GLOBALIZATION is a contested concept. 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. Many people still have trouble recognizing globalization for what it is. ‘Globalization’ has been variously used in both the popular press and academic literature to describe a process, a condition, a system, a force, and an age. A sloppy conflation of process and condition encourages circular definitions that explain little. 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.

GLOBALIZATION is an uneven process. People living in various parts of the world are affected very differently by this gigantic transformation of social structures and cultural zones. 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. 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.

GLOBALITY signifies a social condition characterized by tight global economic, political, cultural, and environmental interconnections and flows that make most of the currently existing borders and boundaries irrelevant. Globality is not yet upon us;
it only signifies a future social condition that, like all conditions, is destined to give
way to new constellations. Globality might eventually be transformed into something
we might call ‘planetarity’—a new social condition brought about by the successful
colonization of our solar system. Globality may have different social manifestations:
(1) one that is based primarily on values of individualism, competition, and laissez-
faire capitalism, or (2) one that is drawn on more communal and cooperative norms.

4. **GLOBALIZATION** is about shifting forms of human contact. Indeed, any affirmation
of globalization implies three assertions: (1) that we are slowly leaving behind the
condition of modern nationality that gradually unfolded from the 18th century
onwards; (2) that we are moving towards the new condition of postmodern globality;
and, (3) that we have not yet reached it (globality).

5. **GLOBAL IMAGINARY** is a concept referring to people’s growing consciousness of
global connectivity. The thickening of the global consciousness destabilizes and
unsettles the conventional nation state within which people imagine their communal
existence.

6. **GLOBALIZATION** constitutes a set of social processes enveloped by the rising
global imaginary that propel us towards the condition of globality. Some influential
definitions of globalization are as follows:

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, Former 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 extensity, intensity, velocity and impact—
generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and
the exercise of power. (David Held, Professor of Politics and International Relations,
Durham University)

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,
Emeritus Professor of Sociology, University of Aberdeen, Scotland)

7. **GLOBALIZATION** has four additional characteristics drawn from the above-cited
definitions: (1) 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; (2) it reflects the *expansion* and the *stretching*
of social relations, activities, and connections; (3) it involves the *intensification* and
*acceleration* of social exchanges and activities; and, (4) it involves the subjective
plane of human consciousness, that is, the frame of reference for human
thought and action has increasingly been made global; hence, 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.

8. **A SINGLE-SENTENCE** definition of globalization may be:

GLOBALIZATION refers to the expansion and intensification of social relations and consciousness across world-time and world-space.

9. **DIFFERENCES** of opinions among thinkers have resulted to the following **PERSPECTIVES** of globalization: (1) globalization as transplanetary-suprateritorial social connections; (2) globalization as internationalization; (3) globalization as liberalization; (4) globalization as universalization; and, (5) globalization as westernization.

As spread of TRANSPLANETARY-SUPRATERRITORIAL social connections, 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. Transplanetary (‘across the planet’) relations refers to social links between people located at points anywhere on earth. Transplanetary argues that globality identifies the planet – the earth as a whole – as a field of social relations, that is, the earth is treated as a single social space. We can therefore distinguish between ‘international relations’ (as exchanges between countries) and ‘global relations’ (as exchanges within a planetary realm). Meanwhile, ‘suprateritorial’ relations are social connections that substantially transcend territorial geography. Transplanetary-suprateritorial connections often 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 and telephone links permit immediate communication across the ocean as readily as across the street. In this sense, more and more suprateritorial social relations occur despite established territorial-state boundaries and despite long-distance gaps separating territories.

As INTERNALIZATION, globalization refers to a growth of transactions and interdependence between countries; that is, a more global world is one where more global messages, ideas, merchandise, money, investments, pollutants and people cross borders between national-state-territorial units. Globalization-as-internalization readily implies 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.

As LIBERALIZATION, 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. To be sure, large-scale globalization and widespread economic liberalization have frequently transpired concurrently in the past quarter-century. Globalization-as-liberalization results to a political implication that neoliberalism is the only available policy framework for a more global world. Of course, anti-neoliberal globalists contend that there might be better ways of advancing human security, social justice and democracy. In many mainstream circles, for example, they suggest that globalization can be rescued with social, environmental and human rights safeguards.

