

Introduction: Concepts of Globalization

There have been many trends in sociology in recent decades. These have varied from country to country. One was a concern with class and social mobility from the 1950s onwards, in part evident in debates between Marxists and Weberians. In the '60s and '70s feminists argued that such debates had marginalised another form of social division, gender inequalities. Feminism grew in influence, itself being criticised for failing to appreciate other divisions, for instance ethnic inequalities identified by those with postcolonial perspectives. In the 1980s this concern with differences was highlighted in postmodern ideas, and the power of knowledge was analysed by theorists like Michel Foucault. In the 1980s and '90s a more homogenising idea came to the fore, globalization. This also then went on to stress local difference and plurality. The themes of globalization were not new, but the word and the popularity of the idea really came to the fore in the 1980s (an early mention is in Modelski 1972).

Why did globalization become a popular idea? One reason is the rise of global communications, especially the internet, which made people feel that connections across the world were flowing more strongly, speedily and becoming more democratic. With the end of the cold war it seemed that the bipolar world had become more unified, whether through cultural homogenisation or the spread of capitalism. People became more conscious of global problems, like climate change. Economic interdependency and instability were more visible. Money flowed more freely and national economies went into recession together in the 1970s and again 30 years later. From the 1970s onwards one of the building blocks of the national era, the nation-state, seemed to be under threat. Welfare states became cumbersome and expensive and economic liberals like Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher led the world in rolling them back.

The first half of this introduction will look at the sociology of globalization and themes of the book. The second half will discuss the concept of globalization.

The Sociology of Globalization

Globalization may appear a macro phenomenon and distant, not the same as micro issues that have more of an impact on daily life. Yet large-scale global processes of economic restructuring and international political power have a big impact on our individual lives. The global economy and distribution of wealth affect, for example, our chances of employment and material circumstances. Identity and cultural experience is forged out of global inputs, from media to music, migration and food. Which side you live on in the constellation of global political powers has significant consequences for your life chances.

For some, phenomena like culture and people movements are what sociologists should be concerned about. Culture is sociological and has social effects whereas economic and political issues are the preserve of other disciplines or maybe just less interesting. Culture is very important and interesting, as we shall see in this book. But

so are economics and politics. Culture is affected by economic and political factors. For instance, mergers and diversification in the media industry and government deregulation have a large impact on our cultural experiences as consumers. Economic and political factors which seem distant from our lives have a large impact. The fact that I live in a rich, developed country, one of the core powers in the world, and relatively democratic, peaceful, and free, has a great effect on my life compared to what it would be like if I lived in a poor, developing country, or one with less democracy and freedom, or more conflict and violence. A large proportion of the world's population live in places with some or all of these problems. That I can watch cable television and access the internet, what are cultural experiences, does not just have economic and political bases but also pales into insignificance next to economic and political factors which give me a privileged everyday experience.

Culture is important, it interests us and we are conscious of it on a daily basis. But economics and politics matter on a micro-, individual and daily basis in ways which we often don't think about.

Some sociologists think that if you look at politics and economics this is not really sociology. It is the territory of political science and economics. But this lacks a sense of an interdisciplinary role for sociology. Furthermore sociology is the study of social structures, relations and processes, of society. Society includes political and economic dimensions. And parts of society and social relations not classified as political or economic, for instance culture and migration, are affected by politics and economics.

This book takes politics and economics seriously and sees these as an important part of sociology. You can't understand globalization without looking at its economic and political dimensions, or by analysing cultural and social spheres instead of, or separately from, politics and economics. If culture is looked at separately from economic and political relations then the economic and political power, inequality and conflict that affects culture is overlooked. This makes cultural globalization seem more equal and benign than it really is.

Some sociologists separate their studies of cultural globalization from their studies of political-economic relations. Consequently their awareness of conflict, inequality and power in politics and economics becomes separated from the more benign, equal and cosmopolitan picture they have of culture (for instance, see Beck 2000, 2006 and Nederveen Pieterse 2004a, 2004b. For a sociology of globalization that incorporates political economy and so power, inequality and conflict see Bourdieu 1998, 1999, 2003).

To take an interdisciplinary perspective is distinctively sociological. Sociology has, from its founding days, drawn on economic and political perspectives and dealt with issues such as capitalism, ownership, the division of labour, economic class, and the role of the nation-state. Consequently, sociology is well equipped to deal with modernity, capitalism and the state, some of the main institutions in globalization.

