www.turkishstudies.net/social

Turkish Studies - Social Sciences

eISSN: 2667-5617

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

INTERNATIONAL
BALKAN
UNIVERSITY
Sponsored by IBU

Globalization: Cultural and Economic Cooperation or Loss of Identity and Diversity

Küreselleşme: Kültürel ve Ekonomik İşbirliği mi, Kimlik ve Çeşitlilik Kaybı mı?

Viktorija Kafedjiska*

Abstract: Thanks to global media and communication, we obtain information from all over the World and easily recognize the signs of global culture. This globalization has led to a fusion of knowledge, morals, and cultures; namely, it has led to the creation of a global world culture, which has emerged precisely because of the modern forms of communication. Those who consider the globalization to be a positive process that, in a historical sense, is connecting people and cultures, also claim that it has enabled the disappearance of the economic borders and has connected the economies all over the World. Consecutively, this has led to a mixture of people who, by seeking a safer economic future, actually dislocated and shared their cultures and traditions on other sides of the World. This interconnection would not have been possible without the existence of strong media corporations, which turned the World in a global village – just as Marshall McLuhan has once predicted. In the media circles, the radically higher potential than the printed or electronic media and the epochal role of the internet cannot be overlooked. By offering encyclopedias, dictionaries, and books with just one click, the internet not only offers knowledge and entertainment to almost everyone, but it also speeds up globalization significantly. On the other hand, many people consider the globalization to be an expansion of the western cultures and their values and the idea of giving even more power to the West has met a firm opposition from some countries. The most prominent example is probably China, but also other smaller countries, which believe that the West hegemonizes the weaker through the process of globalization. Therefore, the resistance towards the globalization is in fact fear of losing your own values and substituting them with foreign ones.

Structured Abstract: Thanks to global media and communication, we obtain information from all over the World and easily recognize the signs of global culture. This globalization has led to a fusion of knowledge, morals, and cultures; namely, it has led to the creation of a global world culture, which has emerged precisely because of the modern forms of communication.

No other field of study, in the past twenty years, has generated as much of literature and discussion as has the field of globalisation. The issue of globalisation can be addressed in all areas (economy, politics, identities, and culture), yet each of the areas has two contrasting explanations. The first suggests the logically dominant presence of globalisation, while the other suggests the consequences of its presence. Hence, there are

* Doç. Dr., Uluslararası Balkan Üniversitesi, İletişim Fakültesi
Assoc. Prof. Dr. International Balkan University, Faculty of Communications
ORCID 0000-0002-5413-6507

viktorija_kafedziska@yahoo.com

Cite as/ Atıf: Kafedjiska, V. (2020). Globalization: cultural and economic cooperation or loss of identity and diversity, *Turkish Studies - Social*, 15(1), 837-844. <https://dx.doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.38814>

Received/Geliş: 02 October/Ekim 2019

Accepted/Kabul: 25 February/Şubat 2020

Copyright © INTAC LTD, Turkey

Checked by plagiarism software

Published/Yayın: 29 February/Şubat 2020

CC BY-NC 4.0

two opposing views on the whole process, that is, universal globalisation, for some, is the greatest friend of humankind, and for others, the greatest threat

Those who consider the globalization to be a positive process that, in a historical sense, is connecting people and cultures, also claim that it has enabled the disappearance of the economic borders and has connected the economies all over the World. Consecutively, this has led to a mixture of people who, by seeking a safer economic future, actually dislocated and shared their cultures and traditions on other sides of the World. Universal society is particularly concerned with the problem of distribution of global wealth, local poverty and jobless capitalism. In the capitalist system, the appropriation of labour surplus occurs, not between two classes, but among three strata: the countries that make up the central area, or the core, the semi-periphery ones and the periphery countries and areas (Wallerstein, 1983: 303).

Globalisation becomes a collective life model and, it can be easily noticed that, in such reasoning, the pillars of the new contemporary form of colonialism can be found, i.e. the cultural imperialism.

