

# GLOBALISATION

*Andy O'Kain*

7 March 2007

## Part 1

I'm going to speak today about a topic hopefully, probably well, hopefully probably you've all come across the word certainly if you've been in England for a while, but pretty much anyone else in the world, the word, globalisation, is this the word you've heard, come across, perhaps there's a slightly different word in your culture. But it's a process that has been identified I suppose within broadly the economic, social scientific field, let's say over the past 20 or so years. Now the problem with such a term is, it's used by lots of different people to explain lots of different things. So, when the planes flew into the World Trade Centre in New York, people think, *ah! that's globalisation*. When the stock market in China last week started going down, *ah! that's globalisation*. It seems to be used, it's a bit like global warming, you know, everything is globalisation, oh what is that then? it has become a kind of easy, kind of an explanation, a bit of a catch-all phrase. And when you are try to pin it down, it becomes a bit elusive and it starts moving around. So, it's a hot topic, but actually one of the hot topics in globalisation is 'what is it?' What do we mean when we use this word, and can we use it usefully to make sense of the way that societies work?

Hopefully you've got two kinds of handout. One like this, *sorry I am trailing a cable*, which is the lecture, one with a kind of couple of groovy pictures on, if you haven't, the diagrams are up here if you need one, perhaps we can just pass them around. All right, I'm aware that time is pressing, so I'm going to kind of give you a lecture in the kind of style that you would have in the traditional lecture theatre setting. And at the end, hopefully you might have some questions, I did give Colin some reading that perhaps he has handed out hopefully, which was a kind of rough introduction to some of the debates. What I'm going to do today, we've only got kind of 40 minutes or so. I'm not going to kind of crack the nut as it were, we are not going to solve the problem of globalisation today, but what hopefully I will do is introduce you to some of the key arguments, so you will have a kind of vocabulary to take away with you. That you will recognise what other people are talking about when they talking about globalisation. So, let's get going.

It's not reacting very fast, but it is going to happen, come on, right. Ah ha! there we go, that's working now. Right, this is from, well it's always good to start with a definition I think. There are many when you are looking into the globalisation literature, lots and lots of these things. You might go to the Oxford English Dictionary, and you will find one definition. You might go into a particular academic book and find a different version. The kind of definition I think that we need is something quite broad, because we are describing a broad set of processes. And so here is one from Walters - it's on your handout, so you don't need to necessarily write this out - but Walters talks about *a social process, in which constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding*. All right, so it's this kind of feeling

that the world - I hesitate to say it - but the world is getting smaller, or a recent book published in this area was called 'The world is flat'. Somehow we more interconnected than we used to be, and this is something important.

Well, ok, that's one. But also presented as an idea - sorry if a few people cannot get through there - this is from key theorist in this area, a man called David Held who writes a lot about globalisation, and he says the globalisation isn't just about power moving away from us, which is often the way that globalisation is portrayed, that somehow we within our countries or within our localities are less able to influence the world because we are so aware now our lives are so tied up with - let's say the Chinese stock market, or let's say kind of food production in certain areas in the world. That we are so linked in, we feel that how can we make changes, that affect us when power has moved away from us. Well, David Held says globalisation isn't just power moving away from you, it's also power coming down to you in certain aspects. He talks about globalisation being a spatial phenomenon, best understood as, sorry best understood as spatial phenomenon, lying on a continuum, with the local at one end and the global at the other. So, the way we are kind of conditioned to think, is that we are members of a nation state, I suppose. That our fundamental identity, is shaped by our national identity. Well, that's a traditional way of thinking. It's actually quite a modern way of thinking. Most people didn't think like this before the Treaty of Westphalia - don't worry about that - but this was a document in 1648. When we kind of traced generally, the rise of modern nation states, and national identity with it. But now we are becoming aware of more than just national identity. We are more aware of ethnic identity within nations. So that's why Held's talking about the local, as well as global. People are much more aware, if you go to Spain, if you're going to come across Catalan identity as being reasserted more than it used to be perhaps in the past, well certainly post Franco period - don't worry if you don't know who Franco was. So, that's what he is saying. It's not just a question of power moving away, it's coming down as well. People are demanding power at local level, so national governments, nation states governments are being hit by a double whammy, if you have come across that boxing phrase. They have been punched from kind of both sides. Power's been taken away from governments because of the national, sorry at the national level. And also people are demanding power to be pushed back down to the local level.