Some of the core themes of sociology are at the heart of this book: such as power, inequality and social divisions and inequalities such as class and gender. Sociology does not have a monopoly on understanding such themes and to make sense of them I will draw on economic and political perspectives. But they have always been central

to the sociological perspective and sociology has been a key influence in forging a role for issues such as power, inequality and conflict across the social sciences and in debates in public life.

So this book looks at some important conventionally sociological topics, migration and the movement of people, the media, culture and social movements. But it also identifies inequality and power as distinctively sociological preoccupations to look out for in globalization. Furthermore it argues that the economy, politics and war, often left out of sociology, are sociological. They are part of society and they affect society, social relations and social structures. If you want to narrow-mindedly rule such things out from being the proper concern of sociology then this leaves out some of the major factors affecting social life and especially behind power, inequality and conflict. This makes sociology into a perspective which turns away from the realities of society, especially its harsher realities.

There is a danger of fetishising the new in recent perspectives on globalization. Old ways of sociology – such as Marxist economic determinism, or perspectives which have a ‘realist’ view of the state (as an actor that pursues its interests in competition with others) - are seen by some as outmoded. Cosmopolitanism is seen to be more appropriate to a new global era. It is argued that we need to break with old approaches and develop new perspectives which fit with a world in which cultures intermingle, where foci on the nation-state or capitalist economic power are too methodologically nationalist or economically determinist, where societies are no longer neatly bounded within national borders, and global identities such as human rights and hybridity are taking over (for instance, see Beck 2006, Urry 2000).

There are problems with this advocacy of a cosmopolitan sociology. A) The old sociology was quite international in its outlook (Turner 2006). Cosmopolitan sociologists overstate the novelty of contemporary cosmopolitan views. B) Rejecting classical sociology as too economic and statist undermines an understanding of the role of economic power and the state in globalization. This leads to a picture of culture and social relations which does not show how they are unequal and power-laden because of economic and political structures. C) Leaving out economic and political power is done in a way which is theoretically elegant and pleasing, but is not empirical enough. The argument is made mainly theoretically in the face of empirical evidence which shows the role of capitalist and state power. D) One empirical absence in cosmopolitanism is the focus of its advocates on their own parts of the world, especially old Europe and North America, and to a lesser extent other fast growing societies, with little attention paid to large parts of the world afflicted by poverty and war. The former fit the cosmopolitan story better than the latter, although even the former are also distinctly unc cosmopolitan when it comes to things like immigration and economic protectionism.

E) Cosmopolitanism is put forward as a new perspective in tune with the new global and intermixed world. There is a fetishisation of the new over the old such that anything that is old is labelled outmoded, unsophisticated or out of date even if empirical evidence shows it has a stronger hold on explaining things. Or categorising something as old and outmoded is used as a way of dismissing it in place of dismissing it with a convincing critique of its theoretical cogency or, more importantly, empirical evidence. The important thing is not whether an argument is

new or old but which is the right argument. F) As well as a lack of emphasis on empirical evidence there is contradiction. Some of those who reject the old approaches combine their new cosmopolitan arguments with other arguments which show the role of state and capitalist power. (Some of these points are developed more in Martell 2008, 2009 and in this book).

Themes of the book

There are number of themes running through this book.

1. Economic bases of globalization. As has been mentioned, many sociological studies of globalization have focused on culture and some have argued for a shift away from economic determinism. Culture has heavily shaped globalization and globalization has a lot to do with the transnationalisation and intermingling of cultures and local cultural responses to global cultures. The interaction between globalization and culture and identities is exciting, important, full of possibilities and is discussed in this book. But it is difficult to see many areas of globalization where lying behind them are not also economic structures which affect the equality or power relations with which globalization is produced or received, or economic incentives to do with making money. My argument is not just about the economics behind globalization, but *capitalist* economics, the pursuit of profit by private owners. Other factors tailor and shape globalization and the economics of profit is not the only causal factor or one that goes in a simple unlinear direction unaffected by other forces. But it is very often a significant driving force.

2. Globalization as historical/modern. Globalization is historical. It started long before the recent years of information technology, the end of the cold war or even the end of the second world war. It has its bases earlier in the development of capitalism and industrialism and the institutions, technologies and incentives these systems brought along. These provided the biggest qualitative leap in globalization and are behind many forms of globalization today. They were not just the key starting point but also the basis for current forms. At the same time it is less plausible that globalization, or the bases for *current* globalization, started before this. While Europe and the West were still relatively backward other more sophisticated parts of the world were practicing long-distance trade, religion and expansion but these were not truly globalization.

3. Sceptical perspectives on globalization. Sociology is historically a critical discipline, and a critical but open-minded approach is healthy and in part what academic research should be about. Being critical about globalization leads to some sceptical conclusions, including doubts about whether what is called globalization really is, or whether international structures and processes in the world match up to the criteria for globalization. What many people describe when they talk about globalization is happening. But it's not clear that it is globalization. Describing it as globalization gives it a meaning which is misleading as to its true character.

The sceptical view is linked to another theme of this book. Globalization is structured by power, inequality and conflict. Some are agents in globalization more than others, and some are more integrated and others excluded. So while there may be globalising processes they are sometimes not global because some people are not as influential or

included as others. Structures and processes described as globalization are significant so studying these is important. But because of the unevenness of inclusion and because of power, inequality and conflict these are not always 'global'. It's important to recognise the significance of international processes but also to not assume they are necessarily globalization.

4. Power, inequality and conflict. Many analyses of globalization have been critical and see it as a problematic process: neoliberalism imposed on parts of the world by the West leading to negative consequences; or American imperialism played out through the media, exploitative multinational corporations or military power; to take a couple of examples. Others in sociology, reacting against this view, see globalization as a more positive, equalising, democratic and benign process bringing an intermingling of cultures in a new cosmopolitanism, and the generalisation of positive values such as universal human rights. One of my aims is to investigate some of these latter perspectives and in doing so themes of power, inequality and conflict come to the fore.

This book adds to the literature on globalization by taking distinctive concerns from sociology. It has an emphasis on critical analysis, that examines power, inequality and conflict in global relations. It puts arguments about globalization to the test of theoretical coherence and empirical evidence. It looks for interdisciplinary links and a holistic view, outlining important social relations of culture and migration but seeing these as not separable from political and economic structures. As well as breadth in perspective the book is broad in the range of areas of globalization discussed, from hybrid cultures to worldwide wars. The book aims to be accessible to an audience that is relatively new to this area, but without sacrificing its own arguments.

Being critical can lead in different directions. In this book it leads to some partly pessimistic conclusions. Globalization may not be as developed as it seems. Insofar as it is, the picture is not as rosy as it might appear. The aim to solve world problems through global politics is well-meant but optimistic and hopeful. It is important to be negative if this is the most accurate conclusion to come to. But alongside doubts about globalization and global politics this book has positive political arguments, for instance about how things could be made better in relation to migration, global poverty and international politics.

It argues that it is necessary to include national politics but go beyond them. At the level of global politics there is power, inequality and conflict. Consensus and commonality cannot always be achieved here because of inequalities, power and differences of interest and ideology. A politics of conflict between different sides might be necessary. This may involve the poorer and less powerful allying internationally against the richer and more powerful. This involves a politics which is international (rather than just national or global) and conflictual (rather than cosmopolitan or consensual).

Political and Pluralist Perspectives on globalization

One of the striking things about the literature on globalization is that positions which see globalization happening or are sceptical about its existence do not break down along clear ideological lines. There are neoliberals and Marxists who see neoliberal

globalization going on, although they may not agree on its consequences (for instance, whether it will solve global inequality and poverty or not) or whether it is good or bad. Normatively and prescriptively there are divisions between neoliberals and Marxists, and sometimes empirically on the consequences of it, but at the descriptive level about the fact of whether economic globalization is happening the split between globalists and sceptics is not along the lines of political ideology. I have outlined some political ideology perspectives on globalization in the table below. These will come up again throughout the book.

Table i: Political Ideologies and Globalization

	Globalization happening? Descriptive	Globalization Good or Bad? Normative
Neoliberals	Yes	Good
Globalist marxists	Yes	Bad (for socialist reasons)
Conservative nationalists	Yes	Bad (for nationalist reasons)
Social Democratic sceptics	No	Bad because a) unequal, ie not global; b) or not route to solving poverty (protectionism better)
Social Democratic globalists	Yes	Good, if subjected to global regulation

One issue discussed in this book is the tendency towards pluralist, hybrid, and multidimensional views of globalization. Such views see globalization as operating at different levels from the economic to the cultural or political. Sometimes emphases on multidimensionality are trying to get away from perspectives which focus mainly on economic globalization. Some views emphasise globalization as a hybrid and mixed phenomena with inputs from many different parts of the world and not just westernised or homogenising. For others globalization is pluralistic and localised in its effects, its reception varying depending on where it is received. Globalization is also driven by a multiplicity of factors rather than being reducible to single or selected causes. Globalization is multidimensional, hybrid, localised in its effects, and multicausal.

Table ii : Pluralist Views of Globalization

Multicausal	Globalization not just caused by one chief factor, eg economy
Multilevel	Economic, political, cultural, military, environmental
Hybrid	Mixture of inputs from East/West/North/South
Localised	Form globalization takes varies where it is received

Seeing globalization in these plural ways is helpful and an antidote to monocausal, over-westernised, homogenising views, some of which focus on the economy at the expense of culture, or have a simplified view of its effects. Pluralistic views of globalization are an improvement on earlier sweeping general theories, less popular nowadays, which see globalization rolling out in a similar manner across the world.

But there is a danger of being pluralist without analysing if there is primacy or greater causality at some levels; whether amongst the plural factors some are more dominant or have a causal effect on the others. To say globalization is multidimensional is helpful and brings out its mix. But there are dangers in seeing it as an equal and

hybrid mix without seeing the primacy, dominance or determination of some factors over others. It is also important not to separate off these plural factors, focusing on each as if separate from others and distracting from causal relations between them.

Concepts of Globalization

The rest of this chapter looks at the meaning of globalization. Defining globalization is important because it affects other issues discussed in this book, such as when globalization started. Globalization is a powerful discourse or ideational force. It has an impact on how we see the world and behave. If an idea has this power it's important to pin down what it means and see if what it refers to lives up to the definition. The picture of globalization as inclusive, unifying and general makes it seem positive, whereas other definitions are more pessimistic. So it's important to identify what globalization means and how this fits with reality.

Globalization – beyond internationalisation, liberalisation and universalisation?

Scholte (2005) argues that a new word should not restate what is already known with other terminology but has to mean something different. He rejects four meanings of globalization –as internationalisation, liberalisation, universalisation or westernisation. These do not add anything new and do not capture what is different about globalization.

Internationalisation involves the growth of transactions and interdependencies between countries. Things cross borders between states or national territories; for example, messages, ideas, goods, money, investments, pollutants, and people. But Scholte says that inter-national transactions are nothing new and the word international captures what this describes so we don't need a new word for these sorts of processes.

Scholte says that globalization is also not liberalisation. The latter refers to the removal of constraints on movements of resources between countries – an open, borderless world. Liberalisation involves abolishing regulatory measures like trade barriers, capital controls and visa requirements, and is linked in part with neoliberalism. Both supporters and critics of neoliberalism define globalization in this way. Scholte says this liberalisation has happened and has facilitated globalization. But liberalisation and globalization are not the same thing. Globalization can and could take different forms, including non-neoliberal ones. We don't need don't need a new word like globalization for this as this has long been debated as liberalisation.

Globalization is also not universalisation. This involves the dispersion of objects and experiences to all parts of the earth. Here global means worldwide or everywhere. Examples that Scholte gives include tobacco, clothes, the state, food, education, childrens' toys and arms. Sometimes this gets extended into globalization as standardisation or homogenisation. But Scholte says there is nothing new about this. It is age-old, for instance in world religions and trade. There is no need for new terminology for something we already have a word for.

Globalization also has to be more than Westernisation. This is a particular type of universalisation, of western structures such as capitalism, industrialism, rationalism, urbanism, individualism, and democracy, or put more critically, colonisation, Americanisation, and imperialism. Scholte says these are part of globalization but not the same. Globalization can go in non-western directions. It need not be imperialist if emancipatory movements can guide it. And westernisation existed long before globalization so let's call this westernisation and not invent a new word for it.

For Scholte globalization is deterritorialisation or supraterritorialism. These involve more than just transplanetary links. *Transplanetary* connectivity, connections between parts of the world, has been around for many centuries. *Supraterritoriality*, however, is relatively new and breaks with territorialist geography, with territories and borders being important. In the first edition of his book Scholte defined globalization as *deterritorialisation*. In the second he replaces this with the idea of *supraterritorialism*. This, he says, is because the word deterritorialisation suggests that territory doesn't matter anymore and this is putting it too strongly.

