GLOBALIZATION VS. CULTURAL IDENTITY

Liljana Siljanovska

SEE University - Tetovo, Republic of Macedonia

Abstract
Globalization, today, is marked as a relatively new discourse although it refers to some old processes that in the previous years had been interpreted a little bit differently. In that sense the universalization and internationalization are just synonyms for globalization of which there are controversial arguments in scientific academic circles and the international public. Globalists and anti-globalists are divided in their attitudes on the effects that it causes nationally and globally. Issues in terms of the theoretical reorganization of space and time that it defines in terms of economical, political and cultural context of an unspecified geographical area, with undefined borders and undefined global governments are disputable. That is why it cannot be regarded neither as Americanization, nor Europeanization, and each attempt at a simple regional gathering of national governments in their joined actions is solely a reduced understanding of the growing global interdependency that simultaneously produces cultural diversity and is nurturing cultural identities at a local level. Their proportional dependency revives in practice the new amalgam of Robertson - glocalization.

Key words: *globalization, cultural identity, glocalization, Americanization*

1. INTRODUCTION

What is globalization - a phenomenon, a process or a movement? Does this mean that in the era of post-modernization the world makes new connections with economy, politics and culture? Who controls, expands, deepens whom? Is globalization an act of Americanization or Europeanization? Maybe there are no global governments, but there are international organizations, bodies and organs that dictate general policies in all spheres of the social-political, the economic and the cultural reality. In such a constellation of international existence, the media reorganize space and time through a mediation of the modern technical-technological revolution, and the Internet, and reshape culture of life mostly as integration of collectivities within national frames, and later in international communication. Hence, McLuhan's saying that the world is a global village becomes more and more relevant. That is why the understanding that globalization represents solely an achievement of economic effects in the intercountry dependency on the global economic market, such as creating transnational companies, free flow of work force, free flow of products, capital and achieving an extra profit, would sound substantially reduced. At the same time, globalization also contains the political aspects of creating joined regulative between separate countries and guaranteeing the rights from social and economic globalization. The rise of intercultural cooperation leads to surpassing cultural differences and exchanging cultural values and artifacts. Such a democratization of culture raises the question of uniformity in a global scale, however not as a loss of cultural identities of national states, but as standardization of cultural values and products, and at the same time, a quality content representation of various cultures. This paper intends to bring to light the theoretical dilemmas of both complex processes - globalization and cultural identity, but not as completely opposite and antagonistically set-up concepts, but as causative and consequential ones, interconditioned discourses of the modern creation of the world society understood as redefining of the retrograde processes for the alarming alienation of cultural identities as a product of modernization and cultural heritage protection. The theoretical assumption of this paper starts from the setting-up of two basic goals as ideology of support and development of a global democratic cultural politics. The first basic goal is to support the means for cultural production and their spreading. The second goal is to support the means of cultural participation. The paradoxes of cultural globalization in the context of explaining the research question set up cultural identity as a basis of cultural politics, but at the same time as a fluid and complex discourse in the global redefining of its meaning and function. This entails that cultural

identity should not be understood solely as a viewpoint of its own consideration, but above all as a insurmountable, live and complex anthropological and social phenomenon.

2. MODERN SOCIETY AND GLOBALIZATION

If we are to explain with one word the term modern society, then science will face a great difficulty in defining this perspective, because every nominal determination of this term in a definition shall reduce and dimension its characteristics, causative and consequential conditioning and effects on the individuals, collectives, national and world cultures. On the contrary, modern society should be understood not just as the time in which we live in today, but also as a process that lasts and surpasses the development phases of a paradigm in the structural functionalism of global society. As one sociologist would say... "not as one moment, that would represent an image of the world in this historic moment, not as a decade which is the short time unit so that it may represent the complex dynamic structure of modern society, but we will define modern society as an analysis of world changes in the twentieth century." 1

Hence, if we are to understand that the main characteristic of social evolution is the modernization that begins with the rise of industrialization and causes radical changes in man's life as a whole, then we can deduce that there are two theoretical orientations in the scientific interpretation of the term modern society, and the second is determining modern society as post modernization or globalization. The first theoretical claim is founded on the fact that modernization begins with the industrial development of society which in turn begins years before the twentieth century, and the second is the postindustrial era which is determined by the technical-technological development and the effects of international networking on economy, culture and politics worldwide. Thus, contemporary society through the phases of social-economic, political and cultural development is mostly modern, and then evolves into a postmodern or global society. Although according to historical interpretations of some modern analysts of globalization we can differentiate between "first" and "second" globalization. The first globalization lasted since the French-Prussian War (1870) up until 7.28.1914 with the act of the Serbian anti-globalist Gavrilo Princip. The second globalization, on the other hand, as Ivica Bocevski writes - ... "starts off shyly with the global changes caused by the development in technology, especially the fall of prices in telecommunications and the fall of transportation prices (the seventies of the last century) so that it may culminate with the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989." 2

2.1 Defining globalization as a complex phenomenon

Globalization understood as a phenomenon of the twentieth century introduces turbulences in everyday life and in the business environment. New trends, the speeding process of modernization, i.e. westernization are generally accepted as aspects of a modernization, although every country in the world is still not ready or developed enough for their adoption and practice with equal intensity.

