Toward a definition of globalization [An excerpt]

'Globalization' has been variously used in both popular press and academic literature to describe a process, a condition, a system, a force, and an age. Given that these competing labels have very different meanings, their indiscriminate usage is often obscure and invites confusion. For example, a sloppy conflation of process and condition encourages circular definitions that possess little explanatory power. For example, the often repeated truism that 'globalization [the process] leads to more globalization [the condition]' does not allow us to draw meaningful analytical distinctions between causes and effects.

Hence, I suggest that we use the term globality to signify a social condition characterized by the existence of global economic, political, cultural, and environmental interconnections and flows that make many of the currently existing borders and boundaries irrelevant. Yet, we should not assume that 'globality' refers to a determinate endpoint that precludes any further development. Rather, this concept points to a particular social condition that, like all conditions, is destined to give way to new, qualitatively distinct constellations. For example, it is conceivable that globality might be transformed into something we could call 'planetarity' - a new social formation brought about by the successful colonization of our solar system. Moreover, we could easily imagine different social manifestations of globality: one might be based primarily on values of individualism, competition, and laissez-faire capitalism, while another might draw on more communal and cooperative norms. These possible alternatives point to the fundamentally indeterminate character of globality.

The term globalization applies to a set of social processes that appear to transform our present social condition into one of globality... However, this does not mean that the national or the local are becoming extinct or irrelevant. In fact, the national and local are changing their character as a result of our movement towards globality. At its core, then, globalization is about shifting forms of human contact. Indeed, any affirmation of globalization implies three assertions: first, we are slowly leaving behind the condition of modern nationality that gradually unfolded from the 18th century onwards; second, that we are moving towards the new condition of postmodern globality; and, third, that we have not yet reached it. Indeed, like 'modernization' and other verbal nouns that end in the suffix '-ization', the term 'globalization' suggests a sort of dynamism best captured by the notion of 'development' or 'unfolding' along discernible patterns. Such unfolding may occur quickly or slowly, but it always corresponds to the idea of change, and, therefore, denotes transformation.

Hence, academics exploring the dynamics of globalization are particularly keen on pursuing research questions related to the theme of social change. How does globalization occur? What is driving it? Does it have one cause or is there a combination of factors? Is globalization a continuation of modernity or is it a radical break? Does it create new forms of inequality and hierarchy? Notice that the conceptualization of globalization as a dynamic process rather than as a static condition forces the researcher to pay close attention to shifting perceptions of time and space mediated by digital technology.

Finally, let as adopt global imaginary as a concept referring to peoples’ growing consciousness of global connectivity... This is not to say that national and local communal frameworks have lost their power to provide people with meaningful sense of home and identity. But it would be a mistake to close one’s eyes to the weakening of national imaginary as it has been historically constituted in the 19th and 20th centuries. The thickening of the global consciousness destabilizes and unsettles the conventional nation-state within which people imagine their communal existence...The rising global imaginary is also powerfully reflected in the current transform of the principal ideas and values that go into the articulation of concrete political agendas and programs.

To argue that globalization constitutes a set of social processes enveloped by the rising global imaginary that propels us towards the condition of globality may eliminate the danger of circular definitions, but it gives us only one defining characteristic of the process: movement towards more intense forms of connectivity and integration. But such a general definition of globalization tells us little about its remaining qualities. In order to overcome this deficiency, it behooves us to identify additional qualities that make globalization different from other sets of social processes. Yet, whenever researchers raise the level of specificity in order to bring the phenomenon in question into sharper focus, they also heighten the danger of provoking scholarly disagreements over definitions. Our subject is no exception. One of the reasons why globalization
remains a contested concept is because there exists no scholarly consensus on what kinds of social processes constitute its essence. After all, globalization is an uneven process, meaning that people living in various parts of the world are affected very differently by the gigantic transformation of social structures and cultural zones. Hence, the social processes that make up globalization have been analyzed and explained by various commentators in different, often contradictory ways. Scholars not only hold different views with regard to proper definitions of globalization, they also disagree on its scale, causation, chronology, impact, trajectories, and policy outcomes.

The ancient Buddhist parable of the blind scholars and their encounter with the elephant helps to illustrate the academic controversy over the nature and various dimensions of globalization. Since the blind scholars did not know what the elephant looked like, they resolved to obtain a mental picture, and thus the knowledge they desired, by touching the animal. Feeling its trunk, one blind man argued that the elephant was like a lively snake. Another man, rubbing along its enormous leg, likened the animal to a rough column of massive proportions. The third person took hold of its tail and insisted that the elephant resembled a large, flexible brush. The fourth man felt its sharp tusks and declared it to be like a great spear. Each of the blind scholars held firmly to his own idea of what constituted an elephant. Since their scholarly reputation was riding on the veracity of their respective findings, the blind men eventually ended up arguing over the true nature of the elephant.

The ongoing academic quarrel over which dimension contains the essence of globalization represents a postmodern version of the parable of the blind men and the elephant. Even those few remaining scholars who still think of globalization as a singular process clash with each other over which aspect of social life constitutes its primary domain. Many global studies experts argue that economic processes lie at the core of globalization. Others privilege political, cultural, or ideological aspects. Still others point to environmental processes as being the essence of globalization. Like the blind men in the parable, each globalization researcher is partly right by correctly identifying one important dimension of the phenomenon in question. However, their collective mistake lies in their dogmatic attempts to reduce such complex phenomenon as globalization to one or two domains that corresponds to their own expertise. Surely, a central task for the new field of global studies must be to devise better ways for gauging the relative importance of each dimension without losing sight of the interdependent whole.

Despite such strong differences of opinion, however, it is possible to detect some thematic overlap in various scholarly attempts to identify the essential qualities of globalization processes. Consider, for example, the following five influential definitions of globalization:

Globalization can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. (Anthony Giddens, Director of the London School of Economics)
Globalization may be thought of as a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensit – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power. (David Held, Professor of Political Science at the London School of Economics)

Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole. (Roland Robertson, Professor of Sociology at the University of Pittsburgh)

These definitions point to four additional qualities or characteristics at the core of globalization. First, it involves both the creation of new social networks and the multiplication of existing connections that cut across traditional political, economic, cultural, and geographical boundaries... Today's media combine conventional TV coverage with multiple feeds into digital devices and networks that transcend nationally based services.

The second quality of globalization is reflected in the expansion and the stretching of social relations, activities, and connections. Today's financial markets stretch around the globe, and electronic trading occurs around the clock. Gigantic and virtually identical shopping malls have emerged on all continents, catering to those consumers who can afford commodities from all regions of the world - including products whose various components were manufactured in different countries. This social stretches applies to...non-governmental organizations, commercial enterprises, social clubs, and countless regional and global institutions and associations: United Nations, the European Union, the Association of South East Asian Nations, the Organization of African Unity, Doctors Without Borders, the World Social Forum, Google, to name but a few.

Third, globalization involves the intensification and acceleration of social exchanges and activities. As the Spanish sociologist Manuel Castells has pointed out, the creation of global network society fuelled by ‘communication power’ required a technological revolution-one that has been powered chiefly by the rapid development of new information and communication technologies. Processing at breakneck speed, these innovations are reshaping the social landscape of human life. The World Wide Web relays distant information in real time, and satellites provide consumers with instant pictures or remote events. Sophisticated social networking by means of Facebook or Twitter has become a routine activity for more than a billion people around the globe. The intensification of worldwide social relations means that local happenings are shaped by events occurring far away, and vice versa. To make the point again, the seemingly opposing processes of globalization and localization actually imply each other. Rather than sitting at the base and the top of conventional geographical hierarchies, the local and global intermingle, sometimes messily, with the national and regional, in overlapping horizontal scales.

Fourth, as we emphasized in our definition of the global imaginary, globalization processes do not occur merely on an objective, material level but they also involve the subjective plane of human consciousness. Without erasing local and national attachments, the compression of the world into a single place has increasingly made global the frame of reference for human thought and action. Hence, globalization involves both the macro-structures of a ‘global community’ and the micro-structures of ‘global personhood’. It extends deep into the core of the self and its dispositions, facilitating the creation of multiple individual and collective identities nurtured by the intensifying relations between the personal and the global.

Having succinctly identified some of the core qualities of globalization, let us compress them into a single sentence that yields the following very short definition of globalization:

**Globalization refers to the expansion and intensification of social relations and consciousness across world-time and world-space.**
Defining globalization [An excerpt]

Introduction
Definition is not everything, but everything involves definition. Knowledge of globalization is substantially a function of how the word is defined. The dissection of globalization must include a careful and critical examination of the term itself. A muddled or misguided core concept compromises our overall comprehension of the problem. In contrast, a sharp and revealing definition promotes insightful, interesting and empowering knowledge, an understanding that helps us to shape our destiny in positive directions.

Notions of globalization have grabbed many an intellectual imagination over the past two decades. In academic and lay circles alike, many have pursued an intuition that this concept could provide an analytical lynchpin for understanding continuity and change in contemporary society. ‘Globalization’ is not the only (or necessarily the best) entry point for such an enquiry, of course, but it has generated a lot of provocative and sometimes highly insightful commentary on present times.

Yet what lies in this word? The present chapter develops a definition in four main steps. The first section below traces the rise of the vocabulary of globalization in academic and lay thinking. The second section identifies several analytical cul-de-sacs with respect to globalization, that is, definitions that generate redundant and in some respects also unhelpful knowledge. The third section sets out a conceptualization of globalization as the spread of transplanetary and, in present times more specifically, supraterritorial social relations. To stress that this analysis does not succumb to globalist exaggerations, the fifth section adds half a dozen key qualifications to this definition, including for example that territorial geography continues to have importance alongside the new supraterritoriality.

Rise of the g-word
Although the term ‘globalization’ was not coined until the second half of the twentieth century, it has a longer pedigree. In the English language, the noun ‘globe’ dates from the fifteenth century (derived from the Latin globus) and began to denote a spherical representation of the earth several hundred years ago (MWD, 2003; Robertson, 2001: 6254). The adjective ‘global’ entered circulation in the late seventeenth century and began to designate ‘world scale’ in the late nineteenth century, in addition to its earlier meaning of ‘spherical’ (OED, 1989: VI, 582). The verb ‘globalize’ appeared in the 1940s, together with the term ‘globalism’ (Reiser and Davies, 1944: 212, 219). The word ‘globalization’, as a process, first surfaced in the English language in 1959 and entered a dictionary two years later (Schreiter, 1997: 5; Webster, 1961: 965). Notions of ‘globality’, as a condition, began to circulate in the 1980s (Robertson, 1983).

The vocabulary of globalization has also spread in other languages over the past several decades. The many examples include the terms lil ’alam in Arabic, quanquihua in Chinese, mondialisation in French, globalizatsia in Russian, and globalización in Spanish. Among the major world languages, only Swahili has not (yet) acquired a globalization concept, and that exception is perhaps largely explained by the widespread use of English in elite circles of the African countries concerned. In minor languages, too, we now find globalisaatio in Finnish, bishwavyapikaran in Nepalese, luan bo’ot in Timorese, and so on.

When new vocabulary gains such wide currency across continents and cultures, can it just be explained away as fad? Or does the novel word highlight a significant change in the world, where new terminology is needed to discuss new conditions? For example, when Jeremy Bentham coined the word ‘international’ in the 1780s (1789: 326; Suganami, 1978), the concept caught hold because it resonated of a growing trend of his day, namely, the rise of nation-states and crossborder transactions between them. The current proliferation of global talk also seems unlikely to be accidental. The popularity of the terminology arguably reflects a widespread intuition that contemporary social relations have acquired an important new character. The challenge – indeed, the urgent need – is to move beyond the buzzword to a tight concept.

As a deliberately fashioned analytical tool, notions of the global appeared roughly simultaneously and independently in several academic fields around the early 1980s. In Sociology, for example, Roland Robertson began to ‘interpret globality’ in 1983 (Robertson, 1983). Concurrently, in Business Studies, Theodore Levitt wrote of ‘the globalization of markets’ (Levitt,
1983). These years also saw some researchers in International Relations shift their focus to ‘global interdependence’ (Rosenau, 1980). Economists, geographers and others picked up the concept later in the decade.

Since the 1990s globalization has become a major academic growth industry. The problem is now explored across disciplines, across continents, across theoretical approaches, and across the political spectrum. Countless academics have rushed to claim the cliché of the day. The number of entries for “globalization” in the United States Library of Congress multiplied from 34 in 1994 to 5,245 in 2005 (Waters, 1995; LoC, 2005). A host of research institutes, degree programmes, course modules, textbooks and websites now focus on the problem. The recent appearance of several anthologies and the preparation of the first Encyclopedia of Globalization further attest to the consolidation of a new field of enquiry (cf. Higgott and Payne, 2000; Lechner and Boli, 2000; Held and McGrew, 2003; Robertson and Scholte, 2006). Since 2000 several new professional groups have also emerged: Global Studies Associations in Britain and the USA: and a Globalization Studies Network with worldwide membership. Some theorists have even presented globalization as the focal point for an alternative paradigm of social enquiry (Shaw, 1999; Mittelman, 2002).

Yet ideas of globalization tend to remain as elusive as they are pervasive. We sense that the vocabulary means something—and something significant—but we are far from sure what that something is. Anthony Giddens has observed that ‘there are few terms that we use so frequently but which are in fact as poorly conceptualized as globalization’ (Giddens, 1996).

Persistent ambiguity and confusion over the term has fed considerable skepticism about ‘globaloney’, ‘global babble’ and ‘glob-blah-blah’. One critic has pointedly dismissed the idea of lending analytical weight to the notion of globalization as ‘folly’ (Rosenberg, 2001). True, some of these objectors have had dubious motives, such as vested interests in orthodox theory, or an intellectual laziness that resists rethinking conceptual starting points. However, other doubters have quite rightly demanded clear, precise, explicit, consistent and cogent conceptualization before they will treat globalization as a serious scholarly category.