Transplanetary relations involve links between people across the world. These have been around for centuries but they are more dense now than before, involve more people, more often, are more extensive and intensive and of greater volume. Supraterritorial relations, however, are more recent and involve not just an intensification of links across the world but different types of global connectivity. They involve not just an intensification of links across boundaries but the decline of those boundaries. They transcend and are detached from territory. They involve things like transworld simultaneity (eg people in lots of places doing the same thing, like consuming the same make of coffee) or transworld instantaneity (eg the telephone, where distant people talk to each other at the same time).

Other examples of supraterritorialism for Scholte include jet planes, telecommunications, global media, finance, ecological problems and global consciousness (eg sports and human rights consciousness). In such cases there is more than compression of time over space, for instance where communications or travel over the same distances are quicker. There are social relations beyond territorial space. The difference between time-space compression and supraterritoriality is qualitative. It involves not just an intensification of existing relations but new sorts of relations. For Scholte, territorial domains remain important but don't define the whole framework where there is supraterritorialism.

Scholte says that examples of supraterritorialism include communications (eg books, post, telegraph, phone, fax, texting, internet, newspapers, radio, TV, film); the movement of people (eg tourism, migration/refugees, business travel); production processes (eg production that occurs in many places, global sourcing, global trade); consumption; global money/finance; global organisations (eg MNCs, faith-based, unions, NGOs, charities); military globalization (eg weapons that have global reach, war carried out from global locations); ecology (in both causes and effects); health (for instance illnesses that spread globally); law (eg international laws); and global consciousness (eg sports competitions, global tours and events, conferences).

The problem is that these are all examples of transplanetary connections as much as supraterritoriality and Scholte makes a number of qualifications to what he is saying. Territorialism, he says, remains important, for instance in production, governance, ecology and identities. Globalism has not eliminated it. The world is both territorial and global and there is no pure globality that exists independently of territorial spaces. The world is territorial and supraterritorial and both intersect. The global is not a domain separate from regional, national, provincial and local levels and there is an intersection of all these. This is what Scholte says and these are quite big qualifications which seem to take the edge off ideas of deterritorialisation and supraterritorialism.

Furthermore many things described by people as globalization fall into the categories of internationalisation, liberalisation, or westernisation. Scholte himself says that these are part of globalization but just not the same as them. So it's not clear how different globalization is from these as he suggests it is. The exception is universalisation. Scholte says this is old but actually there isn't much universalisation. Few of the processes Scholte mentions are universal. So while globalization encompasses internationalisation, liberalisation and westernisation as much as breaking from them, it rarely achieves the universalisation he also differentiates globalization from.

The qualifications that Scholte makes, mentioned above, undermine his concept of globalization. They suggest that globalization is intertwined with territory rather than something above, beyond and separate from it. It might be better to say that what people talk about when discussing globalization are forms of westernisation, internationalisation and liberalisation but that they are not above and beyond these.

Sociologists and historians define globalization

Waters (2001: 4) mentions definitions of globalization made by Robertson and Giddens. For Robertson (1992: 8)

Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole ... both concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole.

Here the compression of space is mentioned. Things which are at a distance as great as ever before are, because of technological developments, nearer in terms of the speed of communications and travel. We can see media from the other side of the world or communicate with someone there as if they are in the next room. This is also sometimes called the annihilation of space (Harvey 1991), where spatial distances don't matter any more because of the possibility of communicating, moving and seeing over them fully and quickly. There is a cultural emphasis in Robertson's concern with consciousness of globality. As we will see in future chapters, consciousness of globalization is, for some, as important as the reality of it.

For Giddens (1990: 64):

Globalization can ... be defined as the intensification of world-wide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice-versa. This is a dialectical process because such local happenings may move in an obverse direction from the very distanced relations that shape them. Local transformation is as much a part of globalization as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space.

Here world wide relations are seen as becoming more intense, and the interactions between the local and global are important, in which the local is not just shaped by globalization but may react to it in an alternative way.

Waters (2001: 5) sees globalization as a social process in which the constraints of geography on economic, political, social and cultural arrangements recede and people become increasingly aware of this and act accordingly. Like Holton, mentioned below, Waters sees globalization as a process rather than an end and he emphasises culture and consciousness and the effect it has on action.

