

formed by a South American band at a
 ian, and the more mundane experiences
 is as Irish bagels, Chinese tacos, Kosher
 it of such hybrids is long and growing
 . The contrast, of course, would be such
 burgers in the United States, quiche in

y related to glocalization is *creolization*.
 people of mixed race, but it has been
 ion of language and culture involving a
 res that were previously unintelligible to
 the Cajun cooking associated with the
 ix of various racial and ethnic groups) is
 example, the famous Cajun jambalaya
 ght to the area by the Spaniards with a
 nts, especially the substitution of a wide
 ound Louisiana for meat and sausage.
 be made in this context of Arjun
Cultural Dimensions of Globalization
 d the disjunctures among them.⁷⁴ These
 realities around the world; they tend
 adurai discusses five global flows (or
flows of people), *mediascapes* (media
flows), *financescapes* (flows of money
ideoscapes (flows of ideas). The use of
 i to communicate the idea that these
 variable shapes and are therefore con-
 ation and not homogenization. The fact
 pes and that they operate independently
 l are perhaps even in conflict with one
) in tune with those that emphasize cul-
 urthermore, these scapes are interpreted
 ng all the way from individuals to face-
 , multinational corporations, and even
 ultimately navigated by individuals and
 jective interpretations of them. In other
 ,"⁷⁵ and those doing the imagining can
 to those who live in and traverse them.
 ose in control and their imaginings, this
 rely live in, or pass through, them the
 bvert them.

All of the above concepts—glocalization, hybridization, creolization, and scapes—should give the reader a good feel for what is being discussed here under the heading of cultural hybridization.

While this book is shaped by a variety of inputs from globalization theory, it is especially framed by the cultural paradigms, in particular cultural convergence and cultural hybridization. Its starting point is the hegemony of the latter paradigm, especially its primary idea of glocalization and the associated notion of heterogeneization. It is undoubtedly the case that glocalization is not only a reality, but an important one in the world today, and that it is associated with continued global heterogeneization. However, it seems to me that the cultural hybridization paradigm, and the concepts of glocalization and heterogeneization, tell only part of the story. The cultural convergence paradigm also has considerable utility and validity in thinking about globalization. While there is certainly continuing heterogeneization, and undoubtedly even new forms of heterogeneity, it is clear that there are also powerful forces leading to at least some increasing homogenization in the world. Similarly, just as glocalization is a useful idea, there is a need for another concept (to be developed below and throughout this book) to parallel it and to help us better understand globalization in general, and homogenization in particular. In sum, what is needed is not a choice between the cultural convergence and the hybridization paradigms but the integration of the two—the use of *both* to offer a better understanding of globalization in general.⁷⁶

→ Glocalization and Grobalization

It is clear that the concept of glocalization gets to the heart of what many contemporary theorists and analysts interested in globalization think about the essential nature of transplanetary processes.⁷⁷ They all recognize that there is much more to globalization than that, but glocalization is often the pivot around which much of their thinking and empirical research revolves. However, as has been made clear above, there is a need for another concept (and perhaps much else that, e.g., encompasses cultural differentialism) that, together with glocalization, would give a more balanced view of globalization, that would represent *both* cultural convergence and cultural hybridization. That concept is grobalization, coined here for the first time as a much-needed companion to the notion of glocalization. *Grobalization* focuses on the imperialistic ambitions of nations, corporations, organizations, and the like and their desire, indeed need, to impose themselves on various geographic areas.⁷⁸ The main interest of the entities involved in grobalization is in seeing their

power, influence, and in many cases profits *grow* (hence the term *globalization*) throughout the world. Globalization involves a variety of subprocesses—Americanization and McDonaldization,⁷⁹ as well as capitalism. They, and others, are central driving forces in globalization, and they are of particular interest to me.

Theoretical Orientation

Globalization and glocalization are rooted in competing visions of the contemporary world. Globalization is a modern view emphasizing the growing worldwide ability of, especially, largely capitalistic organizations and modern states⁸⁰ to increase their power and reach throughout the world. Two of the preeminent modern theories—those of Karl Marx and Max Weber (and of their followers)—undergird this perspective. While Marx focused on the capitalistic economic system, Weber was concerned with the rationalization of not only the economy but many other sectors of society in the modern world. Both capitalism and rationalization were products of the Western world, and both were aggressively exported to the rest of the world, largely in the 19th and 20th centuries and to this day. That is, it could be argued that both have been, and are, examples of globalization.