An even harder task is the theoretical defining of the term globalization because in the past 20 years in scientific and academic circles there is an intense debate on its causes, consequences, effects and meaning, but they are mostly viewed from a specific scientific level of interest such as an economic, political or cultural aspect. For economists, globalization means that the economic activities are conducted on the international market where there is a free flow of services, capital, products and workforce in the international exchange. Thus, international corporations regardless of international interests make decisions. This means that international institutions that are accepted on a national and regional level regulate the mechanism of the world market. For political scientists the subject of interest in determining globalization is the new context of political thought in redefining centers of power, supranational bodies and organs, implementing general policies on global issues in structuring and democratization of the international order.

In the area of cultural treatment of the phenomenon of globalization, the focus is on alienation of cultural values and traditions of a nation, the removing cultural differences and unifying standards. There is a great pressure for a debate regarding the issue of control on global communications of a neocolonialism or new imperialism type as an effect from the influence of transnational

communication companies. Or more specifically whether they are under someone's influence and ultimately protect someone's interests or if the culture products of every possible kind that are being offered on the international market stimulate new or simultaneously develop old forms of cultural identity.

Each and every such fragmented determination of the phenomenon of globalization means a unilateral definition of the set of processes that with great intensity occurred in the sixties of the twentieth century. An all-around and simultaneously shortest definition would be the one regarding the theoretical reorganization of space and time. "Simply put this term entails the reorganization of time and space (distance) in social life". 3 Therefore, sociologist Giddens believes that globalization represents a collective action and living remotely in separate worlds that are nationally and religiously separate, in a sense of personal characteristics and values. According to Held (2003), globalization can be understood as expansion, deepening and accelerating world interdependency in all aspects of modern social life, from culture to crime, from finances to a spiritual life.

2.2. Globalization vs. globalism

Given the complexity of the lively, dynamic and, at the same time, contradictory phenomenon of globalization we can easily define it as global networking or simply as resetting the system of which there is no going back. On the other hand, globalism is the direction of human thought which strives to understand the rhythm of globalization. Or more specifically, to understand the forces that move globalization of economy, business, politics, culture and education. Globalism as a new philosophy and movement that arises from social reality strives to understand the ties, relations and the influence of the international public, to foresee future flows of globalization and the appearance of the globalized world, but also to warn about the consequences and challenges that arise from globalization. In the process, we should make a difference between globalists and globalizers. Those that direct and lead the process of globalization are called globalizers. Those are actually individuals or an elite group of people that through their decisions direct the process of globalization. However, at the same time, they themselves are victims, i.e. suffer the consequences of the influence of globalization. Globalists tend to understand globalization, to institutionalize it and direct it. However, at the same time, if their philosophy is regarded as ideology - a system of values, attitudes and views on global thinking without the use of rational modalities in achieving several aspects of globalization as a process in the global order and practice in the world, then such a direction of philosophical thinking falls in the ideology which means belief in the mythical ideas on the global world. In that case there is also a danger for that part of the world, usually we talk about underdeveloped or not-so-developed countries, instead of active participants in the process of globalization, to become its subjects, which does not correspond to the actual condition of the world. For philosopher Karan Singh the answer to these and many other questions, for example - if globalization will result in a permanent domination of a people or of a culture or society will become pluralistic or multicultural, depend on several factors. The first and most important response is contained in the restructuring of the United Nations, in order to be more accessible towards reality. The second aspect is contained in the economy. Namely if we want to be actors, and not just subjects, surely we cannot accept full and constant domination of the policy of the World Bank and of the International Monetary Fund. The third element is the culture factor where the educational component plays a valuable role. -What a global society needs is not homogenization of culture, but a situation where each civilization will give a special contribution into the rich mosaic of global society in development" - Singh considers. 4

According to David Held (1997), authors of globalization theories can be divided into hyper globalists, skeptics and transformalists. One of the most famous globalization conspiracists is Kenichi Ohmae, according to whom globalization leads towards a world without boundaries, i.e. creates a world where the market is stronger than national governments. To globalists, globalization is a process that does not depend on national boundaries because it produces a new global order, and the opening up of states represents a unique alternative, especially for the undeveloped states. On the one hand, skeptics doubt that globalization represents a significant problem worth discussing, while on the other, when conspiring for world economic integration it is the national states, i.e. their political elites, that play a significant role. Transformists believe that globalization is just one of the changes that modern society

faces, where despite new behaviors and attitudes exist old norms, beliefs and way of life. According to them, the greater global interdependence is not an obstacle for retaining the power of national governments and globalization has a positive and a negative influence.

