GLOBALIZATION AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE TECHNO-*CULTURAL* ECONOMY FOR *THE DEVELOPING NATIONS*

OKEKE V.O.S PhD

Faculty of social sciences, Department of political science

Anambra State University, Nigeria

Ohiaegbu Prince Chiemezue
Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Eme Okechukwu Innocent
Department of Public Administration and Local Government Studies
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Abstract: T*his paper in its contribution to the debate on how globalization impinge on culture, envisions a techno-cultural political economy. It argues that it is a priori analytically more helpful seeing culture and technology as domains not separable from politics and economics in the analysis of globalism. The sociological implication of globalisation for both nations and their nationals, it posits, is that both are categorised according to the place they occupy in the production process in the techno-cultural economy, either as producers, or consumers. Finally, the paper concluded by noting that developing nations` engagement with globalisation has the prepotency to displace them from the developmental landscape upon which their civilization was to be built.*

KEY WORDS: Globalization, Culture, inequity, Politics, Technology, techno-cultural economy,domination.

Introduction/Problematique/Conceptual Framework

> *The information arm of international commerce's sprawling body reaches out and touches distinct nations and parochial cultures, and gives them a common face chiseled in Hollywood, on Madison Avenue, and in Silicon Valley. ... What is the power of the Pentagon compared with Disneyland? Can the Sixth Fleet keep up with CNN?."McDonald's in Moscow and Coke in China will do more to create a global culture than military colonization ever could"* (Barber (1992, p. 58) in Jihad vs. McWorld,")... *the notion of an authentic culture as an autonomous internally*

coherent universe is no longer sustainable [in either the First or the Third Worlds,] except perhaps as a 'useful fiction' or as a revealing distortion.(Renato Rosaldo (1989)*"Whether or not there is a desire for hegemony, the greatest danger of imperialism is in the cultural sphere."*(Claude Nicolet, according to Jean Tardif (2002) in *"The Hidden Dimensions of Globalization:What is at Stake Geoculturally).*

Questions about the impact of globalization on culture, and the imperatives of technology have entailed casting ideological/normative commitment either way (is globalization good or bad? destructive of the local and so on).This are not just the subject of an academic discourse, or a kind of intellectual jousting of absorbing interests to the protagonists but of only passing interests to the spectators.At the end of the debate, the apparent victor in the argument and the broad conclusions that the spectators draw, will crucially affect decisions in the real world. It cannot help but affect policy choices made in the future by nation-states about what we eat, what we drink, what we wear, how we travel, and what we travel with, who produces these ,and who affords them.

Put differently, culture and technology are functional for the reproduction of global capitalism in much the same way as states are crucial to maintaining the competitive dynamic essential to the survival of the world-economy. Thus,because we are living in a world where the techno-cultural imperatives of globalization pervades all the ramifications of human life and compresses the political, economic and socio-cultural space in the process, culture and technology should not be made to play second fiddle in any discourse on globalism. As such virtually all countries in the world, if not all parts of their territory, and all segments of their society, have become part of the larger global system in a way as the 'culture of globalization' and 'globalization of culture' strives towards 'deterritorialization' and're-territorialization' of political and economic power. The consequent new patterns of global stratification is such that some states, societies and communities are enmeshed in the global order whereas others are marginalized. Globalization and its culture as well as mass mediated technology are among the most viable instrument of this new patterns of global stratification.

Thus, since capitalism itself is a cultural form (or forms) embedded in liberalism as both theory and practice,it is, therefore, only a moot point if the socio-political nature of technology and culture are not means-ends to the pursuit of political and/or economical interests .He who says postmodernity makes the cultural economic at the same time as it turns the economic into myriad forms of culture says the obvious.

At least we can hypothetically make a case of a notion of culture that is more complex and not just a by-product or a mere signifier of a locality. Thus, what is called communication technology is perhaps the most exemplary case of technology turning into ideology through its interference in daily life and its impact on the mode of production and exchange of commodity. In other words new communication technologies are making a quantum leap in the generation and imposition of ideologies. While pre-existing trends towards the commodification of social life continue, political changes have made this possible- a possibility explained by the fact that cultural factors and aesthetics too have assumed a growing significance, not only in matters of political display, but also as registers of power and interest.

Joining in this renewed interest in the cultural dominant of the logic of contemporary society where only an industrial and commercial understanding of culture is nolonger analytically helpful, this article presents a more nuanced and credible picture of how the distinction between culture and economics has all but dissolved. To show how culture seeps into everything and everything subject to the cultural logic of commodification(a sort of guise of market ideology) on the one hand, and addresses the axiom that globalization has generated a social conduct ("culture") buoyed by power of technology, on the other hand , we shall, in this paper, elaborate on some propositions. One of these propositions may be regarded as a null hypothesis which is presented as a counter-factual to the other hypotheses. These propositions are outlined below:

❖ The autonomous instrumentalist status of culture and technology requires imposing a new culture or a superior ideology and social structure if globalization were to be a social fact;

❖ Culture is constitutive of global social relations defined as global flows, networks, interactions and connections not just a signifier of place or, a property of place.

❖ Cultural embededness underscores how economic transactions can be understood as cultural objects;

❖ Globalization tends to widen Inequality among individuals and societies

Globalization and World Culture

The 'hyper-globalist' defines the contemporary world in terms of economic globalization and the end of nation state, whereas the 'skeptics' view the whole debate about culture of globalization in terms of a cliché**.** For instance, from the reactionary ontology as it affects the developing nations, it can be graphically demonstrated that while globalization can in some cases, be a positive cultural and political force for some societies, in many cases, the varied potential gains in their engagement with it reduces globalization to mundane adaptations to increasingly oppressive market conditions. In the face of the variation of its effect, in each case,

globalization has a different meaning. For instance, in international marketing terminology, it can be seen as a new strategic weapon in building niche markets. In all cases, however, globalization is mediated, that is, translated via a communicative process dovetailed to particular agendas.

As such critics of globalization contend that globalization can be variously articulated, hegemonically or progressively depending on the forces shaping the local spaces where its different forms manifest. In other words, in its myriad historical, rhetorical, empirical and textual dimensions and manifestations, globalization can, therefore, be discoursed either from the progressive, or the reactionary ontology .For instance, George Mason University economist and Cato adjunct scholar Tyler Cowen has for years been one of the most insightful and incisive debunkers of the former ontology as Cowen squared off against political theorist Benjamin Barber of the University of Maryland, one of the most prominent skeptics of globalization and author of the best-selling Jihad vs. McWorld.

The irreconcilability ,and lack of consensus between the above outlined the ontologies of globalization has morphed up into the idea of alternative globalizations now widely canvassed, whether in the discourses of alter-globalization or the more visceral idea of clash of civilizations, and notions of oriental globalization conjure visions of a world of cultures, instead of a world culture.Thus,contrary to the orthodoxy of a mono-cultural convergence, there has been an explosion of varied insurgent discourses in the domains of cultural and socio-political thought and representation of anti-capitalist globalization movements of various scales. Such a resistance to capitalism's consumerist culture-ideology eloquently speaks to the world that globalization is not everyone's dream.

Since the 1980s there has been a cultural turn that has enshrined culture, in contrast to "society" or "national development," as the locus of analysis while the focus has been cultural influence. Consequently, the emergent notion of culture has become more complex and culture is no longer seen as a by-product or a mere signifier for a locality. In other words, postmodern theories highlight the centrality of culture in developing theories of contemporary society; however, these theories at the same time have done little toward advancing a theory of culture which incorporates human agency and economic determinism (Indra & Rosaldo, 2009).Though cultural perspectives on globalization share many of the propositions from other theories, including the recognition of economic forces and international system of states; it places a heavier emphasis on values, ideas and identities.

World culture describes a contested world society that extends beyond individual nation states into a global arena. For instance, "the concept of cultural imperialism," writes Schiller "…

best describes the sum of the processes by which a society is brought into the modern world system involving "… how [that society's] dominating stratum is attracted, pressured, forced and sometimes bribed into shaping social institutions to correspond to, or even promote, the value and structures of the dominating center of the system.Thus,whereas national societies appear encased in national structures, global societies engage in global cultural conflict. It is for this reason that globalization, for Robertson, is necessarily contested insomuch that we are in a period of "globewide cultural politics" which stem from differing worldviews on how to solve universal problems. Nevertheless, while identity is increasingly defined in relation to the global whole, defining one's relation to it does not entail consensus. World culture theory involves notions of a global civil society based on global ideologies (of religious fundamentalism and secularism)[2].

Therefore, world culture theory attempts to capture the tension between the local and the global, between the particular and the universal as well as how individuals and groups struggle to increase their local identity vis-à-vis the global whole as .global integration proceeds. For instance, under the world culture model, nationalism, for example, is understood not as fragmentation but the universalism of social identities across the world. Along with greater awareness of one's self and one's community in the wider world comes increased demand for sovereignty and cultural distinction. National societies demand their own sovereign political structures relative in shape and form to others existing in the system and thus illustrates a type of "global political culture", according to Robertson, Roland (1992)`s *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*.

Understood this way, globalization is not radically different from how societies and processes of civilization have been unfolding since antiquity. World culture's almost exclusive focus on cultural factors disregards political economy altogether. Cross-cultural encounters have been a regular feature of world history since the earliest days on the human species' existence, and the relationship between hybridity and power is of the utmost importance because the formation of hybridity is pervaded by political, economic and cultural inequalities. In the following section, using globalization as my narrative mode I would argue that culture is a reality *sui generis*, in a Durkheimian sense, but one that exists primarily for it's own sake and with its own logic[3] in different form.

Since cultures and technologies do not necessarily coincide with national boundaries, contemporary *realpolitik* must deal with the complex realities of what Vacla Havel calls "cultural spheres". Understanding this geocultural stakes gives strategic importance to relationships between cultures and societies comparable to those involved in geo-security and

geo-economic matters. Thus, the implication being that whether or not there is a desire for hegemony, the greatest danger of imperialism would be in the cultural sphere. Already, relationships between societies and cultures depend primarily on cultural capitalism which is no longer mediated primarily by states. It is now submitted to market exchange relations, to the goals of profitability and more and more oriented to the homogenization of products created in the few huge studios that manufacture the world's dreams. The media is the primary channels for these *industries of the imagination* and *infotainment* products industries as technological development has made cultural exchanges continuous at planetary level with unprecedented rapidity and amplitude.

Bringing in the Economic vis-a-vis the Cultural

In spite of the above almost exclusive focus on cultural factors, the tendency has been for economic sociology to reduce everything to social relations leaving out, or disregarding the political economy of the cultural. It was for this reason on the one hand that sociologists like Paul Dimaggio and Viviana Zelizer have criticized economic sociology for not taking the concept of culture seriously, and . Jeffery Alexander, on the other hand, was arguing for a cultural sociology as a discipline distinct from the sociology of culture. To these must be added a call by Fejes for a renewed understanding of culture and the formulation of theoretical bases and methodological approaches for understand culture as everyday life processes infused with power differentials ,and something to be explained by something else entirely separated from the domain of meaning itself[4]

The new economic sociology as inspired by the work Mark Granovetter's (1985) who adopted a cultural approach in treating other economy-related phenomena as cultural objects. Hence now classic articles are arguing that economic action is embedded in networks of social relations. In other words, the presupposition is that economic analyses should pay more attention to culture, especially, when a retrospective appraisal of the cultural construction of objects of market exchange is the ontology of the analysis. Hence, we now have studies that treat the discipline of economics as a cultural object whose production and appropriation varies across national contexts.

It is understandable, therefore, why the new economic sociology sees culture as a tool. Based on this perspective, the expectation is that cultural resources available to actors when they engage with economic globalization are malleable, i.e. mean different things to different actors. Understanding these "geocultural stakes" gives strategic importance to relationships between cultures and societies comparable to those involved in geo-security and geo-economic matters. Once, this is the case, whether or not there is a desire for hegemony, the greatest danger of

imperialism is in the cultural sphere. To grasp capital and profit in all its appearances, both, cultural and social capitals are forms of economical capital which in turn is equated with political power. Put differently, with the universalization of capitalism, only an industrial and commercial understanding of culture is left, in which manufacturing and productive institutions are the collective basis of social life and the new cultural system.

The Techno-Cultural Embeddness of the contemporary society

It is not enough to say that the lack of enthusiasm of economic sociologists to pay more attention to the cultural and technological embededness[5] of globalization is defensible simply because most *economic* phenomena can be rightfully conceptualized as *cultural* objects. Scholarly literature has much to say about globalization as a complex process that influences social, political and economic phenomena at a multitude of spatial scales. Scholars who focus on the cultural and technological embededness of globalization seem to have emphasized a techno- cultural approach to a reading of globalization. Such an approach is not product of a digital delirium, or hysterical sublime, it is an explanation of the often taken-for-granted nature of the technological embeddness of everyday life with respect to mass mediated technologies. Yet this approach seems a minority perspective in a retrospective analysis of the processes of globalization.

The logic of contemporary society is a cultural dominant where all of contemporary social, economic, and political life has been reduced to the semiotic interplay of signs and symbