of how the powers of nation-states diminish in a globalising world and how this might eventuate into the development of a global polity as global governance is required to manage the impacts of complex transnational activities (Held, 1991, pp. 207-209). However, if such a global polity were to eventuate as Held envisions, it would require a cultural convergence that would enable political agreement to be secured. In fact with the end of the Cold War, Fukuyama declared such a convergence with his "end of history" thesis (1992) which claimed forms of liberal democracy and market economics were emerging triumphant as the former communist states of Eastern Europe joined the market.

Other analysts look to existing structures such as the United Nations at the international level and the European Union at the regional level and question whether they can be considered precursors to a global polity (e.g. Holton, 1998; Rosenau, 1996). The European Union provides the most advanced example of the willingness of states to surrender sovereignty to a larger political body but it remains a "work in progress" since clearly the roles of the member states have not yet been swept away despite efforts to share sovereignty. While some might see the United Nations as a potential precursor to "one world" government it is clearly currently a long way from serving as a global polity (see Holton, 1998). The United Nations is a complex umbrella institution which has structures of varying power and influence ranging from the Security Council with its executive capacities (though enfranchising only a

handful of nation-states), to the General Assembly with its status as a "global forum", and specialised agencies such as the World Health Organization and UNESCO with their detailed concerns with various aspects of the global community including economic development, social justice, human rights and environmental issues (Holton, 1998, pp. 118-121).

Waters' judgement of progress in advancing political globalisation towards the achievement of a global polity is decidedly negative. He claims that political globalisation is strikingly less advanced than economic globalisation and its main advances have been in the areas of international relations and the development of political culture (1995, p. 122). However, Waters proposes that political globalisation is being facilitated by the more rapid development of ***cultural globalisation*** which fosters the development of common cultural values.

In fact, the cultural arena is one of the most important in the analysis of globalisation. The changes in temporal and spatial relationships between peoples and societies that are the foundation of globalisation mean that one must question the impacts on cultures[11] which develop organically within local and national contexts. Cultural homogenisation[12] refers to the tendency for contacting cultures to shed their differences under the influence of globalisation and to thereby become more alike. The ultimate concern that this arouses is the loss of cultural diversity and establishment of a monoculture, whether through cultural dominance as described by

---

[11] Cohen and Kennedy claim "most sociologists tend to define culture as the repertoire of learned ideas, values, knowledge, aesthetic preferences, rules and customs shared by a particular collectivity of social actors. Drawing on this common stock of meanings enables them to participate in a unique way of life" (2000, p. 26).
[12] A related term that is important in the tourism literature is "acculturation", which refers to "…social processes and consequent social and psychological changes that occur when peoples of different cultures come into contact" (Nash, 2000, p. 6).

Westernisation and Americanisation or through cultural mixing as described by hybridity. Another position important to address is that of cultural polarisation (Holton, 1998).

Cultural homogenisation arises largely from the obvious changes under way around the world as people join the market economy and adopt consumerism which challenges their traditional lifestyles. One particular discourse concerns westernisation. Theodore Von Laue focuses on what he calls the "revolution of westernization", which he describes as fostering a globalist vision (1987, p.109). He claims that the phenomenon of Western cultural forms spreading globally is due to Europe's historical advantage resulting from geography, the Greco-Roman cultural tradition and "the culture of cerebral asceticism" that sprang from Christianity and enabled Europe's development of science, technology and industry (p. 7). He claims that other peoples will not develop until they shake off their sensuality, become ascetic and develop ambition, or in effect become more "western". A more recent argument in a similar vein analyses the impacts of globalisation on culture and declares its "praise of cultural imperialism" (Rothkopf, 1997). Rothkopf advocates the nurturing of a global culture, and in particular, a global culture in the image of America's (which he describes as dynamic, tolerant and free), so that all will join in the global marketplace that works not only to American advantage but the world's as well. Similar to the discussion of modernisation, this discourse springs from the intellectual tradition that supports Western penetration and transformation of other peoples and places. [13] In terms of the cultural homogenisation (as well as

---

[13] The westernisation position is countered by the discourse fostered by Edward Said's analysis of "orientalism" (1978). Said's legacy has been fruitful in fostering examination of cultural relativism, postcolonial studies, indigenist perspectives and offering support to feminist analysis. In a nutshell, Said argues that Western discourse asserts "otherness" as inferiority and thus legitimises cultural and

modernisation) thesis, what is demanded or lauded is that non-Western and underdeveloped peoples must transform themselves culturally to be like the West in order to achieve the successes and privileges enjoyed by their western neighbours. From this perspective, westernisation could be viewed as fostering such characteristics as individualism, consumerism, urbanisation, breakdown of familial ties, abandonment of tradition, secularisation and rationalism.

In a related vein, some analysts see globalisation as based on Americanisation. The historical backdrop for this position is the rise of American hegemony in the aftermath of World War II that coincided with the decline of British and European powers. Cohen and Kennedy describe this era as laying the foundations for a world society (2000, pp. 41-59) and note the important role of American economic power and political leadership as well as the promotion of English as the global language. Less measuredly, journalist turned globalisation analyst Thomas Friedman asserts:

> …globalization has its own dominant culture, which is why it tends to be homogenizing to a certain degree…culturally speaking, globalization has tended to involve the spread (for better or worse) of Americanization – from Big Macs to iMacs to Mickey Mouse (2000, p. 9).

Friedman concludes after wide-ranging discussion and anecdotes from around the globe "…globalization is globalizing Anglo-American-style capitalism and the Golden Straightjacket. It is globalizing American culture and cultural icons. It is globalizing the best of America and the worst of America…" (2000, p. 380).[14] While Friedman acknowledges that American-led globalisation has some detrimental

---

other forms of domination. For a helpful discussion of Said's work in relation to cultural homogenisation see Holton 1998, pp. 164-166.

[14] Refer back to footnote 8 in Chapter two.

impacts (and he does briefly address the need to ameliorate this), he is in effect a keen supporter of American-led, American-protected globalisation. As he makes clear:

> Sustainable globalization requires a stable power structure, and no country is more essential for this than the United States… the hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist…America truly is the ultimate benign hegemon …(2000, pp. 464 & 467).[15]

However, others are more critical, even scathing of America's role in international affairs and the globalisation process.[16]

There is much criticism of the Westernisation and Americanisation positions. For example, referring to the Philippines, Appadurai argues that to claim it is subject to the forces of Americanisation is not accurate despite its long and close ties to the US. He sees:

> a confusion between some ineffable McDonaldization of the world and the much subtler play of indigenous trajectories of desire and fear with global flows of people and things… if a global cultural system is emerging, it is filled with ironies and resistances, sometimes camouflaged as passivity and a bottomless appetite in the Asian world for things Western (1996, p. 29).

---

[15] Similarly, Rothkopf, referred to previously, advocates "exporting the American model" because "…of all the nations in the world, theirs is the most just, the most tolerant, the most willing to constantly reassess and improve itself, and the best model for the future" (1997, p. 47).

[16] These range from the intellectual arguments of thinkers such as Noam Chomsky (see Chomsky, 1997 for example) and Hannerz who coined the term "cocacolonization of the world" (1992, p. 217), to the cultural resistance of the French academy to English language encroachment (Economist, 2001), to the hostility to America expressed by leaders of European and developing countries in the UNESCO forum (Holton, 1998, p. 166). This topic is even more contested in light of events surrounding the War on Terrorism and the 2003 invasion of Iraq where America and its handful of allies could not gather the support in the UN Security Council to sanction this action. The French in particular have been labelled as "anti-American".

Holton provides a balanced discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of the cultural homogenisation arguments and concludes "…the global field is multicentred rather than dominated by a single centre. There is no single dominant centre, in spite of the dominance of the USA [or West] or certain American symbols in particular markets or sectors… (1998, pp. 169-170).

Another position on the fate of cultures in a globalising era is that of polarisation. In his work *Jihad vs. McWorld*, Barber argues that the demise of communism at the end of the Cold War unleashed two rival tendencies that are in a dialectical relationship to each other - "jihad" and "McWorld" - both of which undermine the possibility for meaningful democracy (1996). He uses the term "*jihad*"[17] as an emotive term to capture the essence of parochialism, nationalism and ethnic identification leading to what he calls "retribalization". This is evident not only in the visible hot spots of the former Yugoslav federation and the former Soviet Union but in every part of the globe. "McWorld" is Barber's characterisation of homogenisation through the forces of global capitalism which create generic global products that are based on the "American way of life". The ultimate objective is to turn the world's population into McWorld consumers. Barber's lament is:

> Jihad pursues a bloody politics of identity, McWorld a bloodless economics of Profit. Belonging by default to McWorld, everyone is consumer; seeking a repository for identity, everyone belongs to some tribe. But no one is a citizen. Without citizens, how can there be democracy?" (1996, p. 8).

---

[17] *Jihad* is the Arabic term for the struggle demanded by Allah for the Islamic faith. Its manifestation is both internal (i.e. maintaining one's own faith) and external (i.e. a struggle against unbelievers who threaten Islam). However, in contemporary politics, it has been used to mean "Holy War" in reference to Islamic opposition to Christian and Jewish peoples in particular (see http://www.ict.org.il/articles/jihad.htm for further discussion). Barber (1996) particularly connects "jihad" to the term "lebanonization" and thus clarifies it as a reference to a breakdown of societies into "tribal" divisions (based on ethnic, religious, cultural or other factors). Said (1978) provides some helpful insight into the way that the term of "jihad" is utilised in the discourse of orientalism.

The other most noted contribution to the polarisation literature is Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" thesis (1993). Huntington argued at the end of the Cold War that conflict would not disappear with the vanishing of the bipolar divide,[18] but would instead reappear around cultural issues that arise from a clash of civilisations (1993). Huntington defines a "civilization" as a cultural entity that cannot be incorporated in any larger cultural entity, and he designates extant Islamic, Confucian, Japanese, Western, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and possibly African civilisations (1993, pp. 22-23). In the early 1990s, Huntington predicted that the key divide in international terms would be between Western and "Confucian-Islamic" civilisations (1993). In a section entitled "The west versus the rest", Huntington states that "the West is now at an extraordinary peak of power in relation to other civilisations" (1993, p. 35) and as a result, has succeeded in cloaking its efforts at global influence as representative of and in the interest of the "world community". However, this hegemony is opposed by rival civilisational powers like China with its Security Council veto and Islamic states such as Iran.

Huntington predicts that these rival powers will attempt to acquire the tools of modernity that are requisite to attain economic and military strength while trying to reconcile this with their traditional cultures and values. As a result, the states making up Western civilisation will have to maintain sufficient military and economic resources to continue to secure their interests within a competitive environment (1993, p. 46). However, Huntington's ultimate advice to Western countries is not military brinkmanship but understanding of other civilisations so that coexistence

---

[18] Huntington's purpose is to caution against those that would envision a "universal civilization" (1993, p. 47) as being within reach at the close of Cold War whose animosities had gripped many people on both sides of the bipolar divide for fifty years and terrorised with the threat of global annihilation. Huntington's pessimistic position contrasts with Fukuyama's heralding of "the end of history" through global convergence based on democracy and trade (1992).

can be negotiated and "global civilizational war" thereby avoided (1993, p. 46).

While Huntington's work was largely neglected in the 1990s, its profile was again

raised in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, when it appeared that Islamic

terrorists had attacked the very symbols of Western civilisation, namely the World

Trade Centre in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. While "Western"

leaders such as Bush and Blair have repudiated any attempt to cast the "War on

Terrorism" as a civilisational war on Islam, there has been much re-visiting of

Huntington's work.

Holton assesses polarisation theory as more convincing than homogenisation against

the empirical evidence presented by the world's numerous conflicts, and prefers

Barber's viewpoint to Huntington's (1998, p. 178):

> Barber's scenario of Jihad versus McWorld has the advantage of integrating economic
> and political as well as cultural elements into processes of polarization, keeping open a
> multidimensional approach to global social change. Unlike Huntington, he does not
> see polarization as primarily driven by culture or by civilizational characteristics. This
> leaves space for awareness of the importance of global capitalism, with its
> technological dynamism, brash consumerism, and unequal power relationships within
> the new world order and the consequent resistances that emerge around retribalized
> culture and politics (1998, p. 178).

Holton is led to ask though, "…whether there is a more adequate paradigm, which

would make better sense of the complexities of global cultural development than

polarization…" and is led to examine hybridisation theory (1998, p. 178).

Hybridisation provides another important perspective on culture and globalisation.

At its simplest, hybridity refers to the "…creation of dynamic mixed cultures"

(Cohen & Kennedy, 2000, p. 363). It derives from anthropology and cultural studies

and the related studies of syncretisation and creolisation which describe the way that cultures in contact serve as catalysts to change in each other.[19] Because of the intercultural mixing that globalisation fosters, hybridisation theory proposes that what results is "…cross-cultural borrowings and intercultural fusion and blending to create hybridized or mixed cultural forms" (Holton, 1998, p. 179). Of exceeding value here is Appadurai's examination of the global cultural economy in which he formulates his theory of flows of cultural objects that foster hybridity (1996). Appadurai uses the suffix "scapes" to designate these global flows and designated five of particular significance: ethnoscapes, technoscapes, finanscapes, mediascapes and ideoscapes.[20]

As the preceding discussion indicates, the globalisation literature indicates a wide breadth of analysis with much diversity in foci among the various analysts. Such a multiplicity of explanations of globalisation (or in line with Giddens (1999, pp. 12-13), "globalisations") could lead to confusion and abandoning the effort to pin down globalisation's importance to changes within our world.

3.4.4   It is capitalist globalisation that matters

While globalisation has a multitude of diverse forms that inspire much varied discussion and analysis, in terms of economic, social and environmental impacts, it is capitalist globalisation which arguably matters most. While people may be

---

[19] Cultural syncretism is also a powerful argument against the Westernisation and Americanisation theses because both are in fact hybrid cultures that have drawn from the cultural, political and religious traditions of other civilisations that have preceded them sometimes by millennia.

[20] Ethnoscapes refers to the movement of mobile people such as tourists, businesspeople, migrant labour and refugees; technoscapes refers to the flow of technologies such as the internet, mobile phones and satellites which put distant peoples in contact; financescapes refers to the flows of capital globally; mediascapes refers to the global flows of information; and ideoscapes refers to the flows of ideas globally such as universal human rights and environmental awareness.

developing a "global consciousness", cultures may be undergoing hybridisation and technologies may be reducing time and spatial distances between societies and peoples, it is capitalist globalisation which is re-ordering individual lives, societies and world order in such a way as to create momentous tensions. These tensions are manifest in the devastating results that have followed the attacks of September 11, 2001 (Reid 2003, p. 3)[21] and environmental crises such as global warming which threaten the very future of the planet (Sklair, 2002, pp. 53-57). A number of analysts of globalisation have concluded after comprehensive review of globalisation literature that capitalist globalisation has more explanatory value if power, development, sustainability, social justice and equity are the concerns of discussion (Gill, 2000a, 2000b; Hoogvelt, 1997; McMichael, 1998; Scholte, 2000; Sklair, 2002).[22]

Development expert Philip McMichael in his article on "Demystifying 'globalisation'" argues that the debates to define and delineate globalisation are a "distraction" and that "that there is a more fundamental issue" to grapple with (1998, p. 304). He claims that globalisation can be seen as a "historical project" which is about "managing power relations within states and across the state system" in order to secure a restructuring that works to secure market rule in the interests of "a powerful global managerial class" (1998, p. 304). The effects of this project are a diminution of the social agendas that all states were previously expected to pursue in

---

[21] Reid claims "While no one can condone the carnage of the events of September 11, they must be viewed as a rejection of corporate globalization and the exploitation taking place across the globe, and not simply as the actions of a few deranged individuals, as some would have us believe" (2003, p. 3).

[22] There are, of course, a number of other analysts who argue in favour of capitalist globalisation, including Norberg (2003) and Hoenig (2003). Their arguments suggest investment of capital in poor countries brings economic opportunities that would not otherwise occur. Their positions ignore the fact that such countries might have other economic options more beneficial to the welfare of their people and fail to address the equity concerns of the critics of capitalist globalisation. Many of these analysts belong to pro-market think tanks and media outlets. See: http://www.johannorberg.net/?page=indefense and http://www.moraldefense.com/default.htm.

meeting the needs of their peoples. For states of the developing world specifically, this meant abandoning their developmental agenda with its social aims, for a set of market criteria including efficiency, competition and entrepreneurialism that underline the agendas of market rule (McMichael, 1998).[23] Elsewhere, in his analysis of the WTO McMichael has argued that its "executive" activities in the support of market rule remove the development agenda from a public function of states to a private function of capital (2000, pp. 467 & 472). He claims that the WTO sends a message that "development now depends on the management of global markets" and the creation of a free trade regime with a result that "development becomes less a socially purposeful national initiative, and more a reward for joining the global market" (2000, p. 472). However, rather than being geared to deliver development to its member states such regulatory mechanisms as the trade regime of the WTO are meant "to facilitate corporate access to markets and raw materials, and investor and speculator access to financial markets, and to recalibrate the ideology of development as a global project" (McMichael, 2000, p. 473).