3. CULTURAL IDENTITY AND CULTURE DEMOCRATIZATION

In the era of globalization, democratic societies face the basic challenge, and that is democratization in culture development. Depending on local, social and political conditions, culture democratization manifests itself in different ways, although the challenge is a consequence of globalization and the different aspects of international communication. The basic identity issues in developing societies are connected to history, the struggle for freeing themselves from colonialism and imposing other cultures, as well as a clash of modern trends with traditional values. The democratic creation of their cultural politics is similar, however at the same time it is completely different in developed industrial countries. They are oriented towards democratization of the higher culture, i.e. bridging the gap between high and popular culture, as well as towards creating an protecting the values of a civil society, and those are democracy, justice, freedom of speech and expression, equal opportunities for all, solidarity, social harmony, unification and standardization in applying general policies. Hence, through different intensities, all countries in the world face several different fundamental points of consideration and acting. Specific measures and activities in the cultural politics for surpassing the alarming alienation that is produced by modernization, i.e. globalization are being taken. Personal media production, production of material artifacts in movies, theatre, literature, painting and other forms of art are just some of the expressional forms of protection of cultural tradition, and at the same time an opportunity for communication between different cultures. Within that frame, policy on democratization of culture as support and development tends to support the funds for cultural production and their diffusion, as well as to support the funds for cultural participation.

In such a constellation of relations in the global era, there is an imposition the need for redefining the fluid and complex discourse of cultural identity, which should not be understood solely from the aspect of its consideration as an abstract concept. As an anthropological and social phenomenon it is a live, an uncircumventable and a complex process. Different cultural facts arise from different experiential contents of life. This directly conditions the problemizing of cultural identity by determining culture. It, on the other hand, as a concept is not at all simple to define given the fact that in theory there is two different meanings. The broader meaning on culture defines it as a way of life, as generally accepted values, beliefs and practice of a social group. According to the second, narrower meaning, culture is determined as a production of artifacts that may become goods that are tradable on the market. 5 In the context of understanding culture in its thoroughness and versatility is the opinion of Danny Kush: "Consequently, there are no "pure", on the one hand, and on the other hand "mixed" cultures. All cultures, according to the universal fact of cultural contacts, are to some degree of diversity mixed cultures, created and with continuity and discontinuity. Creating a tendency for differentiation of cultures, considering them as separate continuities, may yield a methodological usefulness and has a certain heuristic value in history of ethnology on defining cultural differences." 6 The fact is that in a given social context, not just in the inside of certain territorial borders, i.e. states, but with a global communication and on an international level, cultures cannot be completely foreign to one another. Their affirmation, through specifying cultural differences, values, customs and beliefs, in no way should mean that there should be a discontinuity between different cultures.

The issue on cultural differences is especially imposed as a response to the economic and political globalization in fear of unification and standardization of norms and regulations in implementing general policies and above all as a response to phenomena which in certain segments have been defined as Americanization or Europeanization vs. national cultural identities. "Cultural identity is the self-awareness of the members of a of group which is historically created and developed in accordance with the criteria which that group establishes in terms of other social groups". 7 Given that the true creator and bearer of social relations is the individual, this means that his determined self-aware and original existence cannot be excluded, nor can the cultural identity be treated as a new concept. Even more so because it represents a notorious fact of history of culture and of culture dynamics.