OK I will click on. Oh right, that wasn't meant to happen. All right, what I'm going to do is identify some of the key features that we need to look for if we were to say that globalisation exists as a real phenomenon, ok? In a minute, I'm going to present some of the different arguments. There are some people that refuse to accept globalisation is anything interesting at all although they write about it, so they must be slightly interested. But their argument is, they are against it as a concept.

## Part 2

Well, one of the first features that I supposed affect most of our experiences in our nation states is what we would call economic exchange and economic interdependence. I mentioned the Chinese stock market. I mean it's got a bit better today, if anybody here is Chinese, don't worry. But the idea is, you know, if the economy starts rumbling in a certain part of the world - the most famous

example of this was the South East Asian economies in the late 1990s, Thailand and various places like that. Their economy starts stumbling. Their stock market started going down. This had a knock on an affect not just in that region, but elsewhere around the world. People in New York were worried. Because Western countries have invested so heavily into these different countries, pension funds are invested in countries around the world. So, it's not just the future of Thailand, let's say, that's decided on the Thai stock market, it's the future of pensioners in, well, let's say Reading who've got their interests tied up there too.

Ok, on your handout, I've got a kind of a chart which may look a kind of a bit like a, well, not very attractive, but this is a chart of values, and I suppose one of the real challenges facing a global world, is the clash of cultures. And many globalisation theorists would point to changing values. Now it's hard for us to locate ourselves in history, but we are at a particular time of massive change, the kind of period we are living through is one of the most interesting times in history, I suspect, when people look back and write about it. I'll show you some figures towards the end that will show the scale of the change that we are encountering. But perhaps you lot are the evidence of this kind of change you know. You are examples of globalisation to some extent. That you are here in Reading kind of listening to me, why are you doing it?

I know, because we are part of the global economy. I would explain what these mean, but many theorists worry about kind of clash of traditional culture, perhaps we are seeing that in the kind of problems with fundamentalisms, clashing around the world or identities clashing. We are going to look at some evidence to decide what's happening to particular values. One of the values we are going to look at is self-expressive values. People are becoming much more individually-minded. They are thinking about themselves and they want to tell you about themselves. This is fairly new. So the group mentality is breaking down to some extent.

Ok, we are culturally connected according to globalisation theorists in ways that previously we were not. Obviously the Internet would be a good example of this. Travel. You know you couldn't simply get on a plane and go to Australia a hundred years ago. It would take you months. That's very something we take for granted now. I'm sure you would all do too. You can travel around the world fairly cheaply and fairly quickly. This is stunningly new and yet we take it for granted. But also other issues, migration, refugees, mass migration of this kind. That might not be quite so welcome in various different parts of the world. So, challenges as well as opportunities are presented by Globalisation. It's a multi faceted idea and it poses threats as well as opportunities.

I've got a kind of, I came up with this term, but don't worry. A perception of being in this together. Globally, i.e. the best example I think would be global warming. I mean if this does exist, and 90% of the world's - I'm not scientist, so I'm not going to get into whys and wheres of global warming. But apparently, the U.N.'s recent committee on this decided that 90% of the scientists were fairly certain that something is happening. And it's of such a scale that something needs to be done about it. Well, there's no point in the government in Britain simply saying right, we are going to cut, whatever you need to cut, carbon emissions. It would need to be on a global level and people would have to a kind of do it in a global way. In a way that's never been done before. Governments

have a knack of not co-operating with each other internationally. So, if there is a problem that's not caused by one particular country, but is caused by everybody, then the only way to solve it is by everybody acting, perhaps. That's just one example.

And we've seen - and this is very tentative, but we have seen the development of rather unsatisfactory - but they are there - international spaces, political spaces like the U.N. and there are many criticisms of the U.N. but it is something again relatively new in world history, dates from the end of the Second World War. Some people argue it has been successful, some people are critical but does it offer a kind of model of a future world government? Is this something that is possible? Globalisation theorists argue about this, some say we should move towards a kind of global government model others argue vehemently against.

The E.U. interestingly, which we are in, although we don't use the Euro is actually probably the most advanced international or supra, s-u-p-r-a national body. i.e. I am a citizen of, well, I am not actually a citizen of Britain because I am a subject of the queen. But I am a citizen of the European Union and this means I have a common identity with someone from Greece, or somewhere like that - we share certain political rights which is new, very new. Perhaps this model could be extended to Africa, maybe South America - perhaps. As a way of overcoming economic difficulties, as a way of overcoming cultural and political difficulties.