As UNIVERSALIZATION, 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. Globalization-as-universalization is assumed to entail homogenization with worldwide cultural, economic, legal and political convergence. 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. But globalization, when handled in certain ways, can promote cultural diversity, revival and innovation.

As WESTERNIZATION, 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 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. 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. On the other hand, it could be argued that globalization may actually take non-western directions: e.g. Buddhist globalization, Confucian globalization, Islamic globalization, or possible future postmodern globalizations.

10. IDEOLOGIES OF GLOBALIZATION: Global Imaginary to GLOBALISMS

IDEOLOGIES are powerful systems of widely shared ideas and patterned beliefs that are accepted as truth by significant groups in society. Serving as political mental maps, they offer people a more or less coherent picture of the world not only as it is, but also as it ought to be. In doing so, ideologies help organize the tremendous complexity of the human experiences into fairly simple claims that serve as guide and compass for social and political action.

11. GLOBALISMS are ideologies that endow the concept of globalization with particular values and meaning. Three types of globalism compete for adherents around the globe: (1) Market globalism seeks to endow ‘globalization’ with free-market norms and neoliberal meanings; (2) Justice globalism [from the political Left] constructs an alternative vision of globalization based on egalitarian ideals of global solidarity and distributive justice; and, (3) religious globalisms [from the political Right]
struggle against both market globalism and justice globalism as they seek to mobilize a religious community imagined in global terms in defense of religious values and beliefs that are thought to be under severe attack by the forces of secularism and consumerism.

12. **GLOBALISMS** articulate and translate the rising global imaginary—a background understanding of community and belonging increasingly tied to the global—into concrete political programs and agendas. The two challengers of market globalism are described as **ALTER-GLOBALIZATIONS**—subscribing to alternative visions of an integrated world that resist neoliberal projections of universal free-market principles. **ANTI-GLOBALIZATIONS** may refer to national populists and economic protectionists. Economic nationalism, for example, holds the view that the economy should be designed in ways that serve narrow national interests, not international or global interests. Patrick Buchanan, an economic nationalist, for example, accuses ‘globalist advocates of multiculturalism’ of opening the doors to millions of immigrants who are allegedly responsible for the economic and moral decline of the United States.

13. **MARKET GLOBALISM** is without question the dominant ideology of our time. Since the 1990s, it has been codified and disseminated worldwide by global power elites that include corporate managers, executives of large transnational corporations, corporate lobbyists, influential journalists and public-relations specialists, intellectuals writing for a large public audience, celebrities and top entertainers, state bureaucrats, and politicians. Given that the exchange of commodities constitutes the core activity of all societies, the market-oriented discourse of globalization itself has turned into an extremely important commodity destined for public consumption. *Business Week*, *The Economist*, *Forbes*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the *Financial Times* are among the most powerful of dozens of magazines, journals, newspapers, and electronic media published globally that feed their readers a steady diet of marketglobalist claims.

14. **GLOBALIZATION & HISTORY.** How does globalization proceed? 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? Is globalization a new phenomenon? Does it create new forms of inequality and hierarchy? What does a proper chronology and historical periodization of globalization look like?

15. **GLOBALIZATION**—the global expansion of social relations and the rise of the global imaginary are gradual processes with deep historical roots. Now, as to what
point in time should we start the story of globalization depends upon how far we are willing to extend the web of causation that resulted in those recent technologies and social arrangements that most people have come to associate with our buzzword. To capture the contemporary uniqueness of globalization, some scholars consciously limit the historical scope of globalization to the post-1989. Others extend this timeframe to include the ground-breaking developments of the last two centuries. Still others argue that globalization represents the continuation and extension of complex processes that began with the emergence of modernity and the capitalist world system in the 1500s. And a few remaining researchers refuse to confine globalization to time periods measured in mere decades or centuries. Rather, they suggest that these processes have been unfolding for millennia.

16. There may be FIVE HISTORICAL PERIODS (separated from each other by significant accelerations in the pace of social exchanges as well as a widening of their geographical scope) that could outline the development of globalization throughout the ages: (1) prehistoric period; (2) premodern period; (3) early modern period; (4) modern period; and, (5) contemporary period.

