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Chapter 1
The Dynamics of Hybridization and Globalization
Loo-See Holt

Globalization and its Definitions

Most agree that globalization represents a serious challenge to the state-centrist assumptions of most explicit or implicit state-centrist critique of state-centrism. In Leslie Sklar’s chapter on “A Transnational Framework for Theory and Research in the Study of Globalization”, in Frontiers of Globalization Research (2007), he termed the qualifiers of globalization as generic, capitalist and alternative globalization with three competing approaches that have dominated the study of globalization: inter-nationalist (state-centrist), transnationalist (globalization as a contested world-historical project with capitalist and other variants), and globalist (capitalist globalization as a more or less completed and irreversible neoliberal capitalist project).

First, the inter-national (state-centrist) approach to globalization takes as its unit of analysis the state (often confused with the much more contentious idea of the nation-state). Globalization is seen as something that powerful states impose on weaker state, and something that is imposed by the state on weaker groups in all states. This line of argument is similar to older theories of imperialism, colonialism and more recent theories of dependency. The idea that globalization is the new imperialism is common among radical critics of globalization, by which they often mean (but do not always say), capitalist globalization. This view can be rejected on the grounds of theoretical redundancy and empirical inadequacy. It is theoretically redundant because if globalization is just another name for internationalization and/or imperialism, more of the same, then the term is redundant at best and confusing at worst (pg.94).

The globalist approach is the antithesis of the state-centrist thesis. Globalists argue that the state has disappeared that we have entered a virtually borderless world, and that globalization, by which is meant invariably capitalist globalization, is irreversible and nearing completion. The central concerns here are the global economy and its governance driven by market forces, the globalist unit of analysis. Globalism of this variety is often referred to as neoliberal globalization. Whereas the inter-nationalist approach exaggerates the power of the state, the globalist approach fails to theorize the role of the state and interstate systems under conditions of capitalist globalization. Sklar consider the transnational approach to globalization as the most fruitful approach, facilitating theory and research on the struggle between the dominant but as yet incomplete project of capitalist globalization and its alternatives. The transnational approach is the synthesis of the collision of the flawed state-centrist thesis and the flawed globalist antithesis.

Generic globalization can be defined in terms of four phenomenon: (1) the electronic moment, notably transformations in the technological base and global scope of the electronic mass media; (2) the postcolonial moment; (3) the moment of transnational social spaces; (4) qualitatively new forms of cosmopolitanism.

His theory of capitalist globalization include the debates whether and to what extent (i) capitalism is the central issue for globalization theory and research; (ii) the transnational capitalist class really is the main driver of capitalist globalization; (iii) capitalist globalization is synonymous with “Westernization” and/or “Americanization” (iv) globalization induces homogenization or hybridization or both at the same time; (v) the state is in decline relative to the forces of capitalist globalization; (vi) the culture-ideology of consumerism is central to the system; and (vii) alternatives to capitalist globalization are possible within the conditions of generic globalization. The transnational capitalist class is composed of the corporate, state, technical and consumerist as follows: (i) those who own and control major TNCs and their local affiliates (corporate fraction), globalizing state and interstate bureaucrats and politicians (state fraction), globalizing professionals (technical fraction), and merchants and media (consumerist fraction).

As for alternatives to capitalist globalization within the conditions of generic globalization, the crises of class and capitalist polarization intensifies and cannot resolve, make it essential to start thinking about alternatives.

Cultural Globalization

In the end, how do we bring people to the cultural heritage in such a way that they are all able to speak and influence decisions? There are many difficult issues here. For example, should all those around the table have an equal voice? Or should those who have suffered more through the colonial process have a louder voice? Who “owns” the past – those associated most closely with it historically, or the world community, or those who found the site and can best preserve it, and so on? Even during an era of cultural globalization where diversity,