Right, this is your map in beautiful techni-colour - it looks like a bad dream. But this is from a guy called Ronald Engelheart who works in America but he has been pretty much to most countries in the world, well, his survey has been everywhere. We are going to do a live experiment in a minute if we have time, and we are going to look at cultural values. But what he argues interestingly, is that with the Industrial Revolution which has spread. I think, was it last year that more people lived in cities than lived in the countryside so the Industrial Revolution is now won in terms of its overall effect. It is now - we are more city dwelling than we are country dwelling. For the first time in human history we live in artificial spaces created by us. He says that as people, as societies industrialize our attitudes change. That we become less interested in survival because we don't have to worry about it. I didn't have to go and catch my food this morning before I got up - before I got up? I didn't have to go and catch my food *after* I got up whereas in the past I suppose this may have been a concern. So food would have been high on your list of things to do that day, now you can just go and catch it at the supermarket.

### Part 3

Shelter would have been another concern. Now we have nice houses that seem to last quite a while and you don't necessarily have to think about them too much. So these basic needs have been overcome to some extent and I am going to say this - only in certain parts of the world, but large areas of the world have overcome these problems, and where these have been overcome people stop thinking about survival values and start thinking about 'oh, what kind of fish do I fancy tonight?'. In the past you would have whatever you caught. Now you go 'oh I fancy a bit of sea bass or, what's the one I had the other day? Tilapia- if I'd been living in England 50 years ago - Tilapia, what is that? Have a look in the supermarket, they are kind of big red things and apparently they are from

Jamaica or somewhere like this. But you know that's a kind of self-expressive value. I wouldn't - quality of life issues become much more important. When we go to the shops to buy clothes we are kind of thinking 'what will look nice?' rather than 'what will keep me warm' kind of thing. So we are moving from survival to self-expressive values and also he notes a shift from traditional values to secular rational values.

Now this is where most of the arguments occur because if you look at the most industrialized country on his list over here, the United States - well you can't really say they have gone to the top of the secular rational values, a country like Sweden has done that. But really, whether you believe him or not, it kind of boils down to whether you are going to give him a bit of leeway or not on this. I will explain what traditional values are at the end if I have a little bit of time. But kind of values than take authority, from tradition, from past ideas whereas secular, rational values are ideas that are based on evidence on what actually works and what can be proven.

Right, I will come back to this at the end, it's not come out as clearly as I had hoped. This is a magazine called 'Foreign Policy' magazine. I've tried to make it clearer on your map, but the idea is, and I did a bit of this, and was being sympathetic to Engleheart's ideas and if you do look at the ... this is the latest, this is the top 20 most globalised countries on earth. Have a look and see if your country is on there. Singapore apparently - anyone from Singapore here? No, well that's the most globalised economy or country in the world according to this survey. And the way they measure it, is they measure economic globalisation. How integrated is the economy into other worlds, how dependent is it on other countries' economies? And it looks at 'personal'. What they mean there is - what do Singaporean people do with themselves? Do they go travelling around the world? And apparently they do, quite a lot of them do this, they go all over the place. Lots of people go there too, so there's a kind of mixture, a melting pot, actually there's a teacher from Singapore. They're not so politically integrated which is the final one, but they are technologically integrated with the rest of the world.

Now Singapore of course is a very particular country, it's a fairly small place and it's at the hub of various trade routes so it's probably a bit idiosyncratic, which is a big word for a Wednesday morning. But, have a look if you can spell it of course in a dictionary. Don't worry about it if you don't. But the idea here is that if you do look at most of these countries and then look on the value map, that involves a bit of flipping, you will see that most of the globalised countries tend to be the ones with secular, rational, self-expressive values. Now there are links on the powerpoint presentation that I will send to Mr Campbell and he can make it available to you if you want to click through. Because there are quite a few different clicking things you can do on this - if they work of course.

Well I am just going to run through the various different positions. This slide isn't on your handout for the simple reason that it is just telling you what the 3 positions are. The 3 positions are presented in your handout, so don't worry. Basically with regards to globalisation there are 3 broad positions and a slight nuance within one of them. There are people that say that globalisation is happening, we are becoming one. We are becoming the same and they are split into two groups. The first group say 'this is great, human being all being together,

thinking similarly, sharing experiences, being dependent upon each other. Then there are the other lot who say 'God that's awful. I don't want to be dependent on that lot, I don't like them very much and it's a disaster because what we are doing is we are threatening our survival in this way. You have probably heard some of these arguments before. So I'll go into those in a second.