Prehistoric period (10,000 BCE–3500 BCE). Twelve thousand (12,000) years ago, small bands of hunters and gatherers reached the southern tip of South America. This event marked the end of the long process of settling all five continents that was begun by our hominid African ancestors more than one million years ago. Agriculture gradually developed and this resulted to founding of permanent settlements and surplus of food supply. Nomads became settled tribes, chiefdoms, and small independent states based on agricultural food production. Globalization in the prehistoric period was severely limited. Advanced forms of technology capable of overcoming existing geographical and social obstacles were largely absent; thus, enduring long-distance interactions never materialized. It was only toward the end of this epoch that centrally administered forms of agriculture, religion, bureaucracy, and warfare slowly emerged as the key agents of intensifying modes of social exchange that would involve a growing number of societies in many regions of the world. A way of characterizing the dynamic of this earliest phase of globalization would be to call it ‘divergence’—people and social connections stemming from a single origin but moving and diversifying greatly over time and space.

Premodern period (3500 BCE–1500 CE). Marking the close of the prehistoric period, the inventions of writing (in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and in central China) and wheel (Southwest Asia) amounted to one of those technological and social boosts that moved globalization to a new level. The wheel spurred crucial infrastructural innovations such as animal-drawn carts and permanent roads that allowed for the faster and more efficient transportation of people and goods. In addition to the spread of ideas and inventions, writing greatly facilitated the coordination of complex social activities and thus encouraged large state formations. The later premodern period was the age of empires. As some states succeeded in establishing permanent rule over other states, the resulting vast territorial accumulations
formed the basis of the Egyptian Kingdoms, the Persian Empire, the Macedonian Empire, the American Empires of the Aztecs and the Incas, the Roman Empire, the Indian Empires, the Byzantine Empire, the Islamic Caliphates, the Holy Roman Empire, the African Empires of Ghana, Mali, and Songhay, and the Ottoman Empire. All of these empires fostered the multiplication and extension of long-distance communication and the exchange of culture, technology, commodities, and diseases. Of these empires, China was the most enduring and technologically advanced. An extensive trade route—the Silk Road—was established and it linked the Chinese and the Roman Empires, with Parthian traders serving as skilled intermediaries. Even 1,300 years after the Silk Road first reached the Italian peninsula, in 50 BCE, a truly multicultural group of Eurasian and African globetrotters—including the famous Moroccan merchant Ibn Battuta and his Venetian counterparts in the Marco Polo family—relied on this great Eurasian land route to reach the splendid imperial court of the Mongol Khans in Beijing. By the 15th century CE, enormous Chinese fleets consisting of hundreds of 400-foot-long ocean-going ships were crossing the Indian Ocean and establishing short-lived trade outposts on the east coast of Africa. Toward the end of the premodern period, then, the existing global trade network consisted of several interlocking trade circuits that connected the most populous regions of Eurasia and northeastern Africa.

**Early modern period** (1500–1750). The label ‘early modern’, then, refers to the period between the European Renaissance and the Enlightenment. During these two centuries, Europe and its social practices emerged as the primary catalyst for globalization after a long period of Asian predominance. Europeans north of the Alps greatly benefited from the diffusion of technological innovations originating in Islamic and Chinese cultural spheres. They turned their expansionistic desires westward, searching for a new, profitable sea route to India. Their efforts were aided by such innovations as mechanized printing, sophisticated wind and water mills, extensive postal systems, revised maritime technologies, and advanced navigation techniques. The rise of European metropolitan centers and their affiliated merchant classes represented another important factor responsible for strengthening globalization tendencies during the early modern period. Embodying the new values of individualism and unlimited material accumulation, European economic entrepreneurs laid the foundation of what later scholars would call the ‘capitalist world system’. The monarchs of Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, France, and England all put significant resources into the exploration of new worlds and the construction of new interregional markets that benefited them much more than their exotic ‘trading partners’. By the early 1600s, national joint stock companies like the Dutch and British East India companies were founded for the express purpose of setting up profitable overseas trade posts. As these innovative corporations grew in size and stature, they acquired the power to regulate most intercontinental economic transactions, in the process implementing social institutions and cultural practices that enabled later colonial governments to place these foreign regions under direct political rule. Related developments, such as the Atlantic slave trade and forced population transfers within the Americas, resulted in the suffering and death of millions of non-Europeans while greatly benefiting white immigrants and their home countries. Religious warfare within Europe also created its share of dislocation and displacement for Caucasian populations. Moreover, as a result of these protracted armed
conflicts, military alliances and political arrangements underwent continuous modification. This highlights the crucial role of warfare as a catalyst of globalization.