**Redundant concepts of globalization**

Much if not most existing analysis of globalization is flawed because it is redundant, failing to generate new understanding that is not attainable with other concepts. Four main definitions have led into this cul-de-sac: globalization as internationalization; globalization as liberalization; globalization as universalization; and globalization as westernization. Arguments that build on these conceptions fail to open insights that are not available through preexistent vocabulary. Commentators who reject the novelty and transformative potential of globalization in contemporary history have almost invariably defined the term in one or several of these four redundant ways. Moreover, these conceptions can also raise political objections.

**Internationalization**

When globalization is interpreted as internationalization, the term refers to a growth of transactions and interdependence between countries. From this perspective, a more global world is one where more messages, ideas, merchandise, money, investments, pollutants and people cross borders between national-state-territorial units. For certain authors, like Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson, globalization is an especially intense form of internationalization, so that the global is a particular subset of the international (1999: 7-13). Many other analysts are less discriminating and simply regard the words ‘global’ and ‘international’ as synonyms to be used interchangeably. Most attempts to quantify globalization have conceived of the process as internationalization. Thus, for example, Dani Rodrik has measured globalization in terms of the current account as a proportion of GDP (Rodrik, 2001). Similarly, the globalization indexes developed by A.T. Kearney consultants and Foreign Policy magazine since 2001 and by the Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation since 2005 have been largely calculated with reference to amounts of cross-border activities between countries. That is, the scores mainly relate to foreign direct investment, international travel, membership in international organizations, international telephone traffic, etc. Moreover, the calculation measures and compares the indicators on a territorial basis, so that one country is said to be more, or less, globalized than another (Kearney/FP, 2001; CSGR, 2005).

Ideas of globalization-as-internationalization are attractive insofar as they entail a minimum of intellectual and political adjustments. Global relations of this kind can be examined on the same ontological and methodological grounds as
international relations. Global Economics can be the same sort of enquiry as International Economics. The study of Global Politics need not differ substantially from traditional International Politics; global culture is equivalent to international culture, and so on. Globalization-as-internationalization gives the comforting message that the new can be wholly understood in terms of the familiar.

Indeed, most accounts of globalization-as-internationalization stress that contemporary trends are replaying earlier historical scenarios. In particular, these analyses frequently note that, in proportional terms, levels of cross-border trade, direct investment and permanent migration were as great or greater in the late nineteenth century as they were a hundred years later (Hirst and Thompson, 1999; O’Rourke and Williamson, 1999). The suggestion is that globalization (read international interdependence) is a feature of the modern states-system and world economy that ebbs and flows over time. So today’s social researchers can relax and carry on enquiries as previous generations have done.

Yet these very claims of familiarity and historical repetition constitute strong grounds for rejecting the definition of globalization-as-internationalization. If globality is nothing other than internationality – except perhaps larger amounts of it – then why bother with new vocabulary? No one needed a concept of globalization to make sense of earlier experiences of greater international interaction and interdependence, and this notion is similarly redundant today. Ideas of globalization-as-internationalization can also be politically objectionable. They readily imply that world social relations are – and can only be – organized in terms of country units, state governments and national communities. As such, the vocabulary of internationality tends to ignore, marginalize and silence other modes of organization, governance and identity that exist and are highly valued by, for example, indigenous peoples, regionalists and various kinds of cosmopolitans.

**Liberalization**

A second common analytical dead-end in discussions of globalization has equated the notion with liberalization. In this case, globalization denotes a process of removing officially imposed restrictions on movements of resources between countries in order to form an ‘open’ and ‘borderless’ world economy. On this understanding, globalization occurs as authorities reduce or abolish regulatory measures like trade barriers, foreign-exchange restrictions, capital controls, and visa requirements.

Using this definition, the study of globalization is a debate about contemporary so-called ‘neoliberal’ macroeconomic policies. On one side of this argument, many academics, business executives and policymakers have supported neoliberal prescriptions that worldwide liberalization, privatization, deregulation and fiscal restraint would in time bring prosperity, freedom, peace and democracy for all. On the other side, critics in the so-called ‘anti-globalization’ movement have opposed neoliberal policies, contending that a laissez-faire world economy produces greater poverty, inequality, social conflict, cultural destruction, ecological damage and democratic deficits.

To be sure, large-scale globalization and widespread economic liberalization have frequently transpired concurrently in the past quarter-century. For example, average tariff rates for nonagricultural products have fallen to record low levels. Moreover, this wave of neoliberalism has often played a significant (albeit not necessary) facilitating role in respect of contemporary globalization. However, it is quite something else to conflate the two concepts, so that globalization and liberalization become the same thing. Moreover, such an equation can carry the dubious – and potentially harmful – political implication that neoliberalism is the only available policy framework for a more global world.

Indeed, on cross-examination most ‘anti-globalization’ protesters are seen to reject neoliberal globalization rather than globalization per se. True, some of these critics have adopted a rejectionist, mercantilist position that advocates ‘de-globalization’ to a world of autarkic regional, national or local economies. However, most opponents of neoliberalism have sought different approaches to globalization – or ‘alter-globalizations’ – that might better advance human security, social justice and democracy. Many in mainstream circles, too, have recently suggested that globalization can be rescued with social, environmental and human rights safeguards. They have thereby also acknowledged that neoliberal policies are not intrinsic to globalization.
In any case, the language of globalization is unnecessary to rehearse arguments for and against laissez-faire economics. People have debated theories and practices of ‘free’ markets for several centuries without invoking talk of globalization. For example, no one needed the concept of globalization when the international economy experienced substantial liberalization in the third quarter of the nineteenth century (Marrison, 1998). Likewise, globalization-as-liberalization opens no new insight today.

Universalization

A third cul-de-sac appears in analyses of globalization when the notion is conceived as universalization. In this case, globalization is taken to describe a process of dispersing various objects and experiences to people at all inhabited parts of the earth. On these lines, ‘global’ means ‘worldwide’ and ‘everywhere’. Hence there is a “globalization” of the Gregorian calendar, tobacco, business suits, curry dinners, bungalows, Barbie dolls, shotguns, and so on. Frequently globalization-as-universalization is assumed to entail homogenization with worldwide cultural, economic, legal and political convergence. For example, some economists have assessed globalization in terms of the degree to which prices for particular goods and services become the same across countries (Bradford and Lawrence, 2004).

Yet this third type of conception, too, opens no new and distinctive insight. To be sure, some striking worldwide diffusion has transpired in contemporary history. Moreover, substantial cultural destruction in recent times has appeared to lend credence to the homogenization thesis (although, as is elaborated later in this chapter, the dynamics of globalization are actually more complex). However, universalization is an age-old feature of world history. Indeed, Clive Gamble has written of ‘our global prehistory’, arguing that the transcontinental spread of the human species – begun a million years ago – constitutes the initial instance of globalization (1994: ix, 8-9). Various aptly named ‘world religions’ have extended across large expanses of the earth for centuries, and several of these faiths have held explicit universalistic pretensions. Transoceanic trade has distributed various goods over long distances on multiple occasions during the past millennium. No concept of globalization was devised to describe universalization in earlier times, and there is no need to create new vocabulary to analyze this old phenomenon now either.

Moreover, inasmuch as this approach carries misguided assumptions of globalization-as-homogenization, it can have unhappy political consequences. Cultural protectionists can be led to oppose globalization per se, when they are in fact only against one of its possible results. Indeed, globalization can when handled in certain ways promote cultural diversity, revival and innovation.