There are what we call the traditionalists, or the sceptics. Do you know what a sceptic is? Somebody who doesn't believe, somebody who doubts. They say 'hang on, there is no such thing as globalisation, it's all - another big word - hyperbole which is a good word for ... I should have spelt it on there, maybe look it up in a dictionary. It's all hot air, it's all nonsense and we'll come to them. Then finally there are the 'transformationalists' - that's a big long word, but luckily it's written on your sheet so you won't have to spell that one. And the transformationalists say 'something's happening but it could be good or bad depending on how we cope with it'. So the transformationalists - let's say they want to ride it like a horse. Have you ever seen in the Wild West where they ride a bucking bronco, that's globalisation, and the transformationalists are trying to stay on the horse, if that makes sense. That's from David Helder, don't worry too much about that.

Alright, one of the terms you might have heard is, anybody heard of this term 'the global village'? Yes, and I think that is the first time that globalisation comes up. It was from a guy called Marshall McLuhan, writing in Canada in the 1960/70's. He was looking towards, he was really talking about television at that time I suppose, and telephones. And he was impressed with the way there that people could use this technology just to talk to their neighbours, which of course gave them a fairly limited understanding of how the world works, but they could talk to people around the world and get a bigger picture. They could also see the images coming into their bedrooms or - it depends where you have got your telly of course - that tells you where mine is. Images coming into their living rooms is probably a better analogy, showing them that people live differently to them and then this, he thought would be a good idea. *Ah, right, people are different* but I can respect that, and this would develop a kind of, almost like a conversation between different peoples around the world explaining to others, overcoming difficulties between cultures.

#### **Part 4**

Here's a big word again 'inexorable', and inexorable means you can't stop it. It's a bit like those American movies where they are on a train - you must have seen one of these - 'Speed' is one of these isn't it? That's an inexorable process, they can't stop the - well they get on various things, there's a bus, then there's a train and the whole premise of it is you can't stop it. If you do - *Bang* that's an analogy you can't stop it, but you don't want to stop it according to these people because it is good, its inevitable. The British Prime Minister talks in this way you know. He says 'look, you can either get with it, go with globalisation, make your country open to other people investing blah, blah, blah, or you can close your mind and pretend it's not happening, but it's going to do you damage, it's going to do the country damage. So if you want your economy to grow the best thing to do is to accept globalisation as a fact.

I suppose, oh there's Mickey Mouse - now I put him up because I can't stand Mickey Mouse, but that's just me. Personal taste. The pessimists might point to Mickey Mouse and they might say 'yes, it's an inexorable process, you can't stop it'. So these are a fairly depressing bunch actually because they kind of say 'oh it's terrible, horrible, and we can't stop it and therefore we are all doomed - it's going to be a disaster. What do they mean? Well we are going to be all turned into Americans, ah, is this right? Maybe you've heard of this idea, you know, American imperialism, but cultural imperialism. America doesn't go around - I was going to say America doesn't go and invade places, but I won't say that. America generally doesn't go around and invading countries like British did - although the Iraq thing makes a bit of change. But they're very good, the Americans, at getting their culture out there, very successful. Hollywood films, rap music, well, any kind of music, you know. Television programmes. When you watch an episode of Friends, you are digesting a culture, a whole way of thinking about the world, ok?

Now, pessimists see this as bad. They don't want us all to be the same, think the same. They call it, some of them call it McDonaldisation, you know always terrible, you always terrible, you go on 'oliday, you just turn up in Saudi Arabia. You say 'what shall I have to eat, I know I'll have a burger, you know, rather than sampling the kind of culture that's there. Particularly in France, they have a backlash against this. There is a guy going around, throwing things through various different McDonalds, and he's a folk hero, you know, they love him because he is going to destroy these - McDonalds. And yet the French public actually want to eat there, so there's kind of contradiction going on. But some big word there, homogeneous, which means everybody becoming the same.

And it's bland and it's boring, this kind of global culture. You know, having to watch MTV on rotation, oh... There is some links there, and I've mentioned the concept of cultural imperialism, i.e. This is America, imposing its culture on everybody else. We all wear jeans. Who is wearing jeans here? Sorry, I am not actually, but you know, that's the idea of cultural imperialism, you know, we all end up wearing kind of baseball jackets, kind of Nike trainers, all that kind of stuff. And Coke, drinking Coke, you know, god, why do we do that? I've no idea.