Marxian (and neo-Marxian) theory leads to the view that one of the major driving forces behind globalization is the corporate need in capitalism to show increasing profitability through more, and more far-reaching, economic imperialism. At first, the expansionism is internal to a given nation, but as profit limits are reached, or profits even begin to erode, there is great pressure to expand to other nations. Many of the firms that succeeded in becoming international presences in the 20th century have become global businesses in the early 21st century. Another driving force is the need for corporations and the states and other institutions (media, education) that buttress them to support efforts at enhancing profitability by increasing their cultural hegemony nationally and ultimately throughout the world. Thus, from this perspective, the need for (especially) American corporations to show ever-increasing profits, and the related and supporting need of the United States and American institutions to exert ever-increasing cultural hegemony, goes to the core of globalization. American corporations aggressively export commodities for their own profit, and the nation as a whole is similarly aggressive in the exportation of its ideas (e.g., free market, democracy) in order to gain hegemony over other nations, not only for its own sake but for the increased ability to market goods and services that such hegemony yields. Of special interest today are the various consumer systems, the “cathedrals of consumption” or “new means of

cons
now
ism h
must
those
capit
How
this,
natic
the l
other
lead
a sin
grob
and
Th
grob
ubiq
throu
sump
Weber
cient
soon
the p
recen
of co
they
“grol
tures
e.g.,
foun
acqui
them
and h
cienc
the U
ducti
struct
of the
W
tradit

profits *grow* (hence the term *globalization*) involves a variety of subprocesses—*globalization*,⁷⁹ as well as capitalism. They, and *globalization*, and they are of particular

are rooted in competing visions of the world. It is a modern view emphasizing the role of socially, largely capitalistic organizations in the world—power and reach throughout the world. These theories—those of Karl Marx and Max Weber—undergird this perspective. While Marx focused on the capitalist system, Weber was concerned with the rationalization of society in many other sectors of society in which rationalization were products of the system that were exported to the rest of the world, and to this day. That is, it could be seen as examples of *globalization*.

Every theory leads to the view that one of the driving forces of *globalization* is the corporate need in capitalism to expand through more, and more far-reaching, expansionism is internal to a given system. When profits even begin to erode, there are pressures on other nations. Many of the firms that were successful in the 20th century have become successful in the 21st century. Another driving force is the need for American and other institutions (media, education) to support efforts at enhancing profitability by expanding internationally and ultimately throughout the world. The need for (especially) American corporations to export profits, and the related and supported American institutions to exert ever-increasing influence to the core of *globalization*. American corporations, for their own profit, and the need to be successful in the exportation of its ideas (e.g., American culture) gain hegemony over other nations, not least the increased ability to market goods and services. The special interest today are the various forms of "new means of consumption" or "new means of

consumption" mentioned above (also, see below), that the United States is now exporting to the rest of the world.⁸¹ They reflect the fact that capitalism has come to learn that it is not enough to export its products, but it also must *globalize* consumerism and create and support the desire to consume those products. Of course, the United States was never alone in any of this; capitalism has thrived in many countries, and they too sought to *globalize*. However, the United States, especially its corporations, took the lead in this, and while it has been supplanted in many areas of production by other nations (e.g., Japan and consumer electronics and automobiles), it retains the lead in the *globalization* of its cathedrals of consumption, as well as other mechanisms (credit, advertising, marketing, branding), designed to lead people throughout the world to consume in a similar way, and to a similar degree, as do Americans. This is reflected, for example, in the *globalization* of such consumption giants as Wal-Mart, Disney, McDonald's, and Visa and MasterCard.

The second modern theoretical perspective informing our views on *globalization* is the Weberian tradition that emphasizes the increasing ubiquity of rationalized structures and their growing control over people throughout the world, especially, given our interests, in the sphere of consumption. One of the defining characteristics of rationalization is efficiency. Weber saw the 19th- and early 20th-century bureaucracy as a highly efficient organizational structure, and in the realm of production it was soon joined by the assembly line, which greatly increased the efficiency of the production process. Both forms have, of course, been *globalized*. More recent is the creation and dramatic expansion of highly efficient cathedrals of consumption—McDonald's and Wal-Mart are good examples—and they too have been *globalized*. The Weberian approach attunes us to the "global" spread of these rationalized structures. That is, rationalized structures have a tendency to replicate themselves throughout the world (through, e.g., global organizations emulating successful others wherever they may be found⁸²), and those nations that do not have them are generally eager to acquire them. That is, they *globalize* both because of a desire to export them to other parts of the world in order to enhance profits and influence and because other nations are anxious to acquire them and the greater efficiencies that they bring with them. While American corporations, indeed the United States as a whole, can be seen as highly rationalized in both production and consumption, there are, as we will see, many other rationalized structures not only in the United States but increasingly throughout much of the world.

While modern theories like those associated with the Marxian and Weberian traditions are closely linked to the idea of *globalization*, *glocalization* is