

Interaction Between ‘Global’ and ‘Local’ as Development of Brand New Forms of Sociality and Components of Glocalization Process

O A Radugina¹, L I Maslikhova², U F Boymatov³

¹VSTU, Voronezh, Russia, ² VSTU, Voronezh, Russia, ³VSTU, Voronezh, Russia

E-mail: radugina@yandex.ru

Abstract. The modern age sees the active development of globalization process. One of the most important problems in globalization studies is the interaction between ‘global’ and ‘local’ resulting in formation of brand new forms of sociality – so-called glocality. In spite of the great significance of globalization process, it has not become the subject of special analysis in social philosophy yet. The article shows that ‘globalization’ and ‘localization’ are the fundamental social processes of the contemporary world. The authors have interpreted globalization and localization based on examination of the inherent antinomy of the globalization process. This interpretation resulted in the need to use the term ‘glocalization’ and to develop the concept of glocalization in the global social process. From the perspective of dialectical methodology, the glocalization process is stepwise. At the first stage, particular locales respond to globalization challenges with countertrends. After that, countertrends coexist for some time and in some space. At the third stage, coexistence gives way to the struggle between countertrends. Then they intermingle, which results in a new quality – so-called glocality, which is characterized by conjugation of opposites. Therefore, we should not set globalization and glocalization against each other, but it is necessary to consider glocalization as a contemporary form of the development of global society.

1. Introduction

The modern age sees the active development of globalization process. It encompasses countries and continents, all areas of society and culture. This process may be metaphorically represented as the movement of a giant road roller rolling along the Earth, crushing and deforming all areas of society and culture, transforming them into new qualities and, therefore, forming a new type of social existence – the global community. Urgency of the globalization problem is determined by the great significance of this phenomenon in the life of society, by its comprehensive impact on the social environment, on the nature and direction of historical process, fortunes of nations and policy of governments, as well as by emergence of new opportunities and prospects changing the social existence of people. In this context, one of the most important problems in globalization studies is the interaction between ‘global’ and ‘local’. The global/local dichotomy sets the logical structure for the analysis of the global community genesis and provides the methodological background for explanation of contemporary social changes within the framework of globalization theory. However, in spite of its fundamental importance for globalization studies, this dichotomy has not become the subject of special analysis in social philosophy yet. Purpose of this article is to make a certain contribution in the

methodological background of globalization studies through philosophical analysis of relations between ‘global’ and ‘local’ and to represent glocalization as a contemporary form of the development of global society.

2. Materials and methods

One of the authors of the globalization concept was R. Robertson from the Princeton University. He identified two antinomic aspects in the globalization process: global institutionalization of lifeworld and localization of globality. Another author who studied globalization, which gives a reference point for interaction between nations, people, civilizations and regions, was H. Khondlker. A. Dirlit, an American historian of Turkish descent, published a number of works focused on modernity, globalization and postcolonial criticism.

In Russia, globalization is studied by D. Ivanov (philosopher) and A. Sogomonov (historian and sociologist).

Our study was based on the dialectical method (law of the unity and conflict of opposites, law of the negation of the negation) and the systemic method allowing us to understand the mechanisms of glocality formation based on the analysis of interaction between ‘global’ and ‘local’.

From the perspective of dialectical methodology, the glocalization process is stepwise. At the same time, the globalization process serves as an impetus for emergence and development of opposite processes. As we know, the main source of diversity and development according to the dialectical methodology is the dialectical contradiction. The development of global community is related to the following contradictions: globalization – localization; centralization – decentralization; universalization – particularization; homogenization – heterogenization; integrity – fragmentation; deterritorialization – regionalization; internalization – ethnic consolidation; unification, standardization – pluralization. In the scientific literature, the problem of inherent antinomy of the globalization process resulted in the need to use the term ‘glocalization’ and to develop the concept of glocalization of the global social process.