Westernization

A fourth common conception of globalization has defined it as westernization. As such, globalization is regarded as a particular type of universalization, one in which social structures of modernity (capitalism, industrialism, rationalism, urbanism, etc.) are spread across all of humanity, in the process destroying pre-existent cultures and local self-determination. Globalization understood in this way is often interpreted as colonization, Americanization and (in the vocabulary of the Iranian intellectual, Ale Ahmad) ‘westoxification’. For these critics, talk of globalization is a hegemonic discourse, an ideology of supposed progress that masks far-reaching destruction and subordination (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2001).

To be sure, a cogent case can be made that current large-scale globalization has resulted mainly from forces of modernity like rationalist knowledge, capitalist production, technologies of automation, and nation-states (Giddens, 1990). At the same time, early global consciousness arguably facilitated the onset of modernity, too (Robertson, 1992: 170). In turn, contemporary globalization has often inserted patterns of modern, western social relations more widely and deeply across the planet. Sometimes this westernization has involved violent impositions that could indeed warrant descriptions as imperialism. Moreover, it is true that governance institutions, firms, academics and civil society associations in Western Europe and North America have ranked among the most enthusiastic promoters of contemporary globalization.

Yet it is one thing to assert that globalization and westernization have had interconnections and quite another to equate the two developments. After all, modernity and western civilization have appeared in many other guises besides contemporary globalization. Moreover – and it is politically important to acknowledge this – globalization could in principle
take non-western directions: e.g. Buddhist globalization, Confucian globalization, Islamic globalization, or possible future postmodern globalizations. Also, it is by no means clear that globalization is intrinsically imperialist, given that there are emancipatory global social movements as well as exploitative global processes.

In any case, westernization, modernization and colonization have a much longer history than contemporary globalization. Perhaps currently prevailing forms of globality could be analyzed as a particular aspect, phase and type of modernity. On this reading, a definition of globalization would need to specify what makes global modernity distinctive. Yet in this approach, too, westernization and globalization are not coterminous.

In sum, then, much talk of globalization has been analytically redundant. The four definitions outlined above between them cover most current academic, corporate, journalistic, official and popular discussions of things global. Critics of ‘globaloney’ are right to assail the historical illiteracy that marks most claims of novelty associated with these conceptions of globalization.

Of course, this is not to suggest that debates about international interdependence, neoliberalism, universalism-versus-cultural diversity, modernity, and imperialism are unimportant. Indeed, a well-fashioned concept of globalization could shed significant light on these problems. However, it is not helpful to define globalization as – to treat it as equivalent to – internationalization, liberalization, universalization or westernization. Not only do we thereby merely rehash old knowledge, but we also lose a major opportunity to grasp – and act upon – certain key circumstances of our times.

A way forward

Fortunately, the four definitions critiqued above do not exhaust the possible definitions of globalization. Important new insight into historically relatively new conditions is available from a fifth conception. This approach identifies globalization as the spread of transplanetary – and in recent times also more particularly supraterritorial – connections between people. From this perspective, globalization involves reductions in barriers to transworld social contacts. People become more able – physically, legally, linguistically, culturally, and psychologically – to engage with each other wherever on earth they might be.

In this usage, globalization refers to a shift in the nature of social space. This conception contrasts with the other four notions of globalization discussed above, all of which presume (usually implicitly rather than explicitly) a continuity in the underlying character of social geography. To clarify this crucial point, the following pages first note the general importance of space in social relations and then elaborate on the features of transplanetary and, more specifically, supraterritorial links between persons.

To clarify the vocabulary, in the approach adopted here, the words ‘global’, ‘transplanetary’ and ‘transworld’ are treated as synonyms. They are therefore used interchangeably in the rest of this chapter. References to ‘supraterritoriality’ are made whenever that particular quality of globality comes into play.

Space

The term globality resonates of spatiality. It says something about the arena and the place of human action and experience: the where of social life. In particular, globality identifies the planet – the earth as a whole – as a field of social relations in its own right. Talk of the global indicates that people may interact not only in local, provincial, country and macro-regional realms, but also in transplanetary spaces where the earth is a single place.

Why highlight issues of space? Most social analysis takes the spatial aspect as an unexplored given. Yet geography is a defining feature of social life (cf. Lefebvre, 1974; Brenner et al., 2003). Relations between people always occur somewhere: in a place, a location, a domain, a site. No description of a social circumstance is complete without a spatial component.

Moreover, no social explanation is complete without a geographical dimension either. Space matters. To take one ready example, geographical differences mean that desert nomads and urban dwellers lead very diverse lives. Space is a core feature – as both cause and effect – of social life. On the one hand, the geographical context shapes the ways that people
formulate knowledge, relate to nature, undertake production, experience time, organize governance, construct identities, and form collectivities. Concurrently, culture, ecology, economics, history, politics and psychology also shape the spatial contours of social relations.

Given these dense interconnections, a change of spatial structure affects society as a whole. A reconfiguration of social geography is intimately interlinked with shifts in patterns of production, governance, ecology, identity, and knowledge. So a transformation of social space – like large scale globalization – is enveloped in larger dynamics of social change.

**Globality: transplanetary relations and supraterritoriality**

Globality in the conception adopted here has two qualities. The more general feature, transplanetary connectivity, has figured in human history for many centuries. The more specific characteristic, supraterritoriality, is relatively new to contemporary history. Inasmuch as the recent rise of supraterritoriality marks a striking break from the territorialist geography that came before, this trend potentially has major implications for wider social transformation.

Globality in the broader sense of transplanetary (‘across the planet’) relations refers to social links between people located at points anywhere on earth. The global field is in these cases a social space in its own right. The globe, planet earth, is not simply a collection of smaller geographical units like regions, countries and localities. It is also itself a distinct arena of social life. We can therefore distinguish between ‘international relations’ (as exchanges between countries) and ‘global relations’ (as exchanges within a planetary realm).

Of course, this more general kind of globality – transplanetary connections between people – is by no means new to the past few decades. Long-distance and intercontinental domains have had age old importance in human history. On the other hand, contemporary transplanetary links are denser than those of any previous epoch. More people, more often, and more intensely engage with the planetary arena as a single social place. Volumes of transworld associations, communications, diseases, finance, investment, travel and trade have never been as great.

However, the distinctiveness of recent globalization involves more than the quantity, frequency, scope and intensity of transplanetary social links. Qualitatively, too, much of today’s global connectivity is different. Unlike earlier times, contemporary globalization has been marked by a large-scale spread of supraterritoriality.

As the word suggests, ‘supraterritorial’ relations are social connections that substantially transcend territorial geography. They are relatively delinked from territory, that is, spatial domains that are mapped on the land surface of the earth, plus any adjoining waters and air spheres. Territorial space is plotted on the three axes of longitude, latitude and altitude. In territorial geography, place refers to locations situated on this three-dimensional grid; distance refers to the extent of territory separating territorial places; and border refers to a territorial delimitation of sections of the earth’s surface.