Understandably, some see such processes as a development of the cosmopolitan culture, while for others, it is but a process of cultural homogenisation, which leads to undermining national specificities, and, thus, national identities.

Media play the key role in this process. They are responsible for spreading and accepting cultural norms, and what is common for them, is that they can be taught.

This interconnection would not have been possible without the existence of strong media corporations, which turned the World in a global village – just as Marshall McLuhan has once predicted. In the media circles, the radically higher potential than the printed or electronic media and the epochal role of the internet cannot be overlooked. By offering encyclopedias, dictionaries, and books with just one click, the internet not only offers knowledge and entertainment to almost everyone, but it also speeds up globalization significantly.

On the other hand, we can consider the globalization, as a process of an expansion of the western cultures and their values and the idea of giving even more power to the West has met a firm opposition from some countries. The most prominent example is probably China, but also other smaller countries, which believe that the West hegemonizes the weaker through the process of globalization. Therefore, the resistance towards the globalization is in fact fear of losing your own values and substituting them with foreign ones.

Many consider global society as the end of the national state. However, history teaches us that no empire has retained its power. In this awaken world, a domination of a single force is not possible.

The world can break the borders for economic, cultural and any other co-operation, yet no one should be asked for to forget their roots. Naturally, the thought of creating an imperialist power over all continents is utopian. Therefore, the reformation and reformulation of the political space is precisely with the intention to upgrade and protect the complex architectural appearance of independence and identity.

The modern territorial state was not built by just one generation, so no one should expect that changes geared toward global transformations will take place in a shorter period of time. Only if we accept the global and local at this level, we can exchange ideas and goods. Otherwise, imposing force, in terms of different cultures and values, can not only lead to cultural homogenisation, but to assimilation, as well. In this awaken world, that cannot be possible

Keywords: globalization, economy, culture, media, identity

Öz: Küresel medya ve iletişim sayesinde, dünyanın her yerinden bilgi alıyoruz ve küresel kültürün işaretlerini kolayca tanıyoruz. Bu küreselleşme bilgi, ahlak ve kültür kaynaşmasına yol açtı; yani, tam olarak modern iletişim biçimleri nedeniyle ortaya çıkan küresel bir dünya kültürünün yaratılmasına yol açmıştır. Küreselleşmeyi, tarihsel anlamda insanları ve kültürleri birbirine bağlayan, aynı zamanda ekonomik sınırların ortadan kalkmasını sağladığını ve tüm dünyadaki ekonomileri birbirine bağladığını iddia eden olumlu bir süreç olarak kabul edenler. Ardından, bu, daha güvenli bir ekonomik gelecek arayışı içinde, kültürlerini ve geleneklerini dünyanın diğer taraflarında gerçekten yerinden çıkarıp paylaşan insanların bir karışımına yol açtı. Bu bağlantı, Dünyayı küresel bir köyde döndüren güçlü medya kuruluşlarının varlığı olmadan mümkün olmazdı - tıpkı Marshall McLuhan'ın bir zamanlar öngördüğü gibi. Medya çevrelerinde, basılı veya elektronik

medyadan çok daha yüksek bir potansiyel ve internetin yankı rolü göz ardı edilemez. İnternet, sadece tek bir tıklamayla ansiklopediler, sözlükler ve kitaplar sunarak, hemen hemen herkes için bilgi ve eğlence sunmakla kalmaz, aynı zamanda küreselleşmeyi de önemli ölçüde hızlandırır. Öte yandan, birçok insan küreselleşmeyi batı kültürlerinin ve değerlerinin bir genişlemesi olarak görüyor ve Batı'ya daha fazla güç verme fikri bazı ülkelerden sert bir muhalefetle karşılaştı. En belirgin örnek muhtemelen Çin'dir, ancak Batı'nın küreselleşme sürecinde daha zayıf olduğu görüşünde olan daha küçük ülkelerdir. Bu nedenle, küreselleşmeye karşı direnç aslında kendi değerlerinizi kaybetme ve onları yabancı değerlerle ikame etme korkusudur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: küreselleşme, ekonomi, kültür, medya, kimlik

Introduction

No other field of study, in the past twenty years, has generated as much of literature and discussion as has the field of globalisation. The issue of globalisation can be addressed in all areas (economy, politics, identities, and culture), yet each of the areas has two contrasting explanations. The first suggests the logically dominant presence of globalisation, while the other suggests the consequences of its presence. Hence, there are two opposing views on the whole process, that is, universal globalisation, for some, is the greatest friend of humankind, and for others, the greatest threat.