Jameson argues that the globalisation of the economy can be seen as a coerced integration:

> The rapid assimilation of hitherto autonomous national markets and productive zones into a single sphere, the disappearance of national subsistence (in food, for example),

---

[23] McMichael states: "The globalisation project is premised on political-economic liberalisation of states. It subsumes the rhetoric of development and reconstructs it as efficiency, competition and entrepreneurialism. But it is not necessarily an equivalent project - it does not possess the coherence of the development project, anchored in the nation-building process. The latter was embedded, to a greater or lesser degree, in social goals specific to each state. The global regime has no social goals, just private/financial goals expressed in appeals to the abstract authority of the market" (McMichael, 1998, pp. 302-303). In Chapter two, the New International Economic Order and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights were briefly discussed. With the globalisation of neoliberalism, the fulfilling of basic human rights to development is no longer seen as a legal obligation of states and the international community but rather an outcome from engaging in the global market economy.

the forced integration of countries all over the globe into … that new global division of labour…[W]hat begins to infuse our thinking of globalization is a picture of standardization on an unparalleled new scale; of forced integration as well, into a world-system from which "delinking" (to use Samir Amin's term) is henceforth impossible and even unthinkable and inconceivable (2001, p. 57).

From a critical Marxist position, Barker describes the forces of cultural imperialism that capitalism has unleashed and which allegedly threaten cultural diversity (2000, p. 115). The argument goes that with the expansion of the capitalist market globally various cultural traits are fostered which serve to change and as a result homogenise cultures. According to Robins:

For all that it has projected itself as transhistorical and transnational, as the transcendant and universalizing force of modernization and modernity, global capitalism has in reality been about westernization – the export of western commodities, values, priorities, ways of life (1991, p. 25).

Stephen Gill describes the contemporary form of capitalist globalisation as an attempt to impose a "neo-liberal market civilisation" (1995). He argues that this system includes culture, ideology and its own mythology of capitalist progress that has come about from the globalisation of neoliberalism. This ideology is put forward as the "sole model of future development" and is reinforced through the muscle of market discipline and political power (1995, pp. 399 & 412). He has coined two phrases to describe this coercive aspect to the system, "disciplinary neoliberalism" and the "new constitutionalism"; the former refers to the application of economic principles to all varieties of social relations and the latter describes the political-judicial structures being developed to secure the system's long-term future (2000a). Gill explains why such a theorisation of globalisation is merited:

> Whilst many authors have stressed the short-term perspectives with dominant forms of economic globalization, for example the sense of immediacy associated with time-space compression, the crucial strategic significance of new constitutionalism is how it seeks to provide political anchorage for the power of capital in the long term (2000a).

Gill argues that it is this long term agenda of the new constitutionalism that matters as it brings about "deep structural transformations in economy, state and society" that will be difficult to overturn as they become "constitutionally" locked in (2000a).

Finally Sklair also concludes that it is global capitalism which matters most. After summing up a variety of approaches to understanding globalisation including world systems theory, the globalisation of culture model, the global polity and society model and global capitalism, Sklair claims that all such approaches can be faulted for their biases and limits (2002, p. 47). But on the latter approach, global capitalism, Sklair says that while it can be criticised as a "one-sided" approach, he suggests that two questions would remain vital to answer: just how important is that "one side"? And what problems does capitalist globalisation bring? (2002, p. 47). Considering his view that capitalist globalisation is irrevocably changing our world and bringing about major ecological and social crises, it is clear that Sklair thinks capitalist globalisation is worthy of concerted analysis. It is to his theory we now turn.

3.4.5   Sklair's sociology of the global system

Sociologist Leslie Sklair has formulated an analysis of globalisation which has much to offer. Sklair describes his theory as a "sociology of the global system", which, although informed by the thinking of many other analysts of globalisation, was a radically new analysis when he first introduced it in his *Sociology of the global*

system in 1991. In his later edition entitled *Globalization, capitalism and its alternatives* (2002), Sklair provides a valuable critique of what he calls capitalist globalisation and uses this as a springboard to contemplate an alternative globalisation that resolves the crises that capitalist globalisation produces. Sklair's model of globalisation is more holistic and comprehensive than most through his focus on transnational practices (TNPs) that encompass economic, political and cultural-ideological spheres (2002).

TNPs are the basis of the transcendence of national boundaries as countries become more bound together; they occupy the physical spaces of globalisation; they are present wherever transnational corporations (TNCs) are operating; members of the transnational capitalist class (TCC) meet and mingle and the culture-ideology of consumerism takes hold (2002, p. 86). Understanding how these TNPs contribute to the "capitalist project" requires examining the particular types of TNPs (economic, political and cultural-ideological) and then addressing how each TNP type is secured by its attendant structural form.

Economic TNPs refer to the economic practices that transcend state borders. This term encompasses a diverse range of phenomena ranging from export production to ethical trading regimes that are responses to the damages of export production practices. For Sklair's work which is primarily (though not exclusively) concerned with the effects of capitalist globalisation in the developing world, the key issue hinges around the capacity for economic TNPs to contribute to "development". Under the "capitalist project", the ideological assertion is that TNCs "…are the surest route to economic development on a global scale" (2002, p. 90). This is the reason

many political and business leaders in the developing countries seek to entice TNCs to invest in their countries. However, the TNCs are not development agencies but profit-making enterprises that seek cheaper means of production and markets in which to sell their goods and services.[24] Sklair proposes that an investigation of TNCs' roles in providing jobs and economic linkages (both backward and forward)[25] within the host economy is a useful starting point to assess TNC contribution to development (2002, pp. 91-96). Sklair shows how the job creation/job destruction outcomes of TNC practice as well as the propensity or failure to create linkages within the economies where they locate, have the capacity to determine developmental outcomes and are thus some of the most important economic TNPs (p. 96). Following in-depth analysis, Sklair is led to conclude that the TNCs through their economic TNPs "…strive to control global capital and material resources…" (p. 115).

Political TNPs are political practices that transcend state borders. Sklair contends they are less advanced in today's world than economic TNPs due to the persistence of the state and attendant nationalisms (2002, pp. 96-98). However, the growth of civil society networks across borders indicate globalising tendencies as evidenced, for example, in the global proliferation of non-governmental organisations linked to environmental or human rights movements. What is of particular interest to Sklair is the advancement of political TNPs through the efforts of the transnational capitalist class (TCC) that is their structural promoter. According to Sklair, the TCC is

---

[24] Therefore, they are not guaranteed to provide development but only opportunities for some well poised elites in those countries.
[25] Backward linkage refers to the situation when a TNC purchases local materials, goods or services in its production process thus stimulating development of local industries. In tourism, for example, this would occur when a TNC hotel chain purchases locally grown farm produce or locally manufactured furniture. Forward linkage refers to the situation when TNC output goes into the local economy for further processing and thus adds value. An example is the manufacture of microchips for use in the production of locally produced consumer goods.

composed of four "fractions": the corporate fraction composed of TNC executives and their local affiliates; the state fraction comprising globalising state and interstate politicians and bureaucrats; the technical fraction including globalising professionals; and finally, the consumerist fraction consisting of globalising merchants and media (Sklair, 2002, p. 99). According to Sklair, they are transnational in five aspects. They share both global and local economic interests; they seek economic control in workplaces, political control at all levels, and cultural-ideological control in everyday life; they hold global, not local, perspectives on a variety of issues; they are comprised of people from many nations all of whom partly identify as global citizens; and they share similar lifestyles predicated on luxurious consumption (2002, pp. 98-99). Sklair's formulation of the TCC argues that they are one coherent group whose mission is to secure the conditions under which their interests and the interests of the capitalist global system prevail at all levels from the local to the global (p. 99).

Cultural-ideological[26] TNPs are often identified as the driving force behind globalisation, whether characterised by other analysts as Americanisation, Westernisation (Barber, 1996; Holton, 1998; Von Laue, 1987) or McDonaldisation (Ritzer, 1996). Cultural-ideological TNPs are manifest in such diverse phenomena as global communications through internet chatrooms, in concepts (consciousness) like McLuhan's "global village" (1962), in the spread of Western youth culture and in the development of a global environmental movement. However, it is how these TNPs manifest themselves under capitalist globalisation that is of interest to Sklair. Key to this is the structural form of the culture-ideology of consumerism which accompanies and promotes certain cultural-ideological TNPs (2002, p. 107). The

---

[26] Sklair places the two concepts "culture" and "ideology" together in this hyphenated form because he argues that capitalist globalisation is forging a "qualitatively new relationship" between these two previously distinct forces.

culture-ideology of consumerism is a new phenomenon that has arisen due to the correlation of two simultaneous circumstances – the globalisation of capitalism and a powerful media, particularly the advertising industry, able to hail its bounties to everyone (p. 108). While consumerism is not new, the culture-ideology of consumerism is a distinct phenomenon as it promotes a consumerist "worldview". In effect, under capitalist globalisation, efforts of media and other agents of the culture-ideology of consumerism are geared toward controlling the "realm of ideas" in order to ensure that endless consumption underpins the whole of the capitalist system (Sklair, 2002, p. 115). As Sklair notes, the role of consumerism is the key - "without consumerism, the rationale for continuous capitalist accumulation dissolves" (p. 116). Its impact is tremendous as commercialisation and commodification is extended to every sphere of endeavour resulting in what Habermas terms "the colonization of the lifeworld" (cited in Sklair, 2002, p. 116). The idea that market dynamics are the most efficient dispenser of resources moves beyond the spheres of economic production into hospitals, schools, the community and homes. Neoliberal principles such as competition, individualism, an emphasis on "progress" and trust in technological solutions hold sway as a result. Table 3.1 provides an insight into the structures and processes that compose Sklair's articulation of the capitalist globalisation system.