Holton (2005) defines globalization as:

1. Interconnection – the intensified movement of goods, money, technology, information, people, ideas and cultural practices across political and cultural boundaries.
2. The interdependence of these activities across boundaries, and convergence and integration, for instance in prices and markets. Globalization must be more than movement which is episodic, or involves few people (eg as in early trade), or has few consequences for those not involved in it.
3. Holton also sees globalization as involving consciousness and identification of the world as a single place, for instance as in cosmopolitan culture, religions, and environmentalism. There are overlaps here with Robertson's consciousness-focused definition.
4. Holton emphasises agency and process in globalization, against it being seen as something which is an external or fixed structure.

Held *et al* (1999) have what they call a transformationalist view. This sees globalization as: new but not unprecedented, open-ended, it may go in many different directions, and varying in the form it takes by place and class and over time. This is compatible with local, regional, and national relations carrying on but interacting with globalization and taking global forms or forms affected by globalization. Globalization transforms human affairs by linking together and expanding human activity across regions and continents. It involves:

1. the *stretching* of activities across frontiers so activities in one part of the world have significance for others in distant regions. There is transregional interconnectedness and a widening of networks.
2. World relations become regularised with the consequence that there is an *intensification* or growing magnitude of interconnections, interactions and flows across societies and states.

3. The *speeding up* of global interactions and processes as a result of the development of transport and communications. The global diffusion of ideas, goods, information, capital and people is faster.

4. The *impact* of distant events is magnified. Local developments can have big global consequences. The boundaries between domestic and global affairs become blurred.

Held *et al* show that globalization is complex. It includes numerous processes rather than one activity or end. It involves both agency and structure, the input of actors into making it and external constraints on them. It is differentiated in the sense that it develops to different extents and in varying patterns in different areas. It is aterritorial in that it can involve deterritorialisation, where the stretching of activities goes beyond being coterminous with territories, but also reterritorialisation, where globalization becomes established in regions, subnational areas, and even encourages nationalism. Some significant complexities and qualifications are added to the concept of globalization here.

Held et al distinguish between *flows*, which are movements of things, people, symbols, tokens and information across space, from *networks*, which are regularised or patterned interactions. This involves an important distinction between things moving across space and those movements becoming established and regularised or even a system.

Held et al also make some important qualifications about what globalization is not. They argue that globalization should not be confused with interdependence, integration, universalism or convergence. It is not interdependence because they say that involves symmetry rather than hierarchy and there is plenty of the latter in globalization; not integration because that implies shared community and that does not exist; not universalism because globalization is not shared by all people or communities in the same way; and not convergence because this assumes growing homogeneity and harmony while globalization could lead to conflict.

So this is a complex definition of globalization which shares a bit with what sceptics about globalization say. Some of the complexities and qualifications they add make what they describe something less than what may others might see as globalization.

The historians Osterhammel and Petersson (2005) also stress regularisation and stability in global relations as a prerequisite to something being globalization. They say that globalization is different to imperialism. While the idea of empire is revitalised in some concepts of globalization, for instance those that stress American power, globalization is also more global and post-colonial. It includes the inputs of non-imperial sources. It is about the end of self-contained societies. They make the distinction between: 1) world history which is the study of different civilisations, their internal dynamics and comparisons between them; 2) global history which is the study of contacts and interactions between societies; and 3) globalization which may grow out of some of those contacts and interactions.

Globalization grows where the contacts and interactions become networks and interaction spheres. Not all interactions become networks. This requires longevity and sometimes institutional reinforcement so that they gain the sort of stability also found in hierarchical organisations. Osterhammel and Petersson say institutions such as

diplomacy and trade help to turn interactions into networks. Other factors in globalization they mention include range, importance, intensity and speed. These are enabled by technology and organisational and institutional support. The durability and frequency of relations affects whether interactions become a network with stability. This can be restricted by space, or frozen or reversed. As such globalization is more a process than a fixed, or static thing at one moment. For Osterhammel and Petersson the features that fit their definition started about 1500 or so and became established in the mid 18th and 19th century.

The concept summarised

Putting together what these authors have said in defining globalization what does it all add up to? Globalization involves the compression of space such that distance is less of a factor than it used to be in terms of knowledge, communication and movement. Geography and territory is undermined and things start to develop at a level which is global and more than and above inter-national relations. What more has to happen for this to become globalization?

