

The Four Faces of Globalisation

Take yourself back to the summer of 2002, and the Korea/Japan FIFA 2002 World Cup Finals.

The first customers arrived at the Cafe All'Angelo at 3am yesterday morning. By 4am, still an hour before Italy's game against Croatia, the Italian eaterie in New York's Greenwich Village was bursting with Italian-Americans making another dawn appointment with emotional intensity.

These fans were desperate for a second successive Italian victory in the World Cup which would send the Azzurri into the tournament's second round. As the game unfolded, svelte waitresses weaved through the throng carrying cups of cappuccino and cornetti filled with zabaglione cream.

Those who had got up obscenely early to follow their team, and those who had not bothered to go to bed, were soon rewarded. A goal early in the second half from Italy's predatory striker Christian Vieri, his third in two games, sent the crowd into ecstasy.

But their hopes of World Cup glory quickly turned to pain as two strikes in four minutes by their unfancied opponents handed Croatia a win that ranks alongside the other amazing upsets - Korea beating Poland, the USA toppling much-fancied Portugal - which have helped turn this World Cup into probably the best football tournament ever played.

More than 5,000 miles away from New York, scores of inhabitants of Soweto had risen early to crowd round a small television set to watch South Africa earn first a creditable 2-2 draw with Paraguay and then, yesterday, a 1-0 win over Slovenia. When Senegal vanquished defending champions France 1-0 on the opening day, hundreds of Senegalese danced jigs of joy in front of the Arche de la Defense in Paris at this famous victory over their former colonial masters.

All over the world, billions of people have been watching the most exciting, most popular and most truly international World Cup in history. After decades as an obsession in Europe and South America but almost nowhere else, the world's most popular sport has finally gone global.¹

Welcome to the world

Globalisation is not something that is often associated with football. Instead, the word usually conjures up images of protest against global economic and trading structures, and the unstoppable onward march of the Golden Arches of McDonalds, the Nike 'swoosh' and dodgy videos on MTV.

We also usually think of globalisation as an economic phenomenon. The riots at the WTO Seattle meetings in 1999 and the G8 gathering in Genoa in 2001, books like "No Logo" and "Globalization and its discontents", and counterstrikes from economists and business leaders, all embody a passionate debate about the nature and source of human prosperity at the beginning of the 21st century. The opponents of economic globalisation doubt the real motives of corporations that look to move production and expand their markets into Majority World countries. Its advocates argue that "there is no alternative", and that economic globalisation can be made to work for the benefit of the poor as well as the rich.

Closely associated with these images of economic globalisation is the spread of global brands around the world. Coke, Gap, Nike, McDonalds, Starbucks, MTV these and other global brands are associated with the West in the minds of consumers around the world, and provide a way for emerging middle-classes to identify with and aspire to that lifestyle. The corporations behind these brands are only too willing to assist the realisation of those aspirations, generously making their branded products available to all who can afford them!

Is it any wonder then that globalisation is so easily associated with Westernisation (or, more usually, Americanisation), and viewed by many in neo-colonial terms, as Western imperialism in its latest incarnation? The emperor's new clothes might come with a logo on the collar, but sadly the empire is still intact.

Football : the globalised sport?

Football, by contrast, is on the way to becoming a truly global sport. The Republic of Korea surprised many during the 2002 World Cup, managing to defeat some of Europe's strongest national teams, including Portugal, Italy and Spain, in fairly short order. Senegal's opening match victory over world champions France set the tone for a tournament which saw the old order of football, well, not overturned exactly (the final was, after all, between Germany and Brazil), but at least shaken. At times, the emperor looked as though he had been stripped down to his Calvin Kleins.

I do not want to extol the virtues of football as a model for the new world order. Corporations like Nike and Adidas both do very well from the sale of replica shirts and footballs as a result of their sponsorship of the world's elite football players and teams. But I want to use it as a way of noting that the free association of globalisation with Western dominance is a bit simplistic, and does not help us to understand the complex nature of the world today, nor its implications for world mission.

I do not believe that globalisation is simply about Westernisation. It is not a single set of processes built around some economic and political trends. It is not only "the ever-increasing integration of national economies into the global economy through trade and investment rules and privatisation, aided by technological advances"ⁱⁱ. It includes some of these things, but it is much more than this.

So what is globalisation?

Globalisation is something of a hydra. It includes many different phenomena, and impacts many different aspects of human life. Trying to come to grips with it is like trying to nail jelly to a wall. As if that wasn't enough, then like the multi-headed beast of Greek mythology¹, when you cut off one head (i.e. when you think you have got globalisation pinned down and understood), three more heads appear in its place. So we will start with a definition that, however general, provides the basis for building a more detailed understanding and analysis.

"Globalization as a concept refers to both the compression of the world and intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole both concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole"ⁱⁱⁱ

This definition, coined by Roland Robertson in 1992, is helpful in that it is both broad and inclusive, not confining globalisation to one part of human life (e.g. economics), and yet at the same time it is concise and brief. So what does it mean?

Geography is History : increasing global interconnectedness

The world is increasingly interconnected. Events and decisions in one part of the world have significant impact on other parts of the world. The Asian financial crises of 1997, which affected the currencies and economies of Thailand, Malaysia, South Korea and Indonesia in rapid succession, leading to recession and unemployment, were triggered in large part by currency speculation in the financial centres of London, New York, Frankfurt and Tokyo. Falling commodity prices can affect the livelihoods of many in the Majority World, as the cash crops they grow for export become worth less than it costs to grow them. Flying jet airliners into skyscrapers in New York can lead to the collapse, a few weeks later, of the governing regime on the other side of the world implicated in those terrible acts.

Not only is the world an increasingly-interconnected place, there are fewer and fewer places that are unaffected by this interconnectedness. There is little or no opportunity for Thoreau-like escapes into the

¹ The hydra had the body of a dog and 100 serpentine heads. It also had poisonous breath and was so hideous it caused most people to die of fear simply from seeing it. My cat would still have treated it with disdain.

wilderness. From electronic crofts in the Scottish Highlands to Amazon tribes using IT to market their craft products, you can run, but you can't hide.

The outcome is a reversal of the adage to "Think Global and Act Local" – now, you can "Act Local" (as did the 9/11 terrorists) and watch the global outcomes.

The FIFA World Cup 2002 showed us this interconnectedness in action. Live sport beamed from Japan is watched in the Soweto slums; Senegalese supporters cheering their team in France. In the article quoted at the start of this chapter, an Italian journalist describes what it is like to live in 3 time zones : "Japan time for football, Italy time for deadlines, New York time where I think I live".

One World : increasing global consciousness

Looking out to a far horizon can be an aesthetically-pleasing experience. I like to stand on a sea-shore, looking out to the horizon, trying to grasp the sense of space and size that comes with such a perspective. Most of the time, however, my horizons are much more restricted – the horizon of my computer screen, the horizon of the road ahead as I drive, the horizon of the trees on the hills outside my town. For most people, horizons are fairly local, provided by friends and family, by home and work, and so on. But increasingly we have the experience, relatively new in human existence, of seeing the whole world as the horizon for our activities. Corporations do not produce products for local or national markets only – they produce for global markets. The Volkswagen was produced for Hitler's Germany, and Henry Ford did the same for America with his Model T. Now the Ford Motor Company produce the Mondeo, marketed consciously as a "world car". Companies and individuals that excel in a given field are referred to as "world class".

Returning again to the example of football to illustrate this, FIFA have a global horizon. They have developed a strategy to expand soccer into a truly global sport. Prior to 1994, countries in Latin America and Europe, the game's traditional heartlands, alternated the hosting of the World Cup. Starting with USA 1994 and more recently with Korea/Japan 2002, and by expanding the number of teams present at the World Cup finals from 24 to 32, FIFA has provided the opportunity for each continent to host the event, and to have its representatives at the finals. FIFA president Sepp Blatter has promised South Africa the right to host the 2010 event, although whether they will actually do so is another question.

The environment : one interconnected world

Environmental issues are a good example of both increasing global interconnectedness and consciousness. We can see how actions in one part of the world have an effect on other parts of the world. Acid rain caused by UK factory emissions denudes Scandinavian pine forests. CFC emissions from refrigerators around the world cause a hole on the ozone layer above Antarctica. Greenhouse gas emissions lead to global warming and sea level rises that threaten Bangladesh with catastrophic flooding and the Maldiv Islands with submersion. And we think of the world as a whole, as a single place, when trying to find global solutions like the Rio Earth Summit 1992, the 1997 Kyoto Protocol on greenhouse gas emissions, and the Rio+10 Earth Summit in Johannesburg in 2002.

So where has this sense of a single, interconnected world come from? Is it that new, and why has it grabbed our attention at this time?

"We are living at a period of most wonderful transition which tend rapidly to accomplish that great end to which indeed all history points – the realisation of the unity of mankind The distances which separated the different nations and parts of the globe are rapidly vanishing before the achievements of modern invention, and we can traverse them with incredible ease Thought is communicated with the rapidity, and even by the power, of lightning The products of all quarters of the globe are placed at our disposal, and we only have to choose which is the best and cheapest for our purposes, and the powers of production are entrusted to the stimulus of competition and capitalism"

(perhaps surprisingly, this quotation is taken from a speech given by Prince Albert, husband of Queen Victoria, at the opening of the Great Exhibition in London in 1851).

So globalisation is not an entirely new phenomenon. Nonetheless there has been a sudden recent acceleration in globalisation in recent years.

Why the acceleration? Probably because of a variety of factors.

- Technological developments have created the opportunity. Travel is not quite instantaneous yet, but I can be anywhere in the world within 24 hours of writing these words. The words themselves can be anywhere in the world in seconds, thanks to email and the web.
- Economic factors have taken advantage of the possibilities provided by technology. Corporations have expanded into new and emerging markets, and have shifted production around the world, in the cause of increased profits and a higher share price.
- Politically, the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in the late 1980s and early 1990s signalled the end of the bi-polar worldview created by the Cold War, and allowed the emerging multidirectional “new world order” to become more visible. Some have suggested that we have moved “from the Berlin Wall to a No Walls world”, although as we will see later I’m not sure it is as simple as that.

Overall, we can say that there is no one single driver of globalisation. It isn’t a conspiracy, devised by a few Western corporations. It is the outcome of a combination of factors, working together to produce this new sense of global interconnectedness.

So what is this interconnectedness doing to us?

The four faces of globalisation

FACE #1 : welcome to McWorld

There are those who advocate globalisation as a (largely) unmitigated good. They tend to define globalisation in economic terms, and look at the expansion of global trade, the decline in protectionism, and the emergence of new markets as something that will improve the prosperity of all, not just those regions currently best placed to take advantage of the new opportunities. It is the rising tide that lifts all boats.

Berger calls this the ‘Davos culture’, after the World Economic Forum meetings held in Switzerland.

Eventually all parts of the world will take a share of the increased prosperity that flows along every tributary of the new interconnected world. Closely linked to this is the decline of the nation-state, being replaced by “region states”^{iv} such as Seattle-Vancouver, Barcelona-Catalonia, northern Italy, London-South East England, and Hong Kong, Singapore and their immediate hinterlands. This new economic order is based on free-market capitalism and Western liberal democratic values, which ‘defeated’ socialism and communism and which are threatened by no viable alternatives^v. Organisations such as the World Trade Organisation have been developed to ‘police’ this new situation, and to penalise nation-states that refuse to play by its rules (trade disputes between the USA and the European Union are often referred to it, just as the EU now plays a role in arbitration in similar disagreements among its own member countries).