However, the social sciences often conclude that the concept of globalization is a disputable one because even if the definition is accepted as true, the dilemmas whether globalization brings more positive or more negative implications would still exist

Nonetheless, globalisation, encouraged by new telecommunication technologies, has reduced the differences between economic, political and information systems, especially in the developed world. Therefore, the way in which a person experiences the world of globalisation would reflect their economic, social and geographical position. The creation of an integrated communication system offers completely new opportunities for economic, business, social, cultural and information activities. The wish to mix and share different cultures was welcomed with eagerness among the supporters of globalization. Another dimension of the cultural but also of the media globalization is that, globalization allows for various encounters, i.e. getting acquainted with the "other worlds".

On the other side, even though these benefits of the globalization are publicly acclaimed, there is a stream of opinions which propagate the development of national, regional or even the local belonging, acknowledging the turbulent changes of globalization as a treat to the former.

Nevertheless, especially in terms of identity and culture, the concept of globalisation is pretty controversial, since it is more often seen as an Americanisation, i.e., as an effort by the United States of America to impose, not only their economic, political and military domination, but also their position and values, which is very alarming for the small cultures.

I. Globalisation in Economy and Culture

For the dominance of globalisation, key authors are: Wallerstein, Rosenau, Gilpin, Held, Robertson and Appadurai. According to Wallerstein, capitalism is the engine of globalisation, while Gilpin and Held are more interested in international politics. A turning point in the viewpoints has, also, prompted the environmental consensus in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, when it came to the question that we live in a globally risky society in which environmental problems would not be able to block, that is, would not limit the national boundaries. In turn, this universal society is particularly concerned with the problem of distribution of global wealth, local poverty and jobless capitalism. In the capitalist system, the appropriation of labour surplus occurs, not between two classes, but among three strata: the countries that make up the central area, or the core, the semi-periphery ones and the periphery countries and areas (Wallerstein, 1983: 303). This tripartite division, which cause conflicts

in the world, are created because of the terrible poverty, on the one hand, as opposed to the extraordinary great wealth, on the other. This, according to Wallerstein, will cause a collapse of the world system, which is threatened by a complete decomposition. Naturally, such theses can immediately be challenged, as a matter of fact, by all the concepts in globalisation.

Nowadays, the world faces global problems, such as refugee crises, the issues of human rights, corruption, and environmental problems. They can be solved not only by local, i.e. national, but, also, by international institutions established for the purpose. The maxim "Think globally, act locally" becomes reality. Hence, the global society has two arenas: a community of states, in which diplomacy and national power are the decisive factor, and a world of transnational sub-policies, in which the decision-makers are the multinational companies of Greenpeace, Amnesty International, the World Bank, NATO, and the European Union (Rosenau, 1990: 70).

The global market has notably far-reaching consequences on cultures, identities and lifestyle. For sure, this process can be called a cultural globalisation, since people all around the world wear jeans and smoke Marlboro. As a result of the global economy, television and global communications, the signs of global culture, are everywhere. The possibilities for sharing the world's cultural symbols is rooted in the ideals of the cosmopolitanism. The cultural encounters of the nations create new productive types of cultural fusion and cultural hybrids. However, this is not just a homogeneous world, a mere multitude of different cultures and traditions, in a cosmopolitan sense. On the contrary, what should be emphasised is the situations in which local cultures and identities are eradicated and replaced by symbols from the public departments and the image of multinational corporations (Robins, 1991: 28). Globalisation becomes a collective life model and, it can be easily noticed that, in such reasoning, the pillars of the new contemporary form of colonialism can be found, i.e. the cultural imperialism. Understandably, some see such processes as a development of the cosmopolitan culture, while for others, it is but a process of cultural homogenisation, which leads to undermining national specificities, and, thus, national identities. Media play the key role in this process. They are responsible for spreading and accepting cultural norms, and what is common for them, is that they can be taught.