One of the significant points of Sklair's analysis is that he admits that capitalism does deliver the goods, so to speak, at least to some in some places. The reason that the capitalist system has been able to be transplanted to the economies and societies

Table 3.1: Sociology of the Global System (Sklair, 1999)

TRANSNATIONAL PRACTICES	LEADING INSTITUTIONS	INTEGRATING AGENTS
Economic sphere • Transnational capital • International capital • State capital	Economic forces • Global TNCs • World Bank, IMF • State TNCs	Global Business Elite
Political sphere • TNC executives • Globalising bureaucrats • Politicians and professionals • Regional blocks • Emerging transnational states	Political forces • Global business organisation • Open-door • Agencies, WTO • Parties and lobbies • EU, NAFTA, ASEAN, UN, NGOs	Global Political Elite
Culture-ideology sphere • Consumerism • Transnational • Neoliberalism	Culture-ideology forces • Shops, media • Think tanks, elite social movements	Global Cultural

of the Third and new Second worlds[27] is because the promise of development and the enticements of consumerism are desired and believed to be attainable by peoples and governments all around the globe. In fact the culture-ideological premises of capitalist globalisation are so successful, that to advocate other alternatives such as socialism brings contempt, dismissal and marginalisation. As Sklair states:

---

[27] Sklair in particular addresses the experience of what he calls the Third World and the new Second World countries. This schematic is based on the "three worlds formula" proposed in the 1950s which divided the advanced, industrialised nations (First World) from the communist nations in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union (Second World) and the "rest, the poorer and relatively unindustrialized, less developed countries" (Third World) (Sklair, 2002, p. 13). The new Second World acknowledges the changes wrought by the collapse of communist regimes following the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 but postulates that their status in development trajectories still necessitates a separate category. For a brief insight into this terminology and how its usage has changed see Holton, 1998, p. 12.

> The ultimate strength of capitalist globalization is that it continually works, and works very hard to persuade people that the system is natural, fair and fundamentally better than any realistic alternative (2002, p. 118).

Others have called this the "there is no alternative" syndrome [28] (Bennholdt-Thomsen & Mies, 1999, p. 52) which has been most effective at securing allegiance to the capitalist form of globalisation. Where this persuasion fails and opposition arises, capitalist globalisation has to date been effective in implementing strategies of coopting, countering or tarnishing the opposition. Capitalism's hegemony is underscored by the fact that it does not usually need to resort to force to achieve compliance. However, when force is required (as was the case for example at Genoa), [29] capitalism scores an even greater victory when the application of force is accepted as legitimate because it helps to underscore the legitimacy of the system (Sklair, 2002, pp. 118-119).

---

[28] Served by the acronym TINA, and supposedly originally stated by Margaret Thatcher. Some analysts of globalisation have been quick to counter the TINA syndrome for a variety of contradictory reasons. Those staffing international financial institutions such as the IMF and World Bank who are pro-globalisation but concerned at the increasingly vocal anti-globalisation fringe, argue that globalisation is reversible thereby threatening those that have a vested interest in the system but fail to advocate globalisation. Others who wish to raise the resistance and input of social movements to curb the excesses of globalisation oppose the TINA position in order to inspire activism (Hellyer, 1999; Wiseman, 1997). Those that are interested in challenging the proponents of the cultural imperialism thesis resist the TINA argument because their focus is upon cultural resilience in peripheral cultures and the phenomenon of hybridisation (Abu-Lughod, 1991; Lechner & Boli, 2000; Nederveen Pieterse, 2000; Sinclair, Jacka & Cunningham, 2000).

[29] This refers to the incident that occurred when "anti-globalisation" protesters gathered in Genoa, Italy in July 2001 to protest at the Group of 8's conference (the G-8 includes the industrialised nations of France, Germany, Russia, USA, Japan, Canada, Italy and Britain). Apparently, protester Carlo Giulani was shot in the head by police with live ammunition after he threw a fire extinguisher at a police vehicle. However, in the aftermath of these violent events, it has become more apparent that the Italian police were unnecessarily aggressive (for example using live bullets) in their tactics and that the violence of protestors was overstated. What is particularly interesting though for this discussion is how "Genoa" "…has become a kind of shorthand for 'violent protesters' in mainstream media" (see *Media missing new evidence about Genoa violence* at http://www.zmag.org/italy/missing_genoa_en.htm). The relevance of the easy equivalency of "Genoa" and "violent protesters" on the part of the media and the public is to show that in this case unnecessary violence was accepted and thus serves to underscore the legitimacy of the capitalist global system and the right of its advocates to defend it by violent measures.

Current development orthodoxy encourages developing countries to integrate their economies into the global market as the best path to development.[30] Aspects of this process include seeking foreign direct investment, siting of TNC production in their locales, orienting economies to export-led production and implementation of IMF structural adjustment programs. For Sklair, it is important how each of these strategies serves capitalist globalisation.

For example, on the issue of TNCs, Sklair states that like all businesses, TNCs seek profits (2002, p. 122). What is at issue is how they secure their profits. Radicals have criticised TNCs as exploitative of labour or as promoters of consumption, but that is only part of the picture. Under capitalist globalisation, TNCs' roles are supported by powerful agencies such as the World Bank and the IMF which advise countries to adopt policies that serve TNC interests; aid agencies fund programs implemented through TNCs in a way that aid seems to be more targeted to assist business than the poor; and TNCs bring with them a culture-ideology that transforms the society not only by introducing "business culture" into the economic sphere but also promoting consumerism to the wider society (Sklair, 2002, pp. 122-123).

Following a discussion of theories concerning the new international division of labour (NIDL) and the feminisation of poverty, Sklair states that to focus on the fact that TNCs exploit women, children or certain men (such as "men of colour") misses the point because capitalist production is based upon the exploitation of all factors of production (p. 131). Sklair emphasises that it is not the foreign origin of the firm that

---

[30] For example, the World Bank's website describes trade as: "vital for poverty-reducing growth". Accessed at: http://www.worldbank.org under "Issue Briefs"> "Trade" (accessed on 23 April 2003). Also see: http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2002/031502.htm in which the IMF advocates economic growth through globalisation of trade as the best hope for development in the developing world (accessed on 24 April 2003).

is at issue with TNCs; rather, what limits the developmental outcomes of TNC investment in developing communities is the nature of the product and the place held by production in that locality on the global commodity chain or as Sklair states "…its transnationality within the capitalist global system" (2002, p. 132). So the point is that some places in certain circumstances secure the benefits from TNC production that they seek and this explains why many Third World governments seek such investment.

This issue brings us to the problem of capitalist globalisation driven in particular by TNCs. Where focus is on the roles of TNCs operating in developing countries, concern is over trade.[31] However, a shift in focus to the goals of states who receive TNC investment, would prioritise development. The goals of states should be the developmental welfare of their peoples. However as Sklair demonstrates in his case study of the global food system, the priorities of capitalist globalisation lead to an emphasis on export production to meet the demand of wealthy consumers at the expense of subsistence production which feeds the poor (pp. 138-152). It is the results of these TNPs which lead to the paradoxical situation of Ethiopia designating land for export crops in the midst of a famine or Egyptian grain farmers being put out of business by American grain aid shipments (p. 145). As Sklair states, "the point at issue … is not whether a corporation and its practices are foreign, but to what extent they work in the interests of capitalist globalization … or in the interests of the majority of the population" (p. 152). So while it is the business of TNCs to make profits and not to act as social charities, what we find under capitalist globalisation is that the spread of the market imperative means that governments whose

---

[31] Hence we have the debate on "free trade" versus "fair trade" as seen in the Oxfam engagement with the international financial institutions in their campaign entitled "Make trade fair" in 2002 (Oxfam International, 2002). A critical discussion of fair trade in tourism will be presented in Chapter five.

responsibilities include supporting the social fabric, are undermined in this role by the agents of capitalist globalisation. This includes the IMF and the World Bank which impose structural adjustment programs (SAPs),[32] members of the TCC resident in a country who chant the mantra of the free market (including globalising politicians and bureaucrats) and the business elite including those working for the TNCs. While development could be achieved in many ways (such as endogenous, socialist or bureaucratic authoritarian development), the TCC works quite hard and has virtually succeeded in arguing that capitalist globalisation is the only vehicle to deliver economic growth and poverty alleviation.