Yet territorial locations, territorial distances and territorial borders do not define the whole geography of today’s transplanetary flows. These global connections often also have qualities of transworld simultaneity (that is, they extend anywhere across the planet at the same time) and transworld instantaneity (that is, they move anywhere on the planet in no time). Thus, for example, on average 3,000 cups of Nescafé are reputedly drunk around the planet every second (Nescafé, 2003), and telephone links permit immediate communication across the ocean as readily as across the street. Global relations with supraterritorial features are not adequately mapped on a territorial grid.

Supraterritorial forms of globality are evident in countless facets of contemporary life. For instance, jet airplanes transport passengers and cargo across any distance on the planet within twenty-four hours. Telecommunications networks effect instantaneous links between points all over the earth, so that a call centre or data processing bureau for customers in North America may be located twelve time zones away in India. The global mass media spread messages simultaneously to transworld audiences. The US dollar and the euro are examples of money that has instantaneous transplanetary circulation. In global finance, various types of savings and investment instruments (e.g. offshore bank deposits and eurobonds) flow instantaneously in transworld domains. Ecologically, developments such as climate change, stratospheric ozone depletion, certain epidemics, and losses of biological diversity unfold simultaneously on a global scale. Ideationally, many people have a supraterritorial concept of place, for instance, when watching televised moon landings and global sports events simultaneously with hundreds of millions of other people scattered across the planet. Global human rights
While these and many more supraterritorial phenomena, current globalization has constituted more than an extension of the compression of time relative to territorial space that has unfolded over a number of past centuries. In this long-term trend, developments in transportation technology like motor ships, railways and early aircraft progressively reduced the time needed to cover a given distance over the earth’s surface. Thus, while Marco Polo took years to complete his journey across Eurasia in the thirteenth century, by 1850 a sea voyage from South East Asia to North West Europe could be completed in 59 days (PTT, 1951: 11). In the twentieth century, motorized ships and land vehicles took progressively less time again to link territorial locations. Nevertheless, such transport still required substantial time spans to cross long distances and moreover still faced substantial controls at territorial frontiers.

Whereas this older trend towards a shrinking world occurred within territorial geography, the newer spread of transworld simultaneity and instantaneity takes social relations substantially beyond territorial space. In cases of supraterritoriality, place is not territorially fixed, territorial distance is covered in no time, and territorial boundaries present no particular impediment. The difference between territorial time-space compression and the rise of supraterritoriality is qualitative and entails a deeper structural change of geography.

A number of social researchers across a range of academic disciplines have discerned this reconfiguration of space, albeit without invoking the term ‘supraterritoriality’ to describe the shift. Already half a century ago, for example, the philosopher Martin Heidegger proclaimed the advent of ‘distancelessness’ and an ‘abolition of every possibility of remoteness’ (1950: 165-6). Forty years later the geographer David Harvey discussed ‘processes that so revolutionize the objective qualities of space and time that we are forced to alter, sometimes in quite radical ways, how we represent the world to ourselves’ (1989: 240). The sociologist Manuel Castells has distinguished a ‘network society’, in which a new ‘space of flows’ exists alongside the old ‘space of places’ (1989: 348). The anthropologist Marc Augé has described an instantaneity that puts ‘any person into relation with the entire world’ (1994: 95 - check). In the field of International Relations, John Ruggie has written of a ‘nonterritorial region’ in the contemporary world (1993: 172).

Might such a geographical transformation in the longer term prove to be as epochal as the shift to territorialism was at an earlier historical juncture? After all, social relations have not always and everywhere operated with a macro spatial framework that is overridingly territorial. For instance, cultures with a metaphysical cosmology have assigned only secondary if any importance to territorial referents. In fact, a territorial grid to locate points on a map was not introduced anywhere until the second century AD, by Zhang Heng in China (Douglas, 1996: 22). Medieval people in Europe did not have a notion of territory defined by three-dimensional geometry applied to the earth’s surface (Zumthor, 1993; Hanawat and Kobialka, 2000). Images of the world showing the continents in anything like the territorial shapes that are commonly recognized today were not drawn before the late fifteenth century. It took a further two hundred years before the first maps depicting country units appeared (Campbell, 1987; Whitfield, 1994). Not until the high tide of colonialism at the end of the nineteenth century did a territorial logic dominate the construction of macro social spaces across the earth.

From then until the third quarter of the twentieth century, social spaces of a macro kind (that is, as opposed to directly perceived micro social spaces like built environments) nearly always took a territorial form. Indeed, one could say that a structure of territorialism governed social geography. In a territorialist situation, people identify their location in the world primarily in relation to territorial position. (In most cases the territorial reference points are fixed, though for nomadic groups the spots may shift.) Moreover, in territorialist social relations the length of territorial distances between places and the presence or absence of territorial (especially state) borders between places heavily influences the frequency and significance of contacts that people at different territorial sites have with each other.

However, like any social structure, territorialism as the prevailing mode of geography was specific to a particular historical and cultural context. True, many people today still use the terms ‘geography’ and ‘territory’ interchangeably, as if to exclude the possibility that social space could have other than territorial forms. Yet world geography today is in an important respect not like that of the period to the mid-twentieth century. Following several decades of proliferating and expanding supraterritorial connections, territoriality has lost its monopoly hold. Territorial domains remain very important, but they no longer define the entire macro spatial framework.
Most of the rise of supraterritoriality is recent. As with any development, longer-term antecedents can of course be found. However, supraterritorial connectivity has reached by far its greatest extents during the past half-century. Earlier periods did not know jet travel, intercontinental missiles, transworld migrants with transborder remittances, satellite communications, facsimiles, the Internet, instant transplanetary television broadcasts, intercontinental production chains, transworld retailers, global credit cards, a continuous diet of global sports tournaments, or largescale transplanetary anthropogenic ecological changes. Contemporary history is supraterritorial to degrees well beyond anything previously known.

True, enthusiasm at discovering something new – a significant reconfiguration of social geography – must not prompt overstatements of its extent. Globalization in the more specific sense of the spread of supraterritoriality has been less extensive than globalization in the more general sense of the growth of transplanetary connections. The supraterritorial aspects of contemporary globalization have far-reaching transformative potentials, but they constitute only part of the larger trend, and assessments of currently unfolding social change need to be correspondingly tempered.

*Global, world, international and transnational*

Further clarification of the idea of globality that is suggested here may be obtained by comparing the term with cognate concepts such as ‘world’, ‘international’ and ‘transnational’ links. All of these words put the spotlight on social relations beyond society conceived on nation/state/country lines. However, the four notions imply different emphases and should not be conflated.

At first glance, ‘world’ might seem synonymous with ‘global’, since in contemporary modern society ‘the world’ is generally conceived as planet earth. Indeed, the present analysis invokes ‘transworld’ as a synonym for ‘transplanetary’. However, people in other eras and cultures have identified their ‘world’ in non-global ways. For example, the ancient Chinese mapped their ‘world’ in terms of a Middle Kingdom surrounded by peripheries of barbarians. Other ancient civilizations unfolded in a Mediterranean ‘world’. Medieval Europeans conceived of the ‘world’ in terms of relations between humanity, nature and God. Hence ‘world’ refers to the spatial totality that prevails in a given context. Globality (in the sense of connectivity across the planetary realm) has featured in some social ‘worlds’ throughout history, but far from all.