**Modern period** (1750–1980). By the late 18th century, Australia and the Pacific islands were slowly incorporated into the European-dominated network of political, economic, and cultural exchange. Europeans and their descendants on other continents took it upon themselves to assume the role of the world’s guardians of civilization and morality. Fed by a steady stream of materials and resources that originated mostly in other regions of the world, Western capitalist enterprises gained in stature. Daring to resist powerful governmental controls, economic entrepreneurs and their academic counterparts began to spread a philosophy of individualism and rational self-interest that glorified the virtues of an idealized capitalist system supposedly based upon the providential workings of the free market and its ‘invisible hand’. Written in 1847 by the German political radicals Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the passage below taken from their famous *Communist Manifesto* captures the qualitative shift in social relations that pushed globalization to a new level in the modern period.

**Marx and Engels on globalization.** The discovery of America prepared the way for mighty industry and its creation of a truly global market. The latter greatly expanded trade, navigation, and communication by land. These developments, in turn, caused the further expansion of industry. The growth of industry, trade, navigation, and railroads also went hand in hand with the rise of the bourgeoisie and capital which pushed to the background the old social classes of the Middle Ages ... Chased around the globe by its burning desire for ever-expanding markets for its products, the bourgeoisie has no choice but settle everywhere; cultivate everywhere; establish connections everywhere ... Rapidly improving the instruments of production, the bourgeoisie utilizes the incessantly easing modes of communication to pull all nations into civilization—even the most barbarian ones ... In a nutshell, it creates the world in its own image.

The volume of world trade increased dramatically between 1850 and 1914. Guided by the activities of multinational banks, capital and goods flowed across the borders relatively freely as the sterling-based gold standard made possible the worldwide circulation of leading national currencies like the British pound and the Dutch guilder. Global pricing systems facilitated trade in important commodities like grains, cotton, and various metals. Brand name packaged goods like Coca-Cola drinks, Campbell soups, Singer sewing machines, and Remington typewriters made their first appearance. International advertising agencies launched the first full-blown trans-border commercial promotion campaigns. The telegraph and its transatlantic reach after 1866 provided for instant information exchanges between the two hemispheres. Moreover, the telegraph set the stage for the telephone and wireless radio communication, prompting newly emerging communication corporations like AT&T to coin advertising slogans in celebration of a world ‘inextricably bound together’. Finally, the 20th century arrival of mass circulation newspapers and magazines, film, and television further enhanced a growing consciousness of a rapidly shrinking world. The modern period also witnessed an unprecedented population explosion. Having increased only modestly from about 300 million at the time of the birth of Christ to 760 million in 1750, the world’s population reached 3.7 billion in 1970. Enormous waves of migration intensified existing
cultural exchanges and transformed traditional social patterns. The process of decolonization in the 1950s and 1960s slowly revived global flows and international exchanges.

**Contemporary period** (from the 1980s). The best way of characterizing this latest globalization wave would be to call it ‘convergence’—different and widely spaced people and social connections coming together more rapidly than ever before. This dynamic received another boost with the 1991 collapse of the communist Soviet Empire and ‘neoliberal’ attempts to create a single global market. Indeed, the deregulation of national economies combined with the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Revolution kicked globalization into a new gear. The unprecedented development of horizontal networks of interactive communication that connected the local and global was made possible through the worldwide diffusion of the Internet, wireless communication, digital media, and online social networking tools.

17. **THOMAS FRIEDMAN**, a journalist writing for *The New York Times*, in his book “The world is flat,” contends that there may be three great eras of Globalization: **Globalization 1.0** (1492 until around 1800); **Globalization 2.0** (1800-2000); and, **Globalization 3.0** (2000—?).

**Globalization 1.0**. This era lasted from 1492—when Columbus set sail, opening trade between the Old World and the New World—until around 1800. Globalization 1.0 shrank the world from a size large to a size medium. Globalization 1.0 was about countries and muscles. That is, in Globalization 1.0, the key agent of change, the dynamic force driving the process of global integration, was how much brawn—how much muscle, how much horsepower, wind power, or, later, steam power—your country had and how creatively you could deploy it. In this era, countries and governments (often inspired by religion or imperialism or a combination of both) led the way in breaking down walls and knitting the world together, driving global integration. The primary questions were: Where does my country fit into global competition and opportunities? How can I go global and collaborate with others through my country?