1. Globalization needs to be *global in distance*. Long distance or transnational extensions of economy, politics and culture that are regional are not global because they do not extend globally. It would be a lot to say that to be globalization something has to reach every part of the world but it is reasonable to say that it needs to reach all continents and most parts of those continents.

2 Globalization needs to be *globally inclusive in inputs* as well as reach. So something that extends things from one part of the world to another is the extension of one part of the world, eg westernisation, rather than really global, ie globalization. Again, it would be a lot to say that absolutely all parts of the world need to have an input of equal weight. But globalization, to be 'global', needs to have inputs from across continents and many countries within them rather than just be a one-way or very unequal process from one place to another.

3. There needs to be *interdependency rather than just interconnection*. Two different things which are in connection need to actually effect one another. So if trade in luxury goods like jewels or silk doesn't have significant repercussions when it stops maybe this is not real interdependency. But if a decline in trade has significant effects for the exporting society's workers and economy or the access of the receiving society to goods then there appears to be an interdependency.

4. There needs to be *stability and regularity* in relations such that these rather than being intermittent or temporary establish a structure or system.

5. Some other aspects could be added to make a more demanding concept of globalization. For instance that it needs to involve *more than elites but to be mass*. Or that there needs to be not just globalization but also *global consciousness*. People need to not be just doing things globally but have an awareness of the globe as one place.

As we shall see when we look at the history of globalization and sceptical perspectives on globalization the use of such criteria leads some to decide that what is

taking place internationally is not globalization. At the same time these are tough criteria – it would be difficult for anything to ever match up to all of them fully. If you see globalization as a process moving towards such criteria, rather than as an end, then globalization may well be something that is going on.

Does defining globalization matter beyond the issue of just deciding when something is globalization or not? This is not just a question of academic definition. There are other things which make defining globalization important. One is that it makes sure we that see the power, inequality and conflict in globalization. Seeing some situations as globalization - as inclusive, integrated, two way, and globally extended - gives an impression of inclusivity and equality that is inaccurate. Questioning whether phenomena meet the definition of globalization helps to show the power, inequality, and lack of inclusion in the processes being outlined.

At the same time saying that certain things, such as flows of capital or multinational corporations, are not globalization, does not mean they are not there or not important. What globalists describe is often real and significant but it is misleading and dangerous to describe it as globalization. What is being described may not be globalization but may still be happening and be significant and something which should be studied and analysed carefully. This is why globalization is important even if you don't think it is happening!

Practical note on reading chapters.

You can read this book by looking at chapters on areas of most interest to you and not reading the others. However, while individual chapters stand alone they are overlapping and interlinked. To avoid repetition I have sometimes only mentioned briefly in some places issues which are developed more in other chapters. At the same time some issues are of such significance in more than one chapter that they are explained, to some extent, in more than one place.

Further Reading

The literature on globalization is enormous. I have not tried to give a full range of references in the chapters of the book. However at the end of each chapter I have given some suggestions for further reading. These are primarily for those who are relatively new to globalization and would like to go a bit further on any of the topics.

Held et al's (1999) *Global Transformations* is quite an old book, but remains a substantive and complex introduction to areas of globalization, with a historical perspective and both theoretical and empirical information. It argues for a transformationalist perspective, in between more globalist and sceptical views. It has a useful companion reader edited by Held and McGrew *Global Transformations Reader* (2003).

Larry Ray's (2007) *Globalization and Everyday Life* is a more recent, compact discussion of some of the key themes in the sociology of globalization.

Robert Holton has written a number of books such as *Globalization and the Nation-State* (1998), *Making Globalization* (2005) and *Global Networks* (2007) which illuminate issues in a concise way.

Scholte's *Globalization* is a good book at an introductory level. It is quite descriptive and I am not convinced by the case it makes for globalization but it is useful as a starting point (second edition 2005). Another short readable book which brings in key themes, with a cultural emphasis, is Malcolm Waters' *Globalization* (second edition 2001).

The news magazine *The Economist* has a mostly neoliberal point of view, but is also fairly open-minded. It is very informative on international affairs. It includes coverage of economics, conflict, politics and poverty left out by some sociologies of globalization.

Sociological perspectives which have a cultural and positive view of globalization have been mentioned in this introduction. For a powerful critical view from a sociologist who brings in politics and economics whilst also paying attention to media and culture see *Acts of Resistance* (1998), *The Weight of the World* (1999), and *Firing Back* (2003) by the French writer Pierre Bourdieu.