Moreover, the contemporary world has multiple spatial dimensions in addition to the global. World social relations today have regional, country, local, household and other geographical aspects alongside the transplanetary facets. Thus ‘world’ is the social-geographical whole, while ‘global’ is only one of its spatial qualities.

The distinction between ‘global’ and ‘international’ has been stressed already, but it bears reiteration. ‘International’ exchanges occur between country units, while ‘global’ transactions occur within a planetary unit. Whereas international relations are inter-territorial relations, global relations are trans- and sometimes supra-territorial relations. Thus global economics is different from international economics, global politics is different from international politics, and so on.

Finally, a number of researchers have since the 1970s adopted a discourse of ‘transnational’ relations to analyze social interchange beyond the state and national society (Merle 1974; Keohane and Nye, 1977). This conception has the merit of highlighting non-governmental relations between countries and non-national forms of social bonds (e.g. transnational religious and class solidarities). However, ideas of transnationalism offer less when it comes to elaborating a more specific conception of the character of these non-statist and non-nationalist circumstances. In contrast, notions of global relations positively identify the transplanetary and supraterritorial qualities of various social relations.

Another objection to the vocabulary of transnationality is that it still takes the nation-state-country as its reference point and to that extent retains traces of methodological nationalism and statism. Indeed, transnational relations are usually conceived as transactions across state borders. On the other hand, ideas of globality avoid domestic/foreign, internal/external dichotomies and thereby foster a clear and important methodological reorientation.

*Manifestations of globality*

The character and scale of globalization as the spread of transplanetary connections – including many (mainly recent) links that have a supraterritorial quality – may be further clarified with a survey of transworld activities. Such a review indicates
that globality can touch pretty well all aspects of social life. That said, as the final section of this chapter emphasizes, it does not follow that global relations have become anything close to the only feature of social geography, either today or in the foreseeable future.

A great deal of globality is manifested through communications, that is, exchanges of ideas, information, images, signals, sounds and text. Transworld communication can be effected by means of the book trade, postal services, telegraph, telephone, facsimile, telex, text messaging, videoconference, computer networks, newspaper, magazine, radio, television, video and film. Supraterritoriality comes into global communications when, for example, certain publications (like Harry Potter books) and recordings (like Eminem CDs) are released simultaneously across the planet. In addition, satellite broadcasts and transoceanic cables enable communication to be effected instantaneously between any points on earth, irrespective of the territorial distances and territorial borders that lie between them. Toll-free 1-800 numbers can link up to a call centre on any continent.

The Internet is supraterritorial communication par excellence, instantly relaying a full range of visual and auditory signals anywhere on the planet that terminals exist to send and receive them. Much of today’s globality is an „e-world“ of e-commerce, e-friendship, e-government, and e-mail. Indeed, in September 2001 the Internet allowed doctors in New York, USA to perform transoceanic robot-assisted telesurgery on a patient in Strasbourg, France (Pogue, 2001). The notion that the Internet involves new kinds of social geography is conveyed by the term ‘cyberspace’.

Other globality occurs in the transplanetary movement of people. Global travel is undertaken by many migrant labourers, professionals, pilgrims, refugees, tourists, adventurers, adopted children and more. Relevant modes of transworld transport include caravans, ships, trains, motor vehicles and aeroplanes. Jet aircraft in particular have introduced something approaching a supraterritorial quality into contemporary global travel, as passengers can be flown between any two locations on the earth within a day. Transworld travel enables the occurrence of large global convocations like the haj, professional congresses, tourist resorts, trade fairs, and United Nations (UN) summits. Transplanetary movements of domestics and sex workers have brought globalization into many a household and brothel (Ehrenreich and Hochschild, 2002). Some business travellers have the globe as their office, working from hotels and airport lounges as much as a fixed home base. Conflicts in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Somalia have generated global waves of refugees and asylum seekers. Although state border controls restrict global travel in many cases, millions upon millions of people each year move about the planet as a single place.

Even when people are not travelling, they may be globally connected through organizations, that is, associations that coordinate the activities of individuals spread across the planet. Many of these organizations pursue mainly commercial purposes as global companies (often imprecisely named ‘multinational corporations’). Examples include Inter Press Service, Mitsubishi, Nokia, Novartis, Standard Chartered, and Royal Dutch/Shell. In addition, many businesses have developed various types of transworld coalitions, often termed ‘strategic alliances’ (for instance, joint ventures, subcontracting arrangements, franchises, and so on). Other transworld organizations have mainly regulatory functions and can suitably be called global governance institutions. For instance, activities of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) extend across the planet. Some regionally, nationally and locally based governance bodies like the European Union (EU), the United States government and the Hong Kong municipal authorities also have significant global reach. Along with commercial and governance agencies, many civil society associations also have a global organization. They include faith-based groups like the World Fellowship of Buddhists, labour movements like the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), NGOs like Amnesty International, peasant coalitions like Via Campesina, and philanthropic bodies like the Ford Foundation. In addition, many localized civil society associations organize globally through coalitions and other networks. For example, the global Oxfam network encompassed nearly 3,000 local associations in some 80 countries in 2000 (Hajnal, 2002: 57, 60). Still other global organizations involve clandestine operations like transworld criminal networks (Berdal and Serrano, 2002).

Some global companies also undertake transworld production. In so-called ‘global factories’ (Fuentes and Ehrenreich, 1983) or ‘global commodity chains’ (Gereffi, 1994), different stages of the production of a commodity are sited at several (perhaps very widely scattered) locations on the planet. Thus, in principle, the research centre, design unit, procurement office, fabrication plant, finishing point, assembly line, quality control operation, data processing office, advertising bureau and after-sales service could each be situated in different provinces, countries and regions across the planet. Global production involves intra-firm trade within a transworld company as well as, if not more than, inter-national trade between
countries. Through so-called ‘global sourcing’, a producer draws the required inputs from a transplanetary field, rather than being restricted to a particular country or region. Differences in local costs of labour, raw materials, regulation and taxation often figure more importantly in these business calculations than the costs of transport across distance and borders between the various sites in the global production chain. This type of manufacture has developed especially in respect of textiles, clothing, motor vehicles, leather goods, sports articles, toys, optical products, consumer electronics, semiconductors, aircraft and construction equipment. A global production process has supraterritorial qualities inasmuch as it occurs simultaneously and with tight coordination across a transworld space.

Globality can be manifested in consumption as well as production. Many commodities are distributed and sold through global markets, sometimes through a tightly coordinated supraterritorial business strategy. In this way consumers dispersed across the planet purchase the same good or service, often under a single brand name like Nike, Pepsi-Cola or Toyota. Already in the 1980s, Howard Perlmutter of the Wharton Business School identified 136 industries where a global marketing strategy had supposedly become vital to commercial success (Main, 1989: 55). The vast range of global products has come to include many raw materials, packaged foods, bottled beverages, cigarettes, designer clothes, household articles and appliances, pharmaceuticals, music recordings, audio-visual productions, printed publications, online information services, financial instruments, office equipment, armaments, transport vehicles, travel services and more. Citicorp has proclaimed itself to be „your global bank“, and Peter Stuyvesant has marketed itself as „the global cigarette“. Transworld products have come to figure in the everyday lives of much of humanity, whether through actual purchases or through unfulfilled desires evoked by global advertising.