However, there is another side to the developmental effects of capitalist globalisation in developing communities. In addition to the growth of TNC investment in Third World production gearing these countries to export production, there are the important effects of promoting the culture-ideology of consumerism in these same countries. Sklair notes that of all of the value systems that could be fostered in developing communities, capitalist globalisation serves to promote the culture-ideology of consumerism (2002). While debating whether consumerism versus producerism is the best path to development, Sklair argues that what is clear is that while consumerism may be difficult to connect to a state's developmental interest it is very easy to "… see how consumerism can be said to serve the interests of the capitalist global system" (p. 166).

---

[32] SAPs are programs pressed upon the governments of developing countries by such bodies as the IMF and World Bank in order to create the correct financial climate to secure international business investment in their economies. These programs include a mix of policies such as reduction in the public service sector, reductions in governmental social spending on health and education, privatisation of public assets such as electricity, communications and transport and financial deregulation. All these policies serve to integrate these countries' economies into the global economy, but Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies argue that they effectively put the IMF and World Bank in charge of national economies (1999, p. 35). Such policies can strangle any true development at birth and leave the elites of the TCC to benefit from the market opportunities. They are now known as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (see http://www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/prsp.asp).

> Capitalist globalization in the Third World depends on the successful promotion of the culture-ideology of consumerism among people with no regard for their ability to produce for themselves, and only with an indirect regard for their ability to pay for what they are consuming.[33] Development assistance (aid), for example, moves funds from taxpayers in rich countries to consumers in poor countries, but not always for appropriate forms of consumption, not to speak of what is siphoned off in corrupt deals or stolen. In this sense consumerism has nothing to do with satisfying biological needs, for people will satisfy these needs without any prompting from anyone else, but with creating what can be called induced wants (Sklair, 2002, p. 166).

These induced wants which are the mainstay of the culture-ideology of consumerism are generated in a number of ways, including what has been labelled cultural and media imperialism. What we find in this analysis, is that the promise of the new communications technologies is not turned to developmental purposes such as education as they were at first anticipated to do, but instead turned to the consumerist message of advertising. This may be in the form of entertainment such as television soap operas (which Sklair discusses as a vehicle for capitalist consumerism, p. 170), or advertising through cultural events through sponsorship agreements,[34] or the association of a product with a lifestyle (for example the consumption of a cola drink evoking participation in (Western) youth culture).[35] Sklair assiduously avoids the debates that have embroiled those in cultural studies concerning the susceptibility of people in developing communities to advertising and media. Instead what he suggests is that rather than being dupes of this "media" or "cultural imperialism",

---

[33] This promotion of the culture-ideology of consumerism also occurs without any regard for the environmental effects or the effects on communities where some find themselves unable to secure the basic needs for survival (p. 166).

[34] Sponsorship can become so dominant that the sponsor's name gains pre-eminence to the point of practically eclipsing the sponsored event. For example what used to be known as the "Australian Grand Prix" is now called "The Foster's Australian Grand Prix". What used to be known as the "Sydney to Hobart Yacht race" has now become the "Telstra Sydney to Hobart Yacht race". A nationally recognised music festival known as the "Tamworth Country Music Festival" has become the "Telstra Country Music Festival, Tamworth". This occurs under conditions of reduced government spending on sporting or cultural events which necessitate sponsorship agreements that result in the events becoming vehicles for fostering the consumerist message.

[35] Sklair states: "There are few parts of the world in which the effects of the cola wars have not been felt. In even the most remote places Coke and Pepsi and their ubiquitous marketing slogans and logos are acknowledged as symbols of the American way of life. They are also marketed on the prospect that anyone, however poor, who can afford a bottle or a can, can join in the great project of consumerism, if only for a few moments" (2002, p. 196).

people in developing communities are making rational choices which involve them in the consumerist project (2002, pp. 173-174). These consumerist products and experiences that they seek to purchase are attractive because they are cheaper than locally produced ones; they make life easier and/or they tap into symbolic power and meanings through their conferring of status and prestige (Sklair, 2002, p. 173).[36] While some rail against this as Americanisation or Westernisation, the fact is that capitalist globalisation will flog any commodity from any source that attracts buyers, and so we see not only Americana in demand but also products and experiences from around the globe - including world music, fusion cuisine, Tai Chi and Jackie Chan's martial arts films. Sklair contends that "…consumerism of capitalist globalization has a universal form but with the permanent potential of national-local cultural contents" (2002, p. 183).[37] He elaborates his theoretical discussion with four case studies in global consumerism[38] to illustrate two main points: one, that consumerism serves to promote consumption of non-essential products which may not be developmental, and can be deleterious or even deadly; and secondly, that capitalist globalisation serves to raise "… consumerist expectations that cannot be satisfied within the foreseeable future for billions of people around the world" (p. 204).

---

[36] It is in this section that Sklair examines Zayed's study of Cairo in which he notes that "Zayed's argument implies that once the culture-ideology of consumerism is adopted, poor people cannot cope economically, and a mode of resistance must develop. In the Muslim case this mostly manifests itself in religious extremism, whose target is as often Americanization as it is consumerism as such" (2002, p. 173). This is very informative in the aftermath of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent War on Terror. Unfulfilled consumerist ambition can lead to frustration manifesting itself in various forms of violence thereby creating a real threat of class polarisation discussed presently.

[37] This is particularly relevant to contemporary tourism.

[38] The four case studies include: the Nestle baby bottle feed controversy, the international effects of the pharmaceutical industry, the "cola wars", and the cigarette smoking industry.

3.4.5.1 Twin Crises

Sklair argues that capitalist globalisation results in the creation of two crises[39] which bring with them the seeds for change. The first crisis is that of class polarisation which occurs both between and within countries and is manifested in a widening gap between rich and poor and an increase in the numbers of the very rich and the very poor (2002, p. 26). The state centric approach which argues that First World states exploit Third World states misses the point; it is not location by birth that determines wealth status (there are very rich people in the Third World and very poor in the First), but instead an individual's transnational class location (p. 26). The point of the polarisation crisis is that while capitalist globalisation promises to deliver development to all, its appropriation of resources through the mechanisms of the capitalist system delivers benefits to an elite minority associated with the TCC and often delivers debt, drudgery and even death to the majority populations. This can be simply demonstrated by the disparities in access to education, safe drinking water, infant mortality, life expectancy, and other relevant statistics.[40]

---

[39] Sklair refers to the crises as the "two crises" however I like the implication of using the term "twin crises" for two reasons. One is the shadow that the attack on the "Twin Towers" of the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2001 casts upon globalisation and its "discontents". This has cropped up periodically within this text and which can be connected to the crisis of class polarisation in particular. Secondly the use of the term "twin" implies a relationship between the two crises, class polarisation and ecological unsustainability, which appears appropriate because these two phenomena are interrelated (for example, as evoked in the term "environmental racism" which describes how the impact of the environmental pollution burden falls inordinately upon the poor and people "of colour". See Haunani-Kay Trask (1993). However, these twins are admittedly more of the fraternal than the identical kind, because they address related but fundamentally distinct issues.

[40] For insights, see *The world guide 2005-06* (New Internationalist, 2005) and the World Bank group's *World development report* at: http://econ.worldbank.org/wdr/. While some might assert that these disparities are not the key issue as development has improved the welfare of people in the developing world to a level that otherwise would not have occurred, others contend that glaring poverty is unacceptable in a world with sufficient resources to relieve the material needs of all. For instance see Kostigen (2004) and Cooper (2005) for arguments about how the "wealth gap" is a key issue even in rich societies such as the USA and UK. Kostigen provides the statistics of Third World poverty and argues that "in just 14 days the problems of the poorest countries in the world - starvation, lack of education, scarcity of potable water, etc. - could be solved if each nation donated its military spending budget for just that period of time - 14 days" (2004).