3. Discussion

R. Robertson identified two antinomic aspects in the globalization process: global institutionalization of lifeworld and localization of globality. The first aspect is interpreted by him as a way for arrangement of daily local interactions and socialization within the framework of interdependence between societies existing within nation states. The second aspect – localization of globality – reflects the tendency towards the implementation of ‘global’ through ‘local’. In this case ‘global’ is not just ‘international’, but also ‘local’ to the extent that the latter is globalized [1.]. Therefore, according to R. Robertson, the term ‘glocalization’ emphasizes two aspects of the globalization process, convergence of ‘global’ and ‘local’. In this context, ‘global’ and ‘local’ are interpreted as two dimensions of life space, where one is absolutely impossible and meaningless without the other. We believe that it is not enough to see only two Robertson’s aspects in the globalization process, since there is also the third one, which essentially means the emergence of the glocality phenomenon. Such approach to interpretation of glocality is determined by the dialectical methodology. The world as a system is arranged according to the dichotomous principle based on the interdependence between ‘global’ and ‘local’ in such a way that ‘global’ and ‘local’ initially presuppose and presume each other; in other words, ‘global’ is impossible without ‘local’ and, vice versa, ‘local’ has a tendency to turn into ‘global’. Therefore, both components of the global/local dichotomy have a mutual impact on each other. It is critical for understanding of relations between ‘global’ and ‘local’. That is why we should agree with R. Robertson who wrote that global is not opposed to local; moreover, local is essentially included in global [2]. It is more and more evident that ‘global’ in the contemporary world cannot ‘exist’ without ‘local’. Global flows come from various places, intersect and continue moving in new forms. Interdependence in the world is so high that any local event and phenomenon will be somehow globally determined and/or will have global consequences. According to A. Dirlit, each local history is a part of global ‘big picture’ [3]. Interrelatedness of the contemporary world results in the situation

where each local event may become globally known or have an impact on distant localities. And this means that in the contemporary world it is impossible to consider any local actions otherwise than within the framework of a broader set of social conditions.

According to R. Robertson and H. Khondlker, globalization sets the global circumstances, the context of interaction, where civilizations, regions, nation states, people interact and design their own history and identity [4]. We should also agree with R. Robertson when he writes that if we conceive ‘global’ as the thing that makes ‘local’ impossible, we believe that ‘global’ lies above and outside of all localities and that ‘global’ has system properties being above and outside of attributes characteristic for individual parts within the global system [5]. Without denying that the world as a whole has certain system properties of its ‘parts’ (localities), we should note that, on the other hand, these ‘parts’ are largely designed by conditions outside of them, within the global dynamics.

At the first stage, particular locales respond to globalization challenges with countertrends. After that, countertrends coexist for some time and in some space. At the third stage, coexistence gives way to the struggle between countertrends. Then they intermingle, which results in a new quality, which is characterized by conjugation of opposites. It is this quality, which is called glocality. Glocalization theorists rely on the assumption that countries, regions, cities, organizations and individuals in the contemporary world differ by the glocal criterion. According to A. Sogomonov, ‘they differ not by historical and chronological ‘development’ or ‘underdevelopment’ according to an imagined modernization scale, but by their distinctive intermingling of inclusion in global flows and observance of local cultural traditions and social norms’ [6]. Another Russian philosopher, D. Ivanov thinks that global culture as a dialectical process conceives and deciphers antinomic elements in their unity, which may be ‘represented as a formula ‘homogenous structure + heterogenous culture’ [7].

4. Findings

The term ‘glocal’ is inherently antinomic, since it combines two opposites – ‘global’ and ‘local’. It was introduced by Japanese scholars and was initially used in the field of economics to designate a new and very successful business strategy – so-called ‘global localization’ meaning adaptation of global business goals and prospects to local conditions [8]. This strategy in the form of ‘glocalization’ passed into the practice of global business and the term was adopted by other languages [9].

The problem of interaction between ‘global’ and ‘local’, in the context of loss and search for identity, is also interpreted on the basis of interaction between ‘us’ and ‘them’. The contemporary cultural process creates an artificial global context for local cultures – the diversity of forms in the unified space. The global space is filled with various identities and identical, local factors are subject to reduction and formalization. The scholars studying glocalization note that globalization results in neutralization and sometimes complete destruction of contexts. I. Yakovenko believes that the key conflict of this process is a part of opposition between ‘universal’ and ‘fundamental’: ‘The thing is that any ‘local civilization’ is experienced by its members as an integral cosmos, as a self-evident entity – natural and therefore the only possible... In other words, any local civilization is nothing more than a modus claiming to be the substance. There is a conflict with an ancient and deeply-rooted apriori attitude’ [10]. Based on this conclusion, I. Yakovenko assumes that the ‘civilizational downfall’ of entire regions and disintegration of social organisms is a natural and inevitable moment in the development of humankind. According to him, ‘in fact, areas ‘falling out’ of the civilizational evolution experience positive processes of self-destruction of structures that are stadially lagging and non-congruent with the changing global context. When these processes are completed, new structures are inevitably included in the global process’ [11]. The result of this process is that the policy of search for identity in the contemporary world is pursued through the ‘fragmentation of relevant social space, where the difference between post-modern entities is articulated according to their mutual horizontal position, i.e. glocal hierarchy: on the one hand, through inclusion in global flows (‘world of flows’), and on the other – through exclusion from them (absorption in ‘worlds of places’).’ The ‘world of flows’ and the ‘world of places’ form the ‘stable cultural cohesion and interdependence’. Any deviation at the local level inevitably results in global consequences, not to mention the inverse