Global communications, global travel, global production and global markets have all promoted, and been facilitated by, global money. That is, some units of account, means of payment, stores of value and mediums of exchange have transplanetary circulation. For example, the ‘US’ dollar, the ‘Japanese’ yen, the ‘British’ pound and other major denominations are much more than national currencies. As supraterritorial monies, they are used anywhere on earth at the same time and move (electronically and via air transport) anywhere on earth in effectively no time. In addition, the Special Drawing Right (SDR) and the euro have emerged through the IMF and the EU, respectively, as suprastate monies with transworld circulation. Many bankcards can extract cash in local currency from the 900,000 automated teller machines (ATMs) in over 120 countries that are today connected to supraterritorial networks like Maestro and Cirrus (MasterCard, 2003). Several credit cards like Visa, MasterCard and American Express can be used for payments at countless establishments in almost every country across the planet. Although not yet in wide usage, digital money can be stored can be stored on certain smart cards (so-called electronic purses) in multiple currencies at once, creating something of a global wallet.

Globality also appears in many areas of finance. For instance, most foreign exchange transactions today take place through a round-the-globe, round-the-clock market that connects the dealing rooms of New York, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore, Hong Kong, Zürich, Frankfurt and London. In global banking, depositors place their savings in a global currency and/or at a global bank and/or at a global branch location such as a so-called ‘offshore’ financial centre. These practices contrast with territorial banking, in which clients deposit their savings in their national currency at a local or national bank within their country of residence. With transworld payments, migrant workers use global banking networks to remit some of their earnings to relations at another corner of the planet. Meanwhile global bank loans occur when a lender (or syndicate of lenders, perhaps spread across several countries) provides credit in a global currency. Thus, for example, a group of banks based in Austria, the Netherlands and the UK might issue a loan in US dollars to a borrower in the Dominican Republic. The level of interest on such a credit is generally not the prevailing national percentage, but a function of a supraterritorial benchmark like the London InterBank Offered Rate (LIBOR). At the same time, micro-credit schemes in local communities can be linked to global programmes. Similarly, global bonds (often called ‘eurobonds’) involve a transworld currency as well as borrowers, investors, a syndicate of managers, and securities exchanges that are spread across multiple countries. Global financial transactions also occur on similar lines in respect of medium-term notes and short-term credit instruments like treasury bills and commercial paper. In equity markets, meanwhile, global shares are company stocks that are: (a) listed on several securities exchanges across the earth; and/or (b) held by investors spread across the planet. For their part derivatives have a global character when, for example, the same futures contract is traded simultaneously on the Chicago, Singapore and London markets, as well as through electronic links between them. Insurance policies, too, can have global coverage in a global currency and/or are handled by global companies in global financial centres. In addition, many private and institutional investors maintain global portfolios. That is, they spread their funds across banks, stocks, bonds, money-market tools, derivatives contracts and insurance policies from around the globe. Indeed, with supraterritorial dealing, a
broker can buy and sell financial instruments anywhere on the planet instantaneously with a telephone call or the click of a mouse. Several major financial markets like the National Association of Securities Dealers Automated Quotation system (Nasdaq) have no fixed territorial meeting place at all. In sum, then, much of today’s foreign exchange, banking, securities, derivatives and insurance business occurs with considerable delinkage from territorial space.

Globality is further manifested in some military activities. Contemporary arsenals include a number of global weapons that can range across pretty well any distance over the earth. Examples include spy satellites, long-range bomber and surveillance aircraft, and unpiolated intercontinental missiles. Global warfare occurs when a campaign of armed combat is pursued from widely spread points across the planet. For instance, although the battlefields lay in Iraq, the 2003 war against Saddam Hussein’s Ba’ath regime involved command headquarters in the USA and Qatar, air bases in Europe and Kuwait, troops and arms from several continents, and satellites in outer space. Likewise, the British military had a global presence with troops in over 80 countries as of 2002 (FT, 12 July 2002). So-called ‘rapid reaction forces’ can be deployed anywhere on the planet within hours. UN peacekeeping operations involve multinational armies deployed anywhere on earth. Certain paramilitary groups like Al-Qaida and the Irish Republican Army (IRA) have also operated as transworld networks. The attacks of 11 September 2001 brought home as never before the potential impact of informal global armies using global communications and global finance.

Ecologically, a planetary life-support system has of course operated from the moment that the first organisms appeared on earth. However, some matters of social ecology can also have global qualities. Several major anthropogenic (i.e. human-induced) environmental changes have had a pronounced transworld dimension. For example, the anthropogenic greenhouse effect is allegedly producing planetary climate change, popularly known as ‘global warming’. Neither the causes nor the effects of this trend can be territorially specified and restricted. Similarly, stratospheric ozone depletion (and its reversal) is effectively a distanceless and borderless process. With respect to the biosphere, the contemporary global world is experiencing major reductions in the diversity of ecosystems, in the number of species of life, and in the variety of genes that circulate within individual species. In contemporary genetic engineering, recombinant DNA techniques allow a gene to be taken from one organism anywhere on earth and put in second at any other location. Another headline global ecological issue asks how many people the planet can support at one time. Further environmental conditions with global aspects include radioactive fallout, flows of sulphur dioxide and nitrogen oxide (so-called ‘acid rain’), the depletion of tropical moist forests, desertification, changes in sea level, marine pollution, management of ocean fish stocks, big dams, possible future shortages of fresh water and arable soil, and waste disposal in outer space. Although the severity of these various ecological problems can be debated, it is clear that none of them is confined to a particular country or region.

Sometimes closely related with ecological concerns, a number of health matters, too, have global dimensions (WHO, 2001; Pirages, 2006). Since prehistory natural forces of waters and winds have transported microorganisms across the planet. In addition, people have for many centuries carried a number of communicable diseases across and between continents, including plague, small pox, anthrax, cholera, syphilis, measles, tuberculosis and influenza. Contemporary times have raised the speed and magnitude of global spreads of various human, animal and plant diseases. Examples include HIV/AIDS, SARS, BSE, foot and mouth disease, and gemini viruses. For viruses and bacteria, the planet is one microbial pool in which pathogens don’t carry passports. Other questions of human health with clear transplanetary aspects include those related to diet, drug use, occupational conditions, and tobacco consumption. Needless to say, successful strategies to address these issues also require a partly global approach.