Economic globalisation will be dealt with far more effectively in the next session. For now, we should note that not everyone is convinced that such deregulation, coupled with faith in the power of the market, will benefit all. Will the rising tide really raise all boats, or just the yachts and ocean-going motor-cruisers, leaving the junks, sampans and outrigger canoes behind to be swamped and flooded?

Big Macs for all

Whenever I travel around the world (not as exciting as it sounds - airports are just big bus stations), I always take the opportunity to visit McDonalds in the country that I am visiting – just once, and just because I can. It's always nice to eat British food when away from home! I'm always intrigued to see just how familiar the environment of a McDonalds restaurant is. The set menus 1-3 are always Big Mac, McChicken Sandwich, and Quarterpounder meals. I can always get a vanilla shake. The environment is familiar (and also air-conditioned, a welcome relief in a hot and humid climate).

This global spread of McDonalds, with its standardised food and restaurant design, is a facet of globalisation that arouses considerable angst. French farmer Jose Bové became a pin-up of the “anti-globalisation” movement when he trashed a local McDonalds restaurant with his tractor. Other French farmers have tipped trailer-loads of French apples outside McDonalds restaurants, and even overturned the sacred statues of Ronald McDonald, in similar protests against the perceived onslaught against French culture and food.

McDonalds are not alone in this now-global ubiquity. Nike, Levi, Coca-Cola, Starbucks, Gap, MTV, Marlboro, Blockbuster, and so on, all represent the emergence of the global superbrand. The high streets of every town begin to look the same. Terms like “Coca-Colonisation” and “global consumer culture” are coined to imply that Western (usually American) consumer culture has been exported via the mass-media to all parts of the globe. We should note that the phrase “consumer culture” means more than just consumption. Items consumed, especially branded items, take on a symbolic value, so that the consumer asks not “does this brand represent good quality?” but “what does this brand say about me?”. Consumption becomes the main source of identity. Wearing Western brands becomes a simulated way of participating in the Western lifestyle, and having a share of Western affluence. It becomes a way of expressing aspirations and even a person's sense of self .

McDonalds represents a good example of the contemporary homogenisation of culture and its associated reduction of choice and local variation, according to George Ritzer^{vi}. ‘McDonaldisation’ is a process by which consumer choice is rationalised and pre-determined according to the principles of the fast food industry. The result – we can only have the products, and the cultural options, chosen on our behalf and offered to us by a decreasing number of global corporations. And these options are closely associated with and determined by the West, so that globalisation becomes simply a euphemism for continued Western dominance of the world. Empire lives on after all, in Nike trainers and Gap khakis, smoking a Marlboro Light.

Ritzer suggests that the 4 characteristics of McDonaldisation are:

- Efficiency – the time and effort expended to satisfy a want is reduced to as small a time as possible (it's shocking, I know, but sometimes you have to wait 2-3 minutes if there are no burgers ready at McDonalds!). McDonalds helps to fulfil this by keeping their menu as limited as possible.
- Calculability – value is determined by money, time and effort, not by less-tangible notions such as quality (Burger King's burgers are usually regarded as being of a higher standard than McDonalds, but Burger King lags behind in popularity).
- Predictability - products are standardised. A Big Mac in London tastes the same as it does in Paris, Sao Paulo and Kuala Lumpur (apparently, this is a selling point). A familiar product fosters security in the mind of the consumer.
- Control – limited and fixed menus, uncomfortable fixed seating, queue controls, standardised production systems and the like.

These principles underlie the success of the McDonalds brand, and are evident in other fast-food brands, but also beyond. Wal-Mart sells the same global brands in its stores in Berlin, Mexico City and Houston^{vii}; Gap's range of clothing is surprisingly limited; politicians carry pagers to ensure they are kept ‘on message’. Welcome to the utopia of McWorld, the most commonly recognised face of globalisation.

But is that all there is to it?

FACE #2 : New Walls in a 'No Walls' world

I mentioned above that globalisation has been seen as creating a 'No Walls' world. But we can see new walls being erected around the world, sometimes in direct response to the processes described above.