correlation between local communities and global changes [12]. Glocal rearrangement of physical and social space provokes the genesis of ‘glocal ethics’ and creates conditions for formation of ‘glocal citizenship ethos’ upon the background of the morality crisis in the modern age. ‘Glocal ethics’ responds to the challenges of time and shows a new ethical matrix providing not so much as for compilation of various cultural and anthropological morality models (postmodern ‘moral pâté’) as for brand new cognitive perspective and cultural opportunity – coexistence of rational morality and real folkways’ [13]. According to U. Beck, as a result of this process, ‘on the one hand, we cannot rule out the formation of ‘global civil solidarity’ and, on the other hand, the global community not just overmasters national communities, but also creates new relations between seemingly divided worlds.’[14]. Based on this assumption we can conclude that the vertical hierarchy of cultures (according to the development level) will soon be replaced by the horizontal one, upon condition of ‘diverse variations of intermingling of global moral fundamentals and local moral roots’, where ‘global’ and ‘local’ are ‘equivalent and devoid of mutually subordinating ambitions’ [15].

5. Conclusion

Thus, the authors have analyzed various works dealing with globalization, systematized them in terms of the ‘global/local’ dichotomy, examined the works that are not reflected in the scientific base for understanding of globalization. After that, they showed the antinomy of global/local relations through the dialectics of globalization of local factors and localization of global ones. ‘Global’ cannot exist without ‘local’. The importance of ‘global’ increases in special local conditions. Most people interact with ‘global’ via so-called ‘local intermediaries’ [16]. Accordingly, the way for perception and definition of global processes and phenomena is determined by certain local conditions.

At the same time, today, ‘local’ does not exist outside of ‘global’, since any local event or phenomenon is either globally determined or have global consequences.

The authors showed that localities are not just passive participants of globalization processes – they demonstrate a broad range of various responses determined by a number of various factors. The article analyzes the transformation of ‘local’ caused by the glocalization effect in the context of globalization.

References

- [1] Robertson R 1990 A minimal phase model of globalization Featherstone M (ed.) *Global culture Nationalism, globalization and modernity*
- [2] Robertson R 1995 Glocalization: Time-Space and Gomogeneity – Heterogeneity *Global Modernities* 35
- [3] Dirlik A 1996 The Global in the Local Global/local: cultural production and the transnational imaginary *Duke University Press* 37
- [4] Robertson R, Khondlker H H 1998 Discourses of Globalization *International Sociology* vol 13(1) 30
- [5] Robertson R 1995 Glocalization: Time-Space and Gomogeneity – Heterogeneity *Global Modernities* 34
- [6] Sogomonov A Y 2001 Glocalnost Glocality: Outline of sociology of spatial awareness *Globalization and post-Soviet society* 67
- [7] Yakovenko I G 2002 Global community and local consciousness *Global community: Mapping of contemporary world* 163
- [8] Radugin A A, Boymatov U F 2001 Problematization and conceptualization of globalization as a social process of the world society *Bulletin of VSU. Series: Philosophy* 3 195
- [9] Startsev E N 2010 Glocalnost as a factor in the formation of a new civilizational reality *Bulletin of the Buryat State University Pedagogy. Philology. Philosophy* 42
- [10] Yakovenko I G 2002 Global community and local consciousness *Global community: Mapping of contemporary world* 206
- [11] Yakovenko I G 2002 Global community and local consciousness *Global community: Mapping of contemporary world* 205

- [12] Sogomonov A Y 2001 Glocalnost Glocality: Outline of sociology of spatial awareness Globalization and post-Soviet society 68
- [13] Sogomonov A Y 2001 Glocalnost Glocality: Outline of sociology of spatial awareness Globalization and post-Soviet society 70
- [14] Beck U 2001 Chto takoe globalizatsiya? What is globalization? 107
- [15] Sogomonov A Y Glocalnost Glocality: Outline of sociology of spatial awareness Globalization and post-Soviet society 72
- [16] Volkova I N 2002 Ecocycle: global and local in a stable equilibrium of nature *Global Community: Cartography of the modern world* 286