Much globality is also found in the area of law. Countless formal rules and regulations have acquired a transworld character. The widely diverse examples include various arms control schemes, criminal laws, environmental agreements, human rights conventions, technical standards, and trade rules. In addition, some law firms have developed transworld networks of offices, while police forces have pursued transplanetary cooperation through the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol). Global suprastate courts include the International Court of Justice (ICJ), ad hoc war crimes tribunals, and the recently established International Criminal Court (ICC). In addition, some national courts hear cases that relate to transworld issues, such as various global intellectual property claims that are brought before US tribunals.
Finally, globality is evident in social relations through global consciousness. In other words, people often think globally. In addition to holding microcosmic conceptions of the social realm as a district or a country, people can also hold macrocosmic notions, where the planet is regarded as a "global village". Globally minded people regard the planet as a principal source of their food supplies, their entertainments, their threats and their friends. Some workers like Ghanian traders and Filipina domestics see the whole earth (as opposed to a particular locality or country) as their potential workplace. Transworld consciousness also takes form in certain languages (e.g. English, Esperanto and Spanish), certain icons (e.g. Coca-Cola labels and world heritage sites), certain narratives (e.g. soap operas), certain fashions (e.g. blue jeans), certain rituals (e.g. sending postcards) and other symbols. Awareness of the planet as a single social place is furthermore evident in events like global sports competitions (including global supporters clubs), global exhibitions, global film festivals, global tours by music superstars, global conferences, and global panics. In addition, global consciousness arises when people conceive of their social affiliations in transplanetary, supraterritorial terms, for instance, with transworld solidarities based on class, gender, generation, profession, race, religion, sexuality and indeed humanity as such. Stories of aliens from outer space seem telling in this regard: the foreign other is conceived not as another nationality from another territory, but as another being from another planet, thereby defining humanity and the earth as one.

The preceding survey of the many instances of globality demonstrates the widespread incidence of transplanetary – including more particularly supraterritorial – circumstances across contemporary social life. Cumulatively, all of this global communication, global travel, global organization, global production, global consumption, global money, global finance, global military, global ecology, global health, global law and global consciousness indicates that contemporary social relations cannot be described without extensive reference to transworld spaces.

**Conclusion**

This chapter argues that, when defined in a particular geographical fashion, notions of 'globality' and "globalization" can be valuable additions to the conceptual toolkit for understanding social relations. Yes, much globe-talk of recent years has revealed nothing new. And yes, loose thinking and careless politics has devalued many ideas of 'globalization'. However, these shortcomings do not discredit the concept in every form. After all, widespread sloppy usage of other key ideas – 'class', 'democracy', 'rationality' and 'soul', to name but a few – has not been reason to discard these notions altogether.

On the contrary, a definition of globalization as a respatialization of social life opens up new knowledge and engages key policy challenges of current history in a constructively critical manner. Notions of "globality" and "globalization" can capture, as no other vocabulary, the present ongoing large-scale growth of transplanetary – and often also supraterritorial – connectivity. Such an insight offers a highly promising entry point for research and action on contemporary history.

To reiterate, this conception of globalization has a distinctive focus. It is different from ideas of internationalization, liberalization, universalization and westernization. The trans-territorial connections of globality are different from the inter-territorial connections of internationality. The transborder transactions of globality are different from the open-border transactions of liberalization. The transplanetary simultaneity and instantaneity of supraterritoriality is different from the worldwideness of universality. The geographical focus of globality is different from the cultural focus of western modernity. Although globalization as defined here has some overlap with, and connections to, internationalization, liberalization, universalization and westernization, it is not equivalent to any of these older concepts and trends.

Of course, the conception of globalization elaborated in this chapter is in no way intended to be the last word about what the term might mean. As stressed earlier, no definition is definitive. The aim is not to issue a final pronouncement, but to offer ever-provisional ideas that provoke further reflection and debate.
Facets of Globalization [An Excerpt]

Increasing global connections promote intensified flows of ideas, goods, and people worldwide. The variety of such flows produces increasingly complex societies in which trends of global significance may override local experiences.

The spread of ideas, technologies, crime, and diseases. Most materially poor countries wish to modernize to catch up with the materially wealthy countries. Technology transfer through improved communications and transportation is basic to such progress. The forces that ease the flow of modernizing technology, however, also facilitate terrorism, together with drug, armament, and slave trafficking and the spread of HIV/AIDS and other diseases.

Flows of goods and services. Trade in raw materials, food products, manufactured goods, and services increased rapidly in the amount and speed of transactions in the late 1900’s. Space-time compression in transportation and communications enhanced the central control of economic activities both goods and services. Supermarket foods, clothing, electronic products, and vehicles come from an increasing number of countries, often marketed by multinational corporations of U.S., Asian, or European origin.

Human mobility. Millions of people displaced by warfare and oppression gather in refugee camps or become asylum seekers in foreign countries. Executives of multinational companies “commute” worldwide. Wealthy people vacation at exotic places. Materially wealthier countries attract those willing to work for low wages, while their better-paying jobs attract people with good education. Such workers from materially poorer countries often send part of their relatives at home. However, this migration also produces a brain and skills drain because of the loss of potential leaders and skilled workers.

Shifts in dominant ideologies, especially religious or political beliefs. The increasing openness of the Chinese economy from the late 1970’s and the breakup of the Soviet Union in1991 significantly diminished the global influence of communism. Military dictators in other countries also fell from power. Their centrally controlled governments were inward-looking and resistant to external influences. Through the 1990’s, democratic ideas spread and more countries had open elections. More were increasingly involved in international affairs. Furthermore, religious and other cultural forces such as language and tradition became as significant as political dependence, particularly in many materially poor countries and those in economic transition from centrally controlled governments and economies.

The access to and availability of images and messages through the media of TV, film, the Internet, and print. In the entertainment industry, worldwide screening of U.S. movies and TV programs may disseminate images of the Western “good life.” Increasingly, however, challenges to Western dominance come from the film industries of India and other countries such as Egypt and South Korea. The Internet and access to the World Wide Web enable international and local firms, political groups, and leisure interests to have exposure outside the control of individual countries. Print media (newspapers, magazines, and books) are increasingly controlled by international consortia.

Uncontrollable negatives. The global spread of ideas, communication, faster transportation, and the resultant lower levels of control by countries leads to an expansion of arms, drugs, and people trafficking that have huge financial rewards, encourage and fund terrorist activities, and take advantage of complex and changeable routes to market.

Measuring Globalization

A globalization index provides a measure of the degree to which a country is involved in global forces. One approach ranks countries by four groups of data sets:

Political engagement indicators, including membership in international organizations to United Nations Security Council missions, ratification of multinational and international treaties, and government transfer (payments and receipts).
Technology measures, such as the number of Internet users, Internet hosts, and secure servers for encrypted transactions.
Personal contact indicators, such as international travel and tourism, international telephone traffic, cross-border nongovernmental remittances, and personal transfer (including from workers abroad).
Economic integration measures, such as trade flows, portfolio capital flows, foreign direct investments, and investment income.

Of the top 20 “globalized” countries, 13 are in Europe, accompanied by Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, and Jordan. Hong Kong, which is a special autonomous region of The People’s Republic of China, is also ranked in the top 20. The United States’ rank was raised by its dominance of technology, but was held back by a low level trade proportional to overall output, few remittances from abroad and poor implementation of international treaties. The top ranking of Singapore highlights the absence of any countries from Africa, East and South Asia, or Latin America, in the top 20. The top 20 countries have major involvement in the economic, personal contact, and technology groups as well as the political, while the lowest ranking 10 countries have little outside the political involvement. There are also detected strong links between globalization rank, longer life expectancies, and better lives for women.