For this to be possible, the global information structure covers the world as a spider web (Ramonet, 1997: 12).

This spider web connects computers, telephones and television, opening up a relentless war among the media. In particular, it creates links among three technological fields: computers, telephones and television, that unite multimedia and the Internet. All companies involved in networking, especially those that maintain it (electricity, telephone, water and roads) are in a rat race to secure their slice of the cake. This is the reason why the US, as manufacturers of new technologies, demanded deregulation and economic globalisation. Thus, many countries would open borders for "free flow of information" – especially for the gigantic US media industries. Hence, the statement of the former US President Barack Obama, that the Russians may have weapons and strength, but the Americans have Hollywood, is perfectly acceptable. Please, try to think of the films in which, almost always, the Americans are the winners. Hence, cultural globalisation refers to the development of events of rejection or non-recognition of the turbulent changes that arise from the global integration, i.e. turning to what is considered traditional and essential loyalty. The great persistence of accepting foreign cultural values encourages revival of the feelings of national, regional, ethnic and territorial belonging. Thus, the revived nations seek their place under the sun, in the new global world. Therefore, the main conclusion would be, that, nowadays, in the era of global communication, we can respect the peoples' cultural values, but only by cherishing and respecting our own. For, if we forget our roots and accept only imposed values, then, a subtle assimilation will take place.

Each technology novelty and media development is dictated by market forces, not national identities. Also, it is the ideology of the media globalisation, characteristic of the large media

corporations. Thus, as early as 1980, Saatchi & Saatchi global advertising and marketing company spoke of the worldwide cultural convergence, claiming that convergences in demography and behaviour, as well as in common cultural elements, create a favourable climate for accepting a particular product. Then, what was listed as examples were the *Dynasty* series, the *Dallas* soap opera, *Star Wars*, MTV (Music TV) and CNN as a global information system.

However, despite such aspirations for the global standardisation, the media were compelled to make compromises in the myths of globalisation. CNN, regarded as the ideal model of global television, is increasingly facing accusations that its corporate identity is too American, and, therefore, its credibility as a global news source is also disputed.

Due to all previously stated, it can be concluded that it is difficult to balance between the logic of globalisation and localisation, and, [yet](#), to respond to market pressures. The local must be considered as part of the global; thus, cultural globalisation should be replaced by the term "glocalisation", a blend word of globalisation and local (Robertson, 1995: 145).

Consequently, we cannot just talk about globalisation, thereto neglecting all other words that determine identity, culture, language, and belonging in any sense. Therefore, it can be concluded that global culture is not a firmly defined, a definitively defined phenomenon. Cultural globalisation, also, prevents equating the national state with the national society by creating intercultural ways of life and communication. It can best be illustrated by the so-called mixed marriages.

Robertson's analyses of the glocal cultures are continued by [Appadurai](#), who speaks of ethno-landscapes or people's landscapes, as tourists, immigrant refugees, asylum seekers, gastarbeiters, and other moving groups that mark the changeable world we live in. It is these communities that contribute to a non-fully uniforming and rejecting global cultures. This flow of images and landscapes poses the question of the traditional differences between the centre and the periphery (Appadurai, 1996: 296–300).

In this regard, radio and television have played a particularly important role. Its greatest merit, globally, is maintaining the diversity of cultures. Nearly thirty years ago, an increased broadcasting activity in the regions of the so-called small nations in Europe was noticed. In the applications for European Union's support for such tendencies, certain television programmes are required in non-standard European languages. In such programmes, the support criteria are not based on standard viewing criteria or according to the percentage of the population, nor are based on the economic parameters. Naturally, programmes are produced, in which the cultures of all nations dominate, with all their specifics.