Right, eh this is slightly in the wrong place, but well it's not really. Well it's in a right place, but it's just one slide out from where I wanted it to be, I don't know how they are jumped when I wasn't looking. But this is from an article I read a couple days ago, I thought I had to introduce it because this is the sceptic's evidence now. The people that don't think globalisation's happening, they are not pessimist, they are not optimist, they just don't believe it. They think actually power is largely still within the nation state. And it's the nation, your country, is where power lies and where the economy will grow. They point to things like this, look, this is 10% which means that everything that is yellow is still within your nation. So immigration, very small, phone call revenues - people mostly phone within their own country, management research, direct investment, private charity, management cases, patents, portfolio investment. Only trade has got up to a kind of significant figure. Roughly 25% of trade around the world is global, between countries. But that still leaves 75% of trade within countries. Now this will differ, but that, there is some evidence there. I presented it - because I don't

agree with this - but I presented it to be fair and to be academic, if you get my point. That is - that will be on the power point presentation.

## Part 5

We are quickly going to have to do this. This is a kind of experiment and when you have experiments they don't always work. But I am going live on to the internet now and hopefully it will work. It's kind of saying 'oh don't do this to me - oh there we go'. We have passwords everywhere in this university - and that's not mine. It's going to ask me for another 5 in a minute. This is a website called 'The World Value Survey' and it's great because - the link's on there- these are questions asked of people around the world, all I am going to do is I am going to take a few risks - if it will let me on .... Well look at this it's just terrible. Name me a country, and I will tell you what people in that country think. Where are you from sir? Oman - hopefully that's there. Please be there Oman, oh God no, no Oman. Any Chinese, can I do China? That's there, I saw that last night, China's there. Denmark, Egypt, anybody from Egypt? - Saudi Arabia - that's there, that should be there. There we go, Saudi Arabia is there. Let's do uhm ... any others? Let's do Britain, O.K. once you have done that's fine, there we go. Go back up to the top actually, and you go across. It's all fairly straightforward but if anybody wants to do this I can send a link. And this kind of shows you what people think about their national identity, and I can tell you that, here we go, that was done live and here we go we've got a graph straight away.

Right, so in China most people are blue - that doesn't mean that people are actually blue - that means that most people in China, and actually quite a high percentage, something like 55% of people in China feel that their most important identity is to be Chinese. So that's the most important thing to them. Quite a lot of them, 25% say that their local region in China, sorry their locality not their region, their particular kind of local area is more important to them than being Chinese, a little bit less the region. But look here, that says not many Chinese people consider the most important aspect of them is to be Asian. That's less important than being Chinese and hardly any of them, well 3 to 4% say that they are citizens of the world. Does anybody here see themselves as a citizen of the world. Well that's telling.

In Great Britain it's a bit different; look - people are less likely to say national identity much more likely to say the locality but more of them and that would be what we would expect, more of them are seeing themselves as citizens of the world. Something like 10% of British people would see themselves as citizens of the world. You can do all sorts of exciting things with this data and there is loads of stuff on there. They ask you questions about whether you would be happy living next door to somebody from, I don't know, Germany and you would be shocked and appalled at some of the responses that people give. But anyway - 'what do you think of women' and these kind of things. That was - it worked. Saudi Arabia, similar to China actually isn't it, iways. But more people seeing themselves as part of the global trend. Right, hopefully I can get back - right O.K. that did work.

And traditionalists or sceptics would point to that, that is the kind of evidence they would use. They look - people don't feel global, they feel national largely, their national identity is the most important. But I showed you the evidence

earlier, that economic power is usually national. This is a famous guy called Anthony Smith – I’ll be rushing a bit now – who argued that we are still far from even mapping out the kind of global culture and cosmopolitan ideal that will truly supersede a world of nations. So he says it is not happening, and there is a little radio programme you can listen to there but we won’t do that now because that is half an hour long, and that would be stupid. But if you want to you can click on to that and it will take you onto a radio programme all about – on the Internet – all about their view.