The second crisis is that of ecological unsustainability. Capitalist globalisation is placing catastrophic demands on the natural environment through the overuse of resources to feed the insatiable appetite for continual growth and the generation of wastes and pollution in production processes. Both factors have generated unpredictable environmental change. Sklair asserts that the real issue is the role of the capitalist global system in these developments and not just the fact that modern economies naturally bring environmental degradation (2002, p. 56). At the heart of the problem is a capitalist system underpinned by a culture-ideology of consumerism which is geared to generate unsatiated consumerism and accumulation of goods which create unsustainability. While the ideology of capitalism advocates the ability of human science and technology to mitigate these problems, and in particular the concept of sustainable development assures us we can manage these issues, at the heart of capitalist globalisation lies an ecological crisis which is intrinsic to the system.

The twin crises give rise to challenges to globalisation as opponents strive to bring down the capitalist global system. Elements of the anti-capitalist globalisation movement logically come from the various components of the green movement who oppose the effects of capitalist globalisation on the environment, and from the labour movement concerned by the advent of class polarisation wrought by the same forces. However, these two factions are joined by numerous other individuals, organisations and communities motivated by their concern with the effects of capitalist globalisation, be it a narrow issue such as endangered species or export-processing zones, or broader issues such as human rights and sustainability. The proponents of capitalist globalisation, most notably the TCC, recognise the threat that the various

factions of the "anti-globalisation" movement represent and have sought to limit their impacts through usurping the sustainability debate through the conceptualisation of sustainable development and co-opting major players in the green movement.[41] Nonetheless, opponents of capitalist globalisation have explored a variety of alternatives.

Sklair devotes some attention to one group of reactions that can be characterised as "de-linking" from the global system (or localisation) which are evidenced in initiatives like the Local Exchange Trading Systems (LETS), permaculture networks and slow food movements. He claims that these represent an alternative to globalisation but not to capitalism as capitalist globalisation "…could accommodate and subvert most of these initiatives and turn them into variations on the consumerist theme" (2002, p. 285).[42] Because the twin crises are not resolvable within capitalism, Sklair advocates an agenda that involves moving forward towards globalisation without capitalism (p. 299). It is important to the later discussion in this thesis to note that Sklair believes widespread transformation to be necessary as reform of capitalist globalisation will not resolve the twin crises. He states "because I cannot accept the optimistic hope that capitalism can become much more humane globally than it already is…in my view the next step in the quest for human progress has to be the transformation of capitalist globalization into socialist globalization through the globalization of human rights" (2002, p. 324).

---

[41] Sklair in particular discusses how the corporate leaders "captured" the 1992 Earth Summit at Rio. As a result much of the sustainable development debate remains embedded within the market paradigm so that the connections between the environmental crises of our time and the culture-ideology of consumerism which engender them are never overtly linked (Sklair, 2002, p. 276). More discussion follows in Chapter five on the concept of sustainable development and its application to tourism.

[42] This tendency for capitalist globalisation to subvert alternative movements is paralleled in tourism where alternative tourisms are subverted by the tourism industry as discussed in Section 5.4.

3.4.5.2 Towards socialist globalisation

In addressing the alternatives to capitalist globalisation, Sklair suggests that the conditions that capitalist globalisation create actually enable circumstances that give rise to socialist globalisation. These include not only whipping up opposition to capitalist globalisation as a result of the damages of the twin crises, but also the interconnectedness that capitalist globalisation has created, the development of shared cultural values centred on human rights and the attainment of a certain level of affluence that makes the socialist alternative possible. While capitalist globalisation opens up the material opportunity for socialist globalisation in this way, it tries to shut down avenues to it in the political and ideological spheres (Sklair, 2002, p. 27). For Sklair the key criterion for judging capitalist globalisation is whether it can deliver global, equitable development and he categorically denies that capitalist globalisation can deliver on these promises:

> While capitalism may be the only system that can produce plenty, theory and practice suggest that it cannot distribute it fairly on a global scale, that is capitalism cannot develop the Third World (1994, p.181).

How would socialist globalisation come about and what would it look like? Sklair advocates a path to socialist globalisation through the creation of true cooperative democracies which would provide a transition and allow the creation of a culture of human rights (2002, pp. 300-321). In contrast to the capitalist global system predicated on a culture of consumption, the socialist global system underpinned by the culture of human rights would set values around realisation of sustainability,

social justice and equity and not accumulation of material possessions.[43] People would still consume but it would not be through the exploitative use of the environment and the labour of others that the current system fosters. Emphasis would not be on never-ending, compulsory and compulsive consumption but on an adequate standard of living. Sklair's conceptualisation argues that the currently accepted notion of universal human rights being limited to those of the civil and political kinds would have to be expanded to add as equally valuable and protected those economic and social rights currently relegated as second-tier rights (2002, pp. 306-311).

While Sklair acknowledges that his vision of socialist globalisation could be regarded as utopian, he argues that one can visualise its achievability by examining how the seeds of socialist globalisation can be built on the foundations of present circumstances (p. 305). To this end he examines producer-consumer co-operatives (P-CCs)[44] as an alternative to the TNCs, a culture of human rights (the full range mentioned above – economic, social, political and civil) as a replacement for the culture-ideology of consumerism and a political system based on political transnational practices of the P-CCs "…entering into larger political and/or economic

---

[43] Consumerism under capitalist globalisation promises the consumerist vision of the good life on an individualistic basis. The ideology promises that if an individual will join the capitalistic system as worker and consumer, the bounties of fulfilment will flow their way whether it be the small tangibles of a can of coke, the more intangible freedom evoked by the Marlboro cigarette or the big tangibles of BMWs and holiday homes. On the other hand, socialist globalisation seeks to secure the good society on a collectivistic basis, where through the adherence to human rights values, all will be guaranteed an adequate quality of life and the peril of the twin crises can be avoided.

[44] P-CCs are market structures which place producers (sometimes worker-owned enterprises) and consumers in social as well as economic relationships and do not privilege profits over fair wages for workers, environmental sustainability and health of consumers. A well known example is the Mondragon network of cooperatives in Spain. These enterprises have the social connectedness that fosters social responsibility that TNCs lack. Sklair states that the contemporary principles of stakeholder theory which form part of current discussions of corporate citizenship reflect relationships that P-CCs would create and represent what could be characterised as socialist practice within capitalist societies (2002, p. 302). However, like sustainable development, stakeholder theory and corporate citizenship are strong on rhetoric but often less effective in practice as discussed in Chapter five.

units on the basis of genuine decision-making, not the transnational capitalist class

focused on the organizing of the global system for private profits" (p. 305).

Sklair states that while socialist globalisation is just one alternative to capitalist

globalisation, pursuit of an alternative is not optional because of the catastrophe that

looms as a result of the twin crises linked to capitalist globalisation which it is

unable to resolve. Sklair concludes:

> What capitalist globalization fails to provide are genuine opportunities for people to make their own choices about whether to live in a forever increasingly marketized society where fewer and fewer things and experiences escape commercialization. While the culture-ideology of consumerism provides ever-expanding apparent choices of goods and services, there is little or no choice about whether or not we wish to live in the consumerist lifeworld. Capitalism takes the global system to the level of material abundance for some, but unrestrained consumerism creates environmental degradation and resource scarcity and still fails to raise the living standards of all to anything like a satisfactory degree. Socialist globalisation would eventually raise the quality of life (rather than the standards of living set by consumerist capitalism) of everyone and render the culture-ideology of consumerism superfluous by establishing less destructive and polarizing cultures and ideologies in its place. There is no blueprint for this – if we want such a world we will have to create it by trial and error (2002, p. 325).[45]

Sklair's work addresses much of the vast terrain that is globalisation. His critique of

capitalist globalisation has been the focus of much of his life's work and has made

important contributions to the understanding of the material effects of this

phenomenon (see Sklair, 1991, 1994, 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1996c, 1999, 2001, 2002).

Equally important is his second objective of providing a normative consideration of

---

[45] While sounding utopian, we can see some of the changes advocated by Sklair presently occurring in Argentina as a result of the 2001 economic crisis during which market relations disintegrated and people turned to worker-run cooperatives, barter arrangements and community solidarity networks to meet their needs. Dangl (2005) provides an analysis of two case studies, the Hotel Bauen and the Chilavert book publishing factory, which illustrates possible alternatives to the dynamics of capitalist globalisation. It is also visible in the changes underway in Venezuela where under Hugo Chavez, "Endogenous Development Zones" are encouraging workers cooperatives in such areas as manufacturing, agriculture and tourism (see Harnecker, 2006, p. 11)

globalisation's alternatives following in the footsteps of numerous others (e.g. Cohen & Kennedy, 2000; Henderson, 1999; Hoogvelt, 1997).