**Globalization 2.0**. Lasting roughly from 1800 to 2000, this era was interrupted by the Great Depression and World Wars I and II. This era shrank the world from a size medium to a size small. In Globalization 2.0, the key agent of change, the dynamic force driving global integration, was multinational companies. These multinationals went global for markets and labor, spearheaded first by the expansion of the Dutch and English joint-stock companies and the Industrial Revolution. In the first half of this era, global integration was powered by falling transportation costs, thanks to the steam engine and the railroad, and in the second half by falling telecommunication costs—thanks to the diffusion of the telegraph, telephones, the PC, satellites, fiber-optic cable, and the early version of the World Wide Web. It was during this era that we really saw the birth and maturation of a global economy, in the sense that there was enough movement of goods and information from continent to continent for there to be a global market, with global arbitrage in products and labor. The big questions in this era were: Where does my company fit into the global economy? How does it take
advantage of the opportunities? How can I go global and collaborate with others through my company?

**Globalization 3.0.** Right around the year 2000 we entered the whole new era. Globalization 3.0 is shrinking the world from a size small to a size tiny and flattening the playing field at the same time. And while the dynamic force in Globalization 1.0 was countries globalizing and the dynamic force in Globalization 2.0 was companies globalizing, the dynamic force in Globalization 3.0—the force that gives it its unique character—is the newfound power for *individuals* to collaborate and compete globally. People all over the world started waking up and realizing that they had more power than ever to go global *as individuals*, they needed more than ever to think of themselves as individuals competing against other individuals all over the planet, and they had more opportunity with those other individuals, not just compete with them. Globalization 3.0 is going to be more and more driven not only by empowered individuals but also by a much more diverse—non-Western, nonwhite—group of individuals. Individuals from every corner of the flat world are being empowered. Globalization 3.0 makes it possible for so many more people to plug in and play and you are going to see every color of the human rainbow take part. As a result, every person now must, and can, ask: Where do I as an individual fit into the global competition and opportunities of the day, and how can I, on my own, collaborate with others globally.

**18.** **GLOBALIZATION 3.0.** Friedman asserts, is primary about ten (10) forces, which he terms flatteners (read: equalizing agents): (1) the fall of the Berlin Wall on 11/9/89; (2) the World Wide Web of 8/9/95; (3) work flow software; (4) uploading; (5) outsourcing of Y2k; (6) offshoring; (7) supply chaining; (8) insourcing; (9) in-forming; and, (10) the steroids (digital, virtual, personal, mobile technologies).

The fall of the Berlin Wall ended the Cold War—a struggle between two economic systems, capitalism and communism—and with the fall of the wall, there was only one system left and everyone had to orient himself or herself to it one way or another. The fall tipped the balance of power across the world toward those advocating democratic, consensual, free-market-oriented governance, and away from those advocating authoritarian rule with centrally planned economies.

**World Wide Web.** With the emergence of the Internet as a tool of low-cost global connectivity, came the birth of the World Wide Web—a system for creating, organizing, and linking documents so they could be easily browsed over the Internet. Tim Berners-Lee, creator of the World Wide Web, explains that the Internet is a network of computers and cables; while the World Wide Web is an abstract (imaginary) space of information containing documents, videos, sounds, information. The (World Wide) Web made the (Inter)Net useful because people are really interested in information (not to mention knowledge and wisdom!) and don’t really want to have to know about computers and cables. Surfing on the Net became more user friendly with the invention of the Web Browser—Netscape, being the pioneer, which not only brought the Internet alive but also made the Internet accessible to everyone from five-year-olds to ninety five-year-olds.
Work flow software speaks of standardization of Net and Web protocols, which allowed collaboration anywhere with anyone; that is, machines are talking to other machines over the Internet using standardized protocols, with no humans involved at all. The emergence of standardized transmission pipes and protocols that connected everyone’s machines and software applications, and also encouraged the development of standardized business processes for how certain kinds of commerce or work would be conducted, meant that more people were not just seamlessly connected but also were able to seamlessly work together on one another's digital content more than ever before. Jerry Rao, the entrepreneur doing accounting work for Americans out of India said, “These work flow software platforms enable you to create virtual global offices—not limited by either the boundaries of your office or your country—and to access talent sitting in different parts of the world and have them complete tasks that you need completed in real time. And so 24/7/365 we are all working.”