Yet, according to Appadurai, the equalisation of the state, society and the local identities is lost in the global society, conquered by the strong tendencies of the glocalisation. Bauman, on the other hand, considers that in such a globalised society, the rich and the poor do not sit at the same table. Why is there no compassion in helping Africa and South America? Globalisation has divided the world's population into globally rich, which outstrip space and which have never enough time, and the locally poor, tied to space. The two aspects of Bauman consider that globalisation leads to polarisation of the poor and the rich. Thus, the citizen is captured within the borders of the national state, while the bourgeoisie is cosmopolitan. A good example of supranationalism is the regionalism in the European Union. The big nations – Germany, France and Spain are forced to mix, so we might say that there are many Europas, not just a single one. What globalisation implies in structural terms is the increase of transnational, international, macro-regional, national, micro-regional, municipal and local functional networks of corporations. The dialectic of the European unification meant that any member country could complain to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. (Bauman, 1998: 45). However, this does not mean that someone, for example, is less Irish or British, and more European.

II. The Future of National Identity In Global Society

Many consider global society as the end of the national state. However, history teaches us that no empire has retained its power. In this awoken world, a domination of a single force is not possible. The world can break the borders for economic, cultural and any other co-operation, yet no one should be asked for to forget their roots. Naturally, the thought of creating an imperialist power over all continents is utopian. Therefore, the reformation and reformulation of the political space is precisely with the intention to upgrade and protect the complex architectural appearance of independence and identity.

The transnational state may deny the national state, but it does confirm the state that recognises globality, as well as the state that uses globality to redefine the politics, not just of the state itself, but of the civil society, too. Hence, transnational states are global states that operate with their diversity, that are seen as part of the global society and that seek their position on the market. Therefore, globalisation is sometimes seen as a declaration of war (Americanisation, and imperialism) that brings us to the positions of threat to national identity. On the other hand, in the strong tendencies of the global processes, a redefinition of the political space can be identified, which strikes precisely on the foundations of the classical theories of statehood of its determination through territory, population and governing power.

The link between globalisation, transnational and nation-states can be analysed through several angles. Firstly, the classical notion of self-determination, binding only to one's own nation and limited to a certain territory (a nation-state), is almost impossible (due to the great flow of people, ideas and communication). Many of the economic, social, cultural and environmental forces which determine the political dynamics are outside the domain of the independent decision-making of the states. Secondly, national governments, once a symbol of power and sovereignty, have an already established networking on regional and global levels (for example, the European Union members voluntarily transfer some of their sovereign rights to the Union). In other words, political power is negotiated at different levels. The classical understanding of the sovereignty of a state bound to a single territory and population is overcome, since globalisation connected even states internationally (Keohane, 2001: 1–13). The power of the national governments is changeable, i.e. sovereign governance over some population and a territory has not completely disappeared, yet has changed drastically. Improving the public good requires coordinated action at many levels (treating environmental problems, security issues, and preventing international crime). States affiliated in international organisations seek solutions to all these general human problems, regardless of religion, race, and gender, because, at present, all people need to understand that, above all, we are inhabitants of the planet Earth and we need to behave friendly towards it. The negative attitude towards this issue faces humanity with enormous consequences (global warming and climate change). On the other hand, on daily basis, governments around the world face fight against international illegal drug trade, nuclear waste management and use of non-renewable resources. These questions are borderless, and, therefore, cannot be treated as an internal problem of a single state. What is more, the interests of the large corporations, investment regimes and regulation of financial markets, in the context of the global division of labour, raise the issue of the effectiveness of the national economic policies. In fact, in this interconnectedness of networks and interests, no government can remain intact by the intense cross-border regulations. Waldron explains all these policies as circumstances of cosmopolitanism, not only because we cannot survive by ourselves, but because mutual interconnection is to grow even more. In such a situation, the need to consider the possibility of common standards and political action is understandable (Waldron, 2000: 236).