Sklair's model of the sociology of the global system achieves a great deal in its critical reflection on capitalist globalisation. However it must be noted that his main focus is on the impacts of capitalist globalisation on the countries of the developing world. Hamilton's analysis (2006) of social democracy in Australia alerts us to an important point of difference between the experiences of the impacts of capitalist globalisation felt by developing versus developed countries. For developing countries, capitalist globalisation is accused of entrenching poverty and thwarting development. But as Hamilton suggests, a justice debate premised on combating poverty and inequality will not resonate in rich societies and it is their very affluence based on a society of consumption that is the key problem for such societies (2006). Hamilton claims:

> Although the ideal of justice is losing its political force, this does not mean that power, exploitation and alienation have disappeared; rather they have re-emerged in a new guise. Previously, a concern for justice gave rise to demands for greater equality (fairer distribution of income and wealth, or equal treatment for excluded groups); today, tackling the new forms of exploitation and denial of identity involves controlling, regulating or eliminating the power of the market. The answer is no longer equality; it is liberation (2006, p. 40).

Hamilton's work reveals that while capitalist globalisation or market civilisation causes grave impacts for the peoples of both the developing and developed world, the nature of these impacts are not the same and therefore articulation of the problem must be correspondingly different. Hamilton therefore proposes a transformation to a politics of well-being in developed societies such as Australia. He recommends detaching from the market and a shift away from market values such as materialism,

competition and individualism that would enable people in rich societies to lead more meaningful and well-balanced lives (2006, p. 57)

Sklair's second objective of outlining an alternative to capitalist globalisation is nevertheless decidedly problematic. His discussion of socialist globalisation illuminates one way of thinking about alternatives to capitalist globalisation. However, it is undermined by the very antipathy that the term "socialist" arouses in the post-Cold War era.[46] Sklair acknowledges that both communism and socialism are currently out of favour in the former communist countries and elsewhere. This is because "… the state forms that Stalinist communism encouraged led neither to increased human freedoms for their populations nor to general increases in prosperity sufficient to compensate the population for the deprivations they suffered in the revolutionary process" (2002, p. 236). There is thus no getting around the fact that "socialist globalisation" is a most unfortunate term in contemporary circumstances.

Sklair's theory holds much in common with some varieties of cosmopolitanism and its depiction of global citizenship (see for instance Hannerz, 1990; Held, 1995; Kleingold & Brown, 2002) and it might have been preferable to identify with that discourse. Alternatively, Sklair could have reformulated his depiction around such terminology as "equitable globalisation" or "humanist globalisation" to avoid the repercussions of the "socialist" label in today's "anti-socialist" environment. This approach would uphold Sklair's critique of capitalist globalisation and retain the position that has been central to much of his earlier discussion on the role of the market and market relationships within society. Socialist/humanist globalisation

---

[46] This antipathy that makes socialism practically unmentionable is another sign of the achievement of hegemony of capitalist globalisation as it has not only defeated its chief rival physically but also wiped out its terminology from critical analysis and discourse.

does not condemn market forces in its move away from the dynamics of capitalist globalisation; instead it seeks to shift the emphasis from private accumulation of profit to securing collective welfare. While various theories of cosmopolitanism share many of the concepts that Sklair explores in his formulation of socialist globalisation based on human rights, they focus more specifically on the development of a social consciousness for a common humanity.[47] Sklair's standpoint remains materialistic, as it is mired in the issue of transnational practices and their impacts on economics, politics and culture-ideology. Additionally, it is curious that Sklair failed to ground his analysis of socialist globalisation in the economic, social and cultural rights already secured through the ICESCR (introduced in Section 2.5) which represents a tool we already possess to humanise globalisation.

Two other criticisms that could be made of socialist globalisation viewed from alternative perspectives concern its shared ideological heritage with capitalism and its universalising tendencies. Firstly, socialism as practised in Eastern Europe and Asia shares a legacy of environmental devastation that rivals its capitalist neighbours. In some of these places, this can in part be attributed to the shared European intellectual tradition that arose from the Enlightenment which advocated the separateness of humans and their superiority over nature and placed faith in human capacity to harness technology to control, exploit and then repair environmental resources. Secondly, and more pertinent to this work, is the criticism that Sklair's theory of socialist globalisation is just another of many universalising theories that originate from Western thinkers and are claimed to be the answer to the

---

[47] However cosmopolitan analyst David Held has accomplished some extensive analyses which overlap with some of Sklair's concerns to rectify the injustices of capitalist globalisation and has proposed "democratic cosmopolitanism" (1995) and "socially backed, cosmopolitan multilateralism" in the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001 (no date).

problems of all of the peoples of the world.[48] These universalising theories have met

with resistance from various analysts from the developing world and/or from

feminist and postcolonial discourses which advocate human and ecological survival

through the imperative of diverse responses embedded in cultural diversity (see

Hawthorne, 2001; Shiva, 2002; Tauli-Corpuz, no date). If Sklair's version of

socialist globalisation were respectful and nurturing of diversity, unlike its

socialist/communist forebears, then it could be a useful alternative. It is a standpoint

that Sklair and other proponents of universalistic models need to be aware of and

embrace critically.

The final comment concerning the conceptualisation of socialist/humanist

globalisation is that it is only a roughly sketched ideal that will require further

fleshing out and more thought than Sklair has currently given it. Chapter five of this

thesis provides some insight into how certain tourism experiences may serve to

promote the solidarity and alternative thinking required if capitalist globalisation is to

give way to alternatives such as socialist/humanist globalisation, or, in terms of

cosmopolitan theory, to foster cosmopolitan consciousness that is a precursor to a

cosmopolitan order.

One final critique of Sklair's work concerns the foundation of his sociology of the

global system – the culture-ideology of consumerism. While the culture-ideology of

consumerism does much to explain how capitalist globalisation perpetuates itself

---

[48] As will be seen in the Indigenous case study in Chapter six, the lesson that Indigenous cultures can
teach is that there are many, local ways that are suited to the local circumstances. It could be
suggested that just as the future of our environmental security rests on biodiversity, the future of our
societal security rests on cultural diversity that comes from creating systems which allow these diverse
ways to thrive (see Bennholdt-Thomsen & Mies on "Diverse Women for Diversity", 1999, pp. 205-
206). The universalising paradigms of capitalism and socialism potentially undermine this diversity.

through making consumers of everyone, it is not enough. It provides one side of the equation as to how capitalist globalisation obtains the support of people everywhere despite the fact that it fails to deliver the goods that it promises to everyone. However, it fails to emphasise the other side of the equation that is alluded to in Sklair's use of the term "global capitalist project" (2002, p. 46). The global capitalist project is the assertion of political power which secures capitalist globalisation and is underpinned by the ideological assertion that capitalist globalisation is the only viable organising system at the global level which will deliver prosperity and freedom to all. Stephen Gill has provided valuable insights into this aspect of globalisation (1995, 1999).

Gill's (1995, 1999) analyses focus on the "market fundamentalism"[49] of "market civilisation"[50] which is undergirded by "disciplinary neoliberalism".[51] He contends that "the dominant forces of contemporary globalisation are constituted by a neoliberal historical bloc that practises a politics of supremacy within and across nations" (1995, p. 402). He characterises this as an attempt to impose a "neo-liberal market civilisation" that includes not only prescribed economic structures, but also a culture, ideology and its own mythology of capitalist progress that has come about from the globalisation of liberalism. This ideology is put forward as the "sole model

---

[49] This is a very evocative term as it has the connotation of religious fundamentalisms and implies that faith in the god-like powers of the market advocated by the supporters of market civilisation is as uncritically promoted as Islamic or Christian fundamentalist beliefs.

[50] Gill introduces his concept of market civilisation in the following terms: "The present world order involves a more 'liberalised' and commodified set of historical structures, driven by the restructuring of capital and a political shift to the right. This process involves the spatial expansion and social deepening of economic liberal definitions of social purpose and possessively individualist patterns of action and politics… capitalist norms and practices pervade the *gestes repetes* of everyday life in a more systematic way… so that it may be apposite to speak of the emergence of what I call 'market civilisation'" (1995, p. 399).

[51] This presents a discourse of governance which "…stresses the efficiency, welfare, and freedom of the market, and self-actualisation through the process of consumption" and it promotes "…policies that tend to subject the majority to market forces whilst preserving social protection for the strong (e.g., highly skilled workers, corporate capital, or those with inherited wealth)" (1995, p. 401).

of future development" and it is reinforced through the muscle of market discipline and political power (1995, pp. 399 & 412).[52] Gill notes that while market forces have been part of human society for eons, "…it can be argued that a disturbing feature of market civilization is that it tends to generate a perspective on the world that is ahistorical, economistic, materialistic, 'me-oriented', short-termist, and ecologically myopic" (1995, p. 399). Similar to Sklair's "capitalist project", Gill argues that:

> New constitutionalism is a macro-political dimension of the process whereby the nature and purpose of the public sphere … has been redefined in a more privatised and commodified way…the new constitutionalism can be defined as the political project of attempting to make transnational liberalism, and if possible liberal democratic capitalism, the sole model for future development. It is therefore intimately related to the rise of market civilisation (1995, p. 412).