The broader contexts in which cultural identity fits is social identity that does not only refer to individuals, but to social groups that are framed in a social system. "Here the social identity implements the principle of inclusion or exclusion of members of a group according to different characteristics with the help of those that differ from the member of another group. Cultural identity, in this sense, can be seen a manner of categorization in the sense of "we" vs. "them", based on cultural differences." 8

4. CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION AND ISSUES OF CULTURAL IMPERIALISM

The crisis in culture is especially re-actualized in a new redefying of the identity crisis especially emphasized with the process of globalization. Also, until recently the issues of cultural and media imperialism were quite prevailing in the theoretical circles, which were conditioned by technological determinism, especially with the development of new communication technologies. However, the perspective - cultural imperialism - according to McQuail - "arises from an influential resistance movement created by developing countries in their struggle to preserve their cultural integrity and political autonomy - which was sought as being led in danger by the Western cultural and media imperialism". 9 Then again, as John Tomilson says, eve today... "there is still a reason why cultural imperialism must be taken seriously, as a point of view from which cultural globalization can be viewed". 10 According to Tomilson, this is due to the fact that real issues which cultural politics addresses show that some national governments continue to take the threat of cultural imperialism seriously. That is why, Tomilson strives for assimilation of the theories for cultural globalization in the theory of cultural imperialism and gives three reasons for this. 11 First off, the omnipresence of western cultural products, i.e. there is lots of evidence that western taste and practice are become global. The second reason is the long history of western imperialism and the fact that what we call third world countries are countries that are "in a historical bond of political and economic subservience to the countries of the developed West, often connected to their colonial past". 12 The third reason for transforming cultural globalization into cultural imperialism is the central position of capitalism as a cultural influence: "globalization is essentially an advanced form of capitalistic globalization". 13 However, Tomilson indicates the boundaries of the paradigm for cultural imperialism because cultural influence will not go down the linear type of paths that cultural imperialism foresees. "It is pretty evident that globalization does not promise the techno-utopia of McLewan's global village, but it is also highly unlikely that it will cause a homogenized dystopia where the same people of power will dominate, and which is predicted in the theses of cultural imperialism... Maybe the only thing that we can predict today is an uncertain, unequal, but radically open cultural future". 14 This is due to the fact that, essentially, the process of globalization is decentralized and produces new forms of advantages and disadvantages. Such forms in the global world are starting to be recognized as an affirmation of personal cultural values on the one hand, and as a unification of cultural goods depersonalized in a standard cultural homogenization, on the other.

5. CULTURAL DIVERSITY VS. GLOBAL CULTURE

Globalization is a contradictory process of the international culture scene. The more nations lose part of the power that they had in the past, i.e. the more the supervision of international organizations and corporations in global communication connection and exchange is expanded, and the more local cultural identities in different parts of the world begin to liven up. Expansion in width also means a deepen development of characteristics, values, and procedures of local i.e. national cultures. Lately there is an emphasis on diversity, and not on unity, an emphasis on the need for acknowledgement of cultural differences and within the European Union a focus on preserving and affirmation of the different European identities. Also, the confirmation of cultural affiliation inside the multicultural politics of certain countries acquires a new form because the issues of multiculturalism and the provisions for providing multiculture are taken from their national frames and are calculated into a new global context. In the era of media communication, transnational media create new transnational communities and transnational diasporic audiences. For instance, in the Republic of Macedonia,

despite the policy for providing a program in the languages of the ethnic communities on a channel on a national television, research shows that the audiences from the ethnic communities prefer the programs that they get from the Albanian, Turkish or Serbian satellite program. The situation is similar in the biggest part of Europe, as well. For instance, the Turkish minority in Germany mostly follows the programs from the Turkish satellite TV, while the Indian community in Great Britain has built a very strong Indian television industry... The Indian programs produced in Britain circulate in Indian communities all across the world along with programs produced in India. The consequences of such transnational forms of media consumption are especially important because they work for a dramatic transformation of the mere meaning of the multicultural issue. However, there is always a danger of cultural ghettoization within globalization of culture that cannot be disregarded in the treatment of issues on the role of the media and the creation of cultural products in the creating and developing cultural identities.

The current world culture scene can be scanned as a true global decentralized network of corporations where different cultural products can be defined such as press, film, television, publishing, music, all in order to create global communication empires which, in turn, especially in media communication, take over the responsibility for the biggest part of the global image flow. American mass culture is still considered as the source of the biggest part of the threats to national cultures of Europe, while the cultural domination of Hollywood is often understood as a threat to the survival of the European film industry and television. This reflects discourses on cultural and media imperialism which is this day and age are not fashionable because the current trend of globalization and the need to understand it as a possible opportunity for promotion and affirmation of different cultural identities. Hence, in practice there is a bigger use of glocalization as a new amalgam, which represents a combination of the words globally and locally, as proposed by Ronald Robertson, one of the founders of the theory and research on cultural globalization. According to him, and as explained by Anthony Giddens and Malcolm Waters, globally and locally never cancelled each other out, i.e. globalization as a process always included localization. That means that local should be understood as an aspect of global. Livening up local cultural identities in different parts of the world is also a consequence from the effects of globalization because expansion and supranational tendencies in the world processes create, at the same time, new pressures on local autonomy, expression of traditional values, cultural creations and works of national cultures and identities and their mutual representation and exchange on the global culture scene. Close contacts between members of different cultures influence the changing of values, and thus, the changes in cultural contents. This is especially true in countries in transition and with a lower degree of democracy and in the process of globalization there is a conflict of the value system. Unification of values in global culture should be understood as standardization of the generally accepted criteria on production rules and promotion of cultural artifacts, where the special values and differences of cultures, and their specific presentations through the expressional capabilities of the identifiers of cultural identities should come into play. At the same time, unification entails universalization of democratic values such as: tolerance, solidarity, respecting basic human rights, cultural identity, principles of equality, regional harmony and social cohesion.