In an article entitled "Jihad vs McWorld"^{viii}, Benjamin Barber contrasted the "commercially homogenous global network" of McWorld with "a threatened Lebanonization of national states in which culture is pitted against culture, people against people, tribe against tribe". Barber called this latter sectarianism 'Jihad', and sees it as a reaction, an escape from McWorld's "dully insistent imperatives". In 'Jihad', the emphasis is on locality, community, culture and identity over against uniformity and economic efficiency.

Another influential essay, "The Clash of Civilisations"^{ix}, by Harvard academic Samuel Huntington, has benefitted from a rekindling of interest in its basic thesis, following the World Trade Center atrocities of 11th September 2001. Huntington suggests that in future "the clash of civilisations will dominate global politics". After 9/11 and the launch of the 'war on terrorism', Huntington's thesis sounds pretty persuasive.

Huntington's basic thesis was as follows. Civilisations are cultural entities, including a large number of peoples and often a large number of countries. There are 8 main civilisations : Western, Slavic-Orthodox, Islamic, Hindu, Confucian, Japanese, Latin American and African. There are a number of reasons why civilisations clash, and especially so at this time:

- They are founded on basic differences of history, language, culture, tradition and, most important of all, religion.
- The world is becoming a smaller place. Because of the increased interconnectedness characteristic of globalisation, interactions between different civilisations are increasing, leading to greater awareness of similarities and differences
- Economic and social changes are weakening people's sense of identity, especially where this is tied to nationality. Religion provides not only a basis for civilisation but also for identity.
- The West is at the height of its power, leading to a desire on the part of others for alternative sources of identity and power as a means of resisting its domination
- Cultural characteristics do not change as easily as economic or political arrangements. Religion discriminates between people even more sharply than ethnicity. It is possible to be half-French and half-Arab, but it is difficult to be half-Catholic and half-Muslim.
- Economic regionalisation is increasing, and these arrangements are most successful when based on common civilisational codes, as in the European Union, the Chinese countries and diaspora of SE Asia, and the North American Free Trade Area.

For these reasons, civilisational identities are strengthening, and clashes between civilisations are becoming more common.

While somewhat prescient in identifying Islam as providing a significant confrontation with the West, Huntington also missed the mark occasionally, suggesting that underlying differences between the China and the USA could develop into a "new cold war".

Nonetheless these observations provide us with a useful counterpoint to the assumption that globalisation leads inexorably to Western economic and cultural hegemony. Through precisely the same mechanism - increasing global interconnectedness - Huntington suggests that both this and the polar opposite will occur, i.e. increased economic and cultural resistance to Western domination.

Parenthesis

Western economic and cultural dominance are undeniable realities in the world today. The "clash of civilisations" thesis and the superb expression "Jihad vs McWorld" remind us that other forces are also in play at the same time. Western hegemony is being resisted. But are we being pushed into a false antithesis, forced to decide which will ultimate 'win', the forces of fragmentation or the forces of uniformity?

Globalisation, defined earlier as increasing global interconnectedness, is changing the economic, political and sociocultural contours of modern societies. There is no longer an easy and clear distinction between what is local and what is international, or what is “over there” and what is “over here”, since what happens “over there” affects and influences “over here”, and vice versa. And we are less and less sure where “here” ends and “there” begins. This is a true for Christian mission as it is for anything else.

Globalisation represents neither the incorporation of more and more societies into a single homogenised global culture, nor a fragmentation and hardening of local identities. Instead, it is about the increase in options in every locality, and the power available to every locality to affect other localities elsewhere.

Since this is not available to all equally, it creates new patterns of power and powerlessness, in which some in each country or region become more enmeshed in a global network whereas others in the same country or region are increasingly marginalised. But this does not undermine the basic thesis.