Uploading. The Net, the Web, and the standardized work flow software did not only enable more people to author more content, and to collaborate on that content, but it also enabled them to upload files and globalize that content—individually or as part of self-forming communities—without going through any of the traditional hierarchical organizations or institutions. This newfound power of individuals and communities to send up, out, and around their own products and ideas, often for free, rather than just passively downloading them from commercial enterprises or traditional hierarchies, is fundamentally reshaping the flow of creativity, innovation, political mobilization, and information gathering and dissemination. Uploading has given the opportunity to all people to be producers, not just consumers.

Outsourcing. The combination of the Personal Computer (PC), the Internet, and fiber-optic cable had created the possibility of a whole new form of collaboration and horizontal value creation: outsourcing. Any service, call center, business support operation, or knowledge work that could be digitized could be sourced globally to the cheapest, smartest, most efficient provider. Henry Schacht said that with outsourcing, “globalization got supercharged”—for both knowledge work and manufacturing for companies found that they could go to MIT and find four incredibly smart Chinese engineers who were ready to go back to China and work for them from there for the same amount that it would cost them to hire one engineer in America.”

Offshoring. Offshoring is when a company takes one of its factories that it is operating in say, Canton, Ohio, and moves the whole factory offshore to Canton, China. There, it produces the very same product in the very same way, only with cheaper labor, lower taxes, subsidized energy, and lower health-care costs.

Supply chaining is a method of collaborating horizontally—among suppliers, retailers, and customers—to create value. The more these supply chains grow and proliferate, the more they force the adoption of common standards between companies (so that every link of every supply chain can interface with the next), the more they eliminate points of friction at borders, the more the efficiencies of one company get adopted by the others, and the more
they encourage global collaboration. Supply chaining is building a process that "delivers stuff" across the globe—involving dozens of suppliers, distributors, port operators, customs brokers, involving dozens of suppliers, distributors, port operators, customs brokers, forwarders, and carriers in a finely tuned chain operating in concert.

**Insourcing.** Because not every company, indeed very few companies, can afford to develop and support a complex global supply chain of the scale and scope that other companies like Wal-Mart has developed, this situation gave birth to insourcing. Insourcing is distinct from supply-chaining because it goes well beyond supply-chain management. Because it is third-party-managed logistic, it requires a much more intimate and extensive kind of collaboration among the company doing the insourcing and its clients and its clients' clients. In insourcing, engineers of the companies that do delivery of packages (e.g. FedEx, United Parcel Service or UPS) come right inside your company; analyze its manufacturing, packaging, and delivery processes; and then design, redesign, and manage your whole global supply chain. And, if necessary, they'll even finance parts of it.

**Informing** is the individual's personal analog to uploading, outsourcing, insourcing, supply-chaining, and offshoring. In-forming is the ability to build and deploy your own personal supply chain—a supply chain of information, knowledge, and entertainment. In-forming is about self-collaboration—becoming your own self-directed and self-empowered researcher, editor, and selector of entertainment, without having to go to the library or the movie theater or through network television. In-forming is searching for knowledge. It is about seeking like-minded people and communities. Thanks to Google and to search engines in general. Said Russian-born Google cofounder Sergey Brin, "If someone has broadband, dial-up, or access to an Internet café, whether a kid in Cambodia, the university professor, or me who runs this search engine, all have the same basic access to overall research information that anyone has. It is a total equalizer."

The **steroids** are certain new technologies that are amplifying and turbocharging all the other flatteners. They are taking all the forms of collaboration previously highlighted—outsourcing, offshoring, uploading, supply-chaining, insourcing, and in-forming—and making it possible to do each and every one of them in a way that is "digital, mobile, virtual, and personal". According to HP CEO Carly Fiorina, it is **digital** because all analog content and processes—everything from photography to entertainment to communication to word processing to architectural design to the management of a home lawn sprinkler system—are being digitized and therefore can be shaped, manipulated, and transmitted over computers, the Internet, satellites, or fiber-optic cable. **Virtual** because the process of shaping, manipulating, and transmitting this digitized content can be done at very high speeds, with total ease, so that you never have to think about it—thanks to all the underlying digital pipes, protocols, and standards that have now been installed. By **mobile,** this refers to wireless technology; hence, all this can be done from anywhere, with anyone, through any device, and can be taken anywhere. And by **personal,** it means that it can be done by you, just for you, on your own device.