6. CONCLUSION

Globalization is a term used to describe changes in society in economy, politics and culture in their thoroughness and collective action on the world scene. With the mere evolution of international communication, the influence of cultures and values towards one another reflects on a global level as a whole and individually in one national state. The need to communicate with other entities from the global society is a necessity that represents a collective action and remote living, and a theoretical reorganization of space and time without specifically defined geographic areas and national governments in treatment of the global aspects, conditions and problems in all spheres of the socio-political, the economic and the cultural reality. Within that scope and despite the controversial disputes on globalization in academic circles each unilateral acceptance or a unilateral rejection of it would lead to a polarization of attitudes and a reduction of the essence of this complex phenomenon which simultaneously expands and deepens, generalizes and differentiates, creates unified cultural values, but

also a lot of different cultural appearances and artifacts as affirmation and development of national, cultural identities. Glocalization as a new discourse is only trying to explain both sides of the same process - globalization - and to redefine global culture by specifying the main proposition of cultural theory. Namely, that it is absurd to think that we can understand the modern world with all its disruptions and departures without taking into account what has been said in the key words - cultural politics, cultural difference and cultural homogeneity. Globalization, at the same time, means universalism and particularism, and not Americanization, or Europeanization. Transnationalization in intercultural communication redefines cultural identity as an enrichment of its content and an addition to the universal values with characteristics and development tendencies of various cultures in the world. That is why the title of this paper has a tendency to emphasize the causative and consequential ties and mutual conditionings of both discourses, globalization and cultural identity, without opposing them in the process as completely different, and mutually separated and independent phenomena.

Endnotes

1. Milosavlevski, S., 1998:467 quoted in Siljanovska, L., Media Culture in Euro Integrative Processes, Tetovo: Arberia Design, 2007: 23
2. Globalization vs. globalism, Dnevnik, 24.04.2007
3. Giddens, E, Runaway World, Skopje: Faculty of Philosophy, 2003:71
4. Singh, (1998) quoted in Siljanovska, L., The Influence of Mass Media in the Creation of European Values in the Republic of Macedonia, Tetovo: Arberia Design, 2007: 46
5. Lorimer, R, Mass Communication, Belgrade: Clio, 1998
6. Cuche, D1996, “La notion de culture dans Les sciences socials”, Paris: La Decouverte, 1996:66.
7. Culture Rights, (group of authors), Belgrade: Belgrade Center for Human Rights, 1999:22
8. Petkovska, A., Forum, Skopje: Broadcasting Council, 2001
9. McQuail, D, Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction, third edition, London: Sage, 1994:113
10. Tomilson, J, Cultural Globalization and Cultural Imperialism in A. Mohammadie (ed) International Communication and Globalization, London: Sage, 1997:175
11. ibid: 175-180
12. ibid: 177
13. ibid:280
14. ibid: 190

References

Cuche, D,1996, La notion de culture dans Les sciences socials, La Decouverte, Paris.

Giddens, E, Runaway World, Faculty of Philosophy, Skopje

Globalization vs. Globalism, Dnevnik, 24.04.2007

Culture Rights, 1999, (group of authors), Belgrade Center for Human Rights, Belgrade

Lorimer, R, 1988, Mass Communication, Clio, Belgrade

Mc Quail,D,1994, Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction, third edition, Sage, London

Petkovska, A., 2001, Forum, Broadcasting Council, Skopje

Tomilson, J, 1997, Cultural Globalization and Cultural Imperialism in A. Mohammadie (ed) International Communication and Globalization, Sage, London

Siljanovska, L., 2007, Media Culture in Euro Integrative Processes, Arberia Design, Tetovo

Siljanovska, L., 2007, The Influence of Mass Media in the Creation of European Values in the Republic of Macedonia, Arberia Design, Tetovo