In this sense, then, globalisation is about change. It is changing the way that people see themselves, so that they no longer define themselves only in relation to other nearby local realities, but also in relation to global realities and other localities on the other side of the world. Previously-homogeneous cultural niches, hitherto able to exist purely on their own terms, are forced to think of themselves in relation to other cultures and outlooks from the world ‘outside’. The deck of cards of the world’s cultures is being shuffled and made ready for a new deal.

FACE #3 : Shuffling the deck

Returning to our football theme, the 2002 FIFA World Cup provided an example of this in relation to Japan. A number of eminent Japanese commentators saw in football an example of the kind of society that Japan needs to become - creative and imaginative, diverse and open to the outside world, rather than based on traditional Confucian values of unity and loyalty, and closed, to the point of xenophobia, to the outside world. Football offers a model blend of the old ethic of team solidarity with the new spirit of individual flair^x. The image of hard-working conformist Japanese company-men was undermined by pictures of 2000 young Japanese football fans hurling themselves into Osaka’s Dotonbori canal (and shouting abuse at police who tried to stop them) in celebration of Japan topping a group that included Belgium and the old enemy, Russia. These celebrations were not however a rejection of their Japaneseness – rather, it represented a show of patriotism unseen since the Second World War, untainted by past militaristic associations. And nationalistic politicians proved unable to exploit the mood to their own ends. Tokyo governor Shintaro Ishihara called Phillippe Troussier, the French manager of the Japan squad, a ‘second-rate bully’ who represented the worst characteristics of white people, whereas most of Japan’s young supporters admired him and chanted for “Troussier Nippon”, a country based on merit rather than seniority, part of a global array of cultures rather than an insular nationalism².

Saudi Arabia provides another example. For a long time a closed kingdom and renowned for its secrecy and resistance to un-Islamic external influence, it now represents a remarkable blend of modernity and the past, like “Dallas policed by the Taliban”. The religious leaders in the town of Buraydah claim that “this is the centre of Saudi Arabia. It is pure here. There is no mixing with other cultures”. They say, “we allow all sorts of winds to come to us, but we don’t let them blow us into the air. Mixing is one reason why people stray from righteousness”. Yet modern economic and cultural influences cannot be escaped in Saudi Arabia, and mixing cannot be denied. Sony advertisements are placed on enormous hoardings built above mosques, women shop at Harvey Nichols in a Norman Foster building while fully shrouded, and McDonalds restaurants close their doors 5 times a day for prayer. Political debate has centred on the revelation that 15 of the 19 World Trade Center hijackers were Saudis, as is/was Osama Bin Laden himself. The closure of the US air base at Dhahran indicates that Saudi Arabia’s 50 year economic and military love affair with the West is coming under considerable pressure, with the USA now viewed as the “first enemy of the Muslims” for its actions in relation to Israel and the Palestinians^{xi}, never mind Iraq.

² But even change has its limits. After stripping, diving and abusing the police, a crowd of Japanese football fans on their way home in Osaka waited patiently at a pedestrian crossing, even though there were no cars on the street.

You're not from round here, are you?

The above cases are examples of a phenomenon known as *glocalisation*. This term describes the way in which ideas and structures that circulate globally are adapted and changed by local realities. So while Wal-Mart sells Heinz and Del Monte products in its stores worldwide, it also pays close attention to local tastes. The Wal-Mart store in Shenzhen, China, for example, sells chicken feet, Ma-Ling brand stewed pork ribs, and Gulong brand pickled lettuce. About 85% of the products come from 14000 Chinese suppliers^{xii}.

McDonalds, that supposed pioneer of homogenised consumption, shows similar approaches to its local marketing. One finds numerous examples of adaptation to local tastes, such as the McBurrito in Mexico, McLlahua sauce in Bolivia (a local chilli sauce found on every meal table), beer on sale in French McDonalds restaurants, and the Maharaja Mac in India (a mutton version of the Big Mac for a country where beef or pork consumption is risky to say the least). McDonalds recognises that it is viewed by many as an example of American cultural and economic imperialism, and asserts in response that it is instead a confederation of locally-owned companies. It even ran adverts in France that poked fun at Americans and their food choices, emphasising that its food was made in France, by French suppliers, using French products^{xiii}. Even when the American identity of McDonalds is undeniable, it produces reactions that reinforce local identities. When McDonalds first entered the Philippines, Filipino hamburger chains responded by marketing their products on the basis of local taste (whereas they had previously promoted them on the basis of their Americanness)^{xiv}. In parts of East Asia, the 'fast food' metaphor of McDonalds has been drastically altered, because instead of 'eat and go', customers linger. Two groups do this – housewives relaxing after shopping, and schoolkids hanging out before going home.

Now global corporations like Wal-Mart and McDonalds don't adapt to local preferences because of a philosophical commitment to global diversity. They do so because they have discovered that local tastes are not easily changed or homogenised, but instead show considerable resilience in the face of 'global' flows of ideas and products.

Finally, we should not overstate the cultural power of Western brands. Berger writes about the "non-sacramental consumption" of Western products (i.e. no carried inner meaning – not a visible sign of an invisible reality). Sometimes a hamburger is just a hamburger.

"The idea of a mindless global homogenisation greatly underestimates the capacity of human beings to be creative and innovative in the face of cultural challenges" (Peter Berger)^{xv}

FACE #4 : The Empire Strikes Back

Non-Western tastes are proving resilient; but they are not simply remainign locally non-Western.

As well as localising adaptations, other cultures are using the processes of globalisation to expand their reach. Non-Westernisation is as much a feature of globalisation as Westernisation is.

So the most popular meal ordered in restaurants in the UK is the Chicken Tikka Masala. The popularity of Indian food in the UK is shown by the existence of the "Curry Mile" in Manchester, and similar large groups of restaurants in cities around the UK. The Chinese takeaway is ubiquitous. And this movement and adaptation of food styles is not new. Consider that symbol of quintessential Englishness, the cup of tea. Tea is of course not grown in Britain, but came from China and India (where the British began farming it in 1835 to break the Chinese monopoly, so it's not that Indian either). Maybe in future a curry will be called an "English", not an "Indian"?

The Indian film industry, "Bollywood", is not only bigger than Hollywood, it has plans for global expansion, as shown by the success of recent films like "Monsoon Wedding" and the Oscar-nominated "Lagaan". Ang Lee's film "Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon" was a massive international hit, despite being a Chinese language film with subtitles. Chinese cultural influence on the West can be seen in the popularity

of *feng shui*³ in interior and garden design, and the interest shown in the persecuted Falun Gong religious movement. Even Hollywood itself, the ultimate visual purveyor of the American Dream, shows signs of sharing in this re-shuffle of cultural influence, as some of its biggest studios are now foreign-owned, such as Sony (Japanese) and Vivendi Universal (French).

Japanese goods dominate the home-entertainment market, and their cars are produced and bought worldwide. But their cultural products are also subject to global dissemination. Pokémon, a cartoon whose rise to global domination of children's imaginations in 1999-2001 was spearheaded by a yellow, electric-shock-inducing mouse called Pikachu, is Japanese in style and origin from start to finish. Movies, computer games, trading cards and figurines tumbled over one another in a marketing *blitzkrieg* that swept children's allowances and parent's credit cards before it. The "Hello Kitty" brand of clothing, accessories and even credit cards has achieved sufficient global penetration to merit a mention on that touchstone of contemporary American culture, The Simpsons. Japanese soap opera and game shows are so popular in East and South-East Asia that they have led to the coining of a new phrase *ha-ri-zu* ("tribe of Japanese infatuation") to describe their devotees, the consumers of Japanese pop culture and media manipulation.

The end of the world as we know it

We have now recognised 4 faces to globalisation. But, in the future, will one face be more recognisable to us than others. In short, does globalisation have a trajectory? Is it going somewhere?