In the context of all these processes, the significance of democracy at the national level changes, too. It should be accepted that the influence of the large corporations is enormous, even on the powerful states, let alone the smaller ones that fight for their own survival in the global world.

However, it is precisely these processes that we have already established that strongly influence national identities should motivate smaller peoples to self-survive. Naturally, everyone can feel as them themselves being a part of the global community, in which, if they possess knowledge, skills and other qualifications, they can fight for their own lives, yet never forgetting where they came from and who they really are. Otherwise, there is no greater threat to a nation. Normally, cosmopolitanism, which, as an idea, is very old, should not be opposed to the national ideas. In fact, the Stoics are considered to be the first cosmopolitans. They developed the idea that we live in two worlds – the local world, given to us by birth, and another one, wider and larger than the local. The primary world of every person is the local community; the community of human ideals and aspirations, too. The other world is fundamental for all, and it is intelligence and humanity (Nussbaum, 1997: 30). The classical idea of cosmopolitanism implies that every person is a "citizen of the world" and has duties to the global community of human beings. Not with standing, the modern territorial state was not built by just one generation, so no one should expect that changes geared toward global transformations will take place in a shorter period of time. Only if we accept the global and local at this level, we can exchange ideas and goods. Otherwise, imposing force, in terms of different cultures and values, can not only lead to cultural homogenisation, but to assimilation, as well. In this awoken world, that cannot be possible.

Conclusion

Despite the different concepts of globalisation, it can still be stated that there is a kind of consensus when it comes to traditional values, such as peace, economic prosperity, human rights and the protection of the environment. On the other hand, the media are constantly attacking these values, because news is full of terrorism, extremism and produce frightening messages in general.

Yet, globalisation would undoubtedly be impossible without the appropriate technical and technological progress, which causes a reduction of the differences among the economic, political and information systems. If previously we used to talk about a gap between the rich and the poor, nowadays, that gap, most openly, is reflected on the media literate and on the media illiterate; even the development and the progress of a country are measured according to its use of the Internet. Hence, the vision of a cosmopolitan aspect, today, is not only possible, but also necessary, yet only if it relies on the principle of co-operation, and in no case on the principle of assimilation.

In pluralistic societies, such as ours, the dominant cultural values often face other value norms. People love those norms that result from the common ones. The freedom of constraints lies in our desire and opportunity to practice and accept new examples, with the sole purpose of challenging and rejecting old models and accepting new ones.

The media, as well as mass communication, become the basic forum for debate and discussion in the multicultural dialogue. Opinion is shaped and set by the most courageous in expression of opinion. The question then arises: what holds that power – the media, or the public? If it is the media that holds the power, then honesty and responsibility should be demanded, which is very difficult to accomplish if ownership interests are taken into account. On the other hand, if priority is given to the public, then one should look at the individuals as critical thought persons. Thus, the forum will be as good and honest as every single participant is.

References

- Appadurai, A. (1990) "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy, in M. Featherstone, *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity: A Theory Culture and Society Special Issue*, 7(2-3), 295-310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026327690007002017>
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge University Press

-
- Keohane, O. R. (2001) "Governance in a partially globalized world." *American Political Science Review*, 95:1-13.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997) *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*, Harvard University Press
- Robertson, R. (1995) "Globalization" in M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson. *Global Modernities*. Eds. London:
- Robins, K. (1991) "Tradition and Translation: National Culture and its Global Context", in J. Corner and S. Harvey. *Enterprise and Heritage: Crosscurrents of National Culture*. Ed. London
- Ramonet, I. (1997) *Le Monde diplomatique*, Fortune: April
- Rosenau, N. J. (1990) *Turbulence in World Politics*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf
- Wallerstein, I. (1983) "Klassenanalyse und Weltsystemanalyse" in R. Kreckel, *Soziale Ungleichheiten, Soziale Welt*. Ed. special issue 2. Gottingen
- Waldron, J. (2000) "What is cosmopolitan" *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Volume 8, 227-243