And finally the transformationalist lists. They say that globalisation is a contingent process, i.e. it doesn’t have to happen so it’s not inexorable it’s contingent upon certain things happening. So certain behaviour that governments put forward, certain policies, certain attitudes of , you know. Whether you choose to travel or whether you decide to stay at home could be to do with economic conditions. If the stock market in America goes ‘woops’ well that will probably affect all of us and it might kind of limit our ability to travel so much. You know if we had not got so much money, if planes are more expensive then we can’t travel, there we go.

## Part 6

They point to the fact, and I showed you the British example that people are starting to see themselves more ‘cosmopolitanly’, i.e. as people who are citizens of the world rather than national citizens. They argue that the nation is still important but it’s being ‘hollowed out’ i.e. some of its functions are moving. So economic policy is moving to the World Trade Organisation. Lots of our governments, many of your governments are members of the World Trade Organisation and this organisation makes implements rules – well, makes rules and implements them - which shape our policies and our economic policies with other countries, this has important effects for all of us. I am not going into the ins and outs of that now but it is important.

We’ve got what we call ‘indiginisation’ now that’s a big word but it means that cultural imperialism – when we watch ‘Friends’ or we watch an American programme we understand it in our ways and link it to our own cultures. So that we don’t just swallow it whole and say ‘Yes, I’m an American’ we kind of react to it. We might wear jeans but we wear them in a slightly different way to Americans. We might listen to some American music but we might not buy the ideas and the ideals of America. And also here could be responses - I picked up on Al Quaeda - by various different groups who may express a response to the undermining of traditional ways of living which challenge globalisation and also use globalisation to challenge it. I mean the Al Quaeda attacks were examples of using global technology to undermine globalisation. Here are examples of indigitisation – has anybody been to a KFC in China? That’s in Beijing I think. Do you eat the same things that you eat in Britain though? ‘You don’t eat chicken sorry.’ I’ve been told though I’ve never been to a KFC in China but apparently you can get noodles there and things like this. But the food is adapted slightly to the local culture. So when you get a MacDonalds in India you get lamb burgers instead, or if you go to – you get the point. People are adapting it to suit their own kind of needs. They are not consuming it in quite the same way. Here is an example – I saw this picture and I thought that’s ironic. There’s a guy here, a Palestinian young guy wearing an Arsenal tee shirt whilst kind of challenging

western values at the same time. So a kind of multi-dimensional process going on. Therefore you can't understand it in one way, it's too complicated to understand it in that way. That's why transformationalists say it's very contingent and you have to adapt to each circumstance, each particular circumstance.

Oh and there's Neckar Cola, has anybody drunk that? Neckar Cola this is a kind of anti Coco Cola cola which is produced - sorry? Yes it's a company in Britain but they sell them around the world. It is run by some kind of Islamic guys.

Right - we are nearly finished now I am just going to sum up. I just wanted to show this, to show that, just to reinforce the scale of change that this world is undergoing at the moment. This is a chart taken from the United Nations which shows world population and it shows what's happened in a very short period of time. There are lots more of us than there have ever been before and we are expanding at a vast rate. Mostly to do with clean water supplies, that's the big thing. But we live in a really idiosyncratic time, a very special time. A kind of time that's never been experienced before and of course this poses challenges. There's the world population there, it's going to go up you know to, well predicted to top 10 billion by the year 2150. There's a lot more of us than there has ever been. We are putting a bigger strain on resources than ever before. So what do we conclude then? Well I am going to say, and the evidence that I am drawing on here is in the handout I gave you earlier, last week or whatever. That Giddens is right, Anthony Giddens's position that the transformationalist position. That globalisation is definitely - something's happening, and it's something important and it's something different to what has happened before. That the scale of global, particularly in that piece, he points to the scale of global economic or financial movements. The sheer size of the movements around the world is so vast and our economies so interlinked that we have to talk about this as something new. That no government can turn its back on globalisation and expect to do well.

So therefore I am going to say especially economically, technologically, and communicatively, we are being globalised. The proviso is that politically I'm not so sure. So you might want to put a proviso there, politically a big question mark - what does the U.N. do? However there were two implications of globalisation. One is this possibility, this hope - shared cultural, economic spaces that we can all enjoy, communicate, express our identities in a kind of 'value added' way, but also we are experiencing the second aspect a reaction - and this is happening in countries that are industrialized as well as those that aren't. So in America you are getting traditional movements reacting against globalisation, a reaction into localised resistant identities. People who don't want to be global, who don't want their way of life to change, who don't want to have to kind of ride globalisation. I will stop there, thank you for listening to me.