Francis Fukuyama's famous essay "The End of History"^{xvi} argued that Western liberal democracy has "won", because of the absence of alternatives since the demise of communism. But globalisation is not producing a homogenised McWorld made in the image of the West. Jihads - or local variants based on tradition - are produced as a reaction against outside influences. While Barber believed that globalisation would eventually defeat the retribalization of Jihad ("Jihad may be a last deep sigh before the eternal yawn of McWorld"), others such as Huntington were not so sure. Since 9/11, the launch of the 'war on terrorism', and the recent invasion of Iraq, the 'clash' thesis is enjoying considerable attention.

We need to be very careful of predictions based on our interpretation of historical trends. Prior to 9/11, Fukuyama's "end of history" thesis was far more widely touted than Huntington's "clash of civilisations". By contrast, "Clash of Civilisations" has sold more copies since 9/11 than in the 8 years before, whereas a review of Fukuyama's most recent book ended with the warning, "do not mistake this man for a thinker".

We should take note of the (probably apocryphal) answer given by Chairman Mao, when asked about the long-term consequences of the American and French Revolutions – "it's too early to tell".

I want to suggest that the "McWorld / Jihad" formulation, while helpful, is too simplistic. We have seen how local variants develop through the flexibility of globalisation. These processes of localisation are not simply coping reactions, but a feature of globalisation itself, as is non-Western globalisation. McDonaldisation may be one aspect of globalisation, but it is not the only or dominant feature. Production and consumption are being diversified, not restricted. If we compare high street shops, food choices, variety in clothing styles, car design, or any other consumption pattern you care to name, we can see that the trend is towards more choice, not less.

"An enormous range of individualised, unpredictable, inefficient and irrational products can be inspected simply by surfing the Internet" (Malcolm Waters).^{xvii}

What is available in one locality becomes, because of globalisation, available in all localities. In any given locality, the range of consumption choices and of cultural opportunities is increased. Local homogeneity is not replaced by global homogeneity, but by global and local diversity. The implications for our understanding of cultural diversity and innovation, the challenges of contextualization in places where cultures are contested, and the increasingly diversifying nature of global Christianity, are immense.

³ There is no truth in the claim that *Feng Shui* is Chinese for "tidy your room!"

Endnotes

- ⁱ This story first appeared in The Observer newspaper, Sunday 9th June 2002.
- ⁱⁱ Colin Hines, quoted by Ruth Valerio in "Globalization and The Poor : Tearfund Policy Paper",
- ⁱⁱⁱ Roland Robertson, quoted in Malcolm Waters, "Globalization" (2nd edn), London : Routledge, 2001, p4.
- ^{iv} Kenichi Ohmae, "The Rise of the Region State", Foreign Affairs, Vol 72, No 2, 1993
- ^v Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?", The National Interest 16, summer 1989
- ^{vi} George Ritzer, "The McDonaldization of Society", Thousand Oaks, CA : Pine Forge, 1993
- ^{vii} Newsweek, 20 May 2002, p46
- ^{viii} Benjamin Barber, "Jihad vs McWorld", The Atlantic Monthly, March 1992, reproduced in P O'Meara, H Mehlinger and M Krain (eds), "Globalization and the Challenges of a New Century : A Reader", Bloomington, IN : Indiana University Press, 2000
- ^{ix} Samuel P Huntington, "The Clash of Civilisations?", Foreign Affairs, Vol 72, No 3, 1993
- ^x [Hhttp://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4454789,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/Archive/Article/0,4273,4454789,00.html)H
- ^{xi} [Hhttp://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,3604,747596,00.html](http://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,3604,747596,00.html)H
- ^{xii} Newsweek, 20 May 2002, p46
- ^{xiii} New York Times, 14 Oct 2001
- ^{xiv} Malcolm Waters, "Globalization", London : Routledge, 2001 (2nd edn), p 226.
- ^{xv} Peter Berger, "Many Globalizations : cultural diversity in the contemporary world", New York : Oxford University Press, 2002, p11
- ^{xvi} Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?", The National Interest 16, summer 1989
- ^{xvii} Malcolm Waters, "Globalisation", *op cit*, p229