Gill's reflections offer a more strident emphasis on the aspects of political power that play out in capitalist globalisation which is less evident in Sklair's "culture-ideology of consumerism" concept. Together, Sklair's culture-ideology of consumerism and Gill's market fundamentalism provide a fuller picture of how capitalist globalisation asserts its hegemony via persuasion and coercion.

3.5   An Indigenous analysis of contemporary global order

The preceding discussion has indicated that while there is a multitude of interpretations of globalisation, there is compelling reason to devote attention to the critical analysis of capitalist globalisation. Sklair's thorough investigation of the dynamics of capitalist globalisation and the culture-ideology of consumerism

---

[52] Gill frequently calls this phenomenon "the new constitutionalism" and "disciplinary neoliberalism" (1995).

provides a tool to explore the dynamics of corporatised tourism. Moreover, such a

perspective can be enriched by Stewart-Harawira's (2005a, 2005b) analysis of global

order which provides an Indigenous perspective on the dynamics of capitalist

globalisation and its alternatives. This perspective will be particularly useful in

understanding the Indigenous case study which follows in Chapter six. As critical

researcher Denzin (2005) has noted, Indigenous analyses (such as Stewart-

Harawira's) go beyond mere criticism of neoliberalism and capitalism to explain

contemporary problems. They identify a spiritual crisis resulting from a

dysfunctional relationship between humans and nature (Denzin, 2005, p. 948) which

could be mitigated by the adoption of Indigenous ontolologies.

Stewart-Harawira asserts that:

> during the latter half of the twentieth century, the locus of hegemony shifted from the
> level of the state to the global arena. Here it is represented by a particular form of
> global governance that operates at the convergence of the interests of global capital
> and the specific form of liberalism widely referred to as neoliberalism (2005b, p.
> 146).[53]

Like many critics of capitalist globalisation, Stewart-Harawira claims globalisation

and the free market have failed to meet their promises "of an international balance of

trade, of peace through prosperity, of justice through internationally agreed human

rights principles, and of the equal distribution of wealth" (2005b, p. 7). According to

Stewart-Harawira, Indigenous peoples perceive globalisation through the lens of

their experiences of imperialism and colonialism. This makes the ethnocentrism of

the ideology underpinning capitalist globalisation and its potential for exploitation of

---

[53] Unlike Sklair, Stewart-Harawira's finds the United States as the key power behind capitalist
globalisation and contends it has created a "new imperial order" (2005b).

Indigenous peoples and others more readily apparent (2005b, pp. 15-19). Like Sklair, Stewart-Harawira describes major crises that are multi-level and multi-causal which affect global order due to opposition and resistance from anti-systemic movements (2005b, p. 7). Such circumstances make possible a "moment of transformational timespace" (Stewart-Harawira, 2005b, p. 32) which provides an opportunity to develop an alternative global order premised on more ecological and humane principles.

Stewart-Harawira offers Indigenous ontologies as a path to such a transformation, despite the long history of Indigenous knowledges being "devalued, marginalized, disenfranchised and frequently submerged throughout the history of Western imperialism" (2005b, p. 32). It was only with the "reconscientization" period in the 1970s when Indigenous peoples began "reclaiming and revalidating indigenous forms of knowledge and world views" (2005b, p. 81) and asserting Indigenous rights that such a possibility has become available.[54] She states: "those teachings handed down by our ancestors, one of the most important being the interdependence of all existence… is articulated by indigenous scholars as the key to political and social transformations for indigenous peoples and, by extension, is postulated here as central to a globally transformative framework" (2005b, p. 200). Stewart-Harawira sees Indigenous ontologies as offering an "eco-humanism" which is grounded on an "awareness of the spiritual reality of existence", "the interconnectedness of all

---

[54] For instance, the Indigenous people of Chiapas, Mexico (one the poorest and most oppressed regions of Mexico) have been at the forefront of opposition to capitalist globalisation through their movement *"zapatismo"*. Since Mexico prepared to join NAFTA in 1994, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (Zapatistas, or Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional-EZLN) fomented a rebellion which has since seen the declaration of Indigenous zones of autonomy in the southern regions of Mexico, provided a model of inspiration and success for the global justice movement and through *zapatismo* demonstrated a vision of creating "a world where many worlds fit" (Ross & Arsenault, 2004).

existence" and a "recovery of the sacred" (2005b, pp. 250 & 256).[55] She asserts that

"the most pressing challenge for indigenous leaders and educationalists is to recentre

the relevance of traditional indigenous ontologies and epistemologies in the

construction of inclusive, sustainable and pluralistic forms of governance" with the

goal of "moving beyond resistance to the study and application of traditional

ontologies of being within multicivilizational frameworks" (2005b, p. 249). If such

values were recognised and adopted, Stewart-Harawira contends, a "saner, truly

sustainable, inclusive, socially just and spiritually informed framework for our

collective global existence" could be within reach (2005b, p. 256).[56] Stewart-

Harawira (2005a, pp. 160-161) has committed herself to a task of fostering

Indigenous ontologies as one part of the development of "radical pedagogies of hope

and transformation" which seek to foster "global peace, global justice, and the

sanctity of collective life".

Stewart-Harawira's insights offer vital dimensions to the critique of capitalist

globalisation being examined here. Her analysis provides an Indigenous insight into

the dynamics of capitalist globalisation and suggests a less universalising vision of

---

[55] Elsewhere, Stewart-Harawira (2005a) articulates eco-humanism more fully. She delineates some of
the key principles of Indigenous ontologies as: the interconnectedness of all beings, the inseparability
of the world of matter and the world of spirit, the deriving of knowledge from human experience, a
recognition of the life force of all things (animate and inanimate), a principle of guardianship in
human relations with nature, a principle of balance and a principle of compassion (Stewart-Harawira,
2005a, pp. 155-156). To gain further insights into this philosophy or paradigm see Parajuli (2004). In
his study of the viewpoints offered by Zapata and Gandhi he conceptualises "ecological ethnicities"
which he defines as any group of people who base their survival on a daily interaction with their local
environment, e.g. indigenous people, peasants, fishingfolk, nomads, etc. (2004, p. 236). He argues:
"Globally, ecological ethnicities are coming to be at odds with the logic of the market because they
are used to depending largely on the maintenance and regeneration of ecosystems for their livelihoods.
That is why they are causing tremendous barriers to the motion of global capital today. As ecological
ethnicities carefully ensure continuity in the symbiotic connection between the human collectivities
and the non-human collectivities, they stand in the way of wanton resource extraction demanded by
the corporations with global reach" (Parajuli, 2004, p. 238).
[56] Similarly, Blaser, Feit and McRae note that "Indigenous peoples' agency and their alliances with
wider movements themselves can have, and sometimes have had, transformative effects on the
emergence of global structures of governance that are not rooted in globalizing development" (2004,
p. 2).

the alternative to capitalist globalisation. For Stewart-Harawira, Indigenous peoples must consciously turn to their traditions and ancestral knowledge for guidance to create a desirable future. But they must do this while reaching out to non-Indigenous peoples to create a shared and cooperative future through negotiation of a multi-civilisational framework which provides a desirable alternative to the competitive, homogenising and destructive system of capitalist globalisation.[57] Stewart-Harawira's insights will inform the discussion of alternative tourisms and the fostering of "eco-humanism" in Chapter five, while her engagement with Indigenous rights is seminal to the Indigenous case study in Chapter six.

3.6   Conclusion

This chapter has devoted significant attention to the globalisation phenomenon because it is arguably establishing the parameters for contemporary social, economic and political action. While there is a diversity of opinions and viewpoints about the essence, import and impacts of globalisation, there is general agreement that it is a phenomenon worthy of study and analysis. However the argument presented here is that if concern is with sustainability, equity, justice and human welfare, then capitalist globalisation is the most vital aspect of globalisation to contend with. Leslie Sklair's model of capitalist globalisation was analysed in considerable detail because of the comprehensive and useful account it provides of the dynamics of contemporary capitalist globalisation. This model of analysis, together with Gill's conceptualisation of the "new constitutionalism" and "disciplinary neoliberalism",

---

[57] Additionally, Indigenous people model an attitude to globalisation as they have been very active in the global arena as they have utilised opportunities to pursue their interests through international networks and organisations like the United Nations because of the difficulties they often experience in their national contexts. See Chapter six for a discussion of efforts to secure Indigenous rights through the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People currently under consideration at the UN.

will be utilised in the next chapter as a tool to understand the contemporary dynamics of global tourism. This will suggest that capitalist globalisation and a globalised tourism industry have formed a symbiotic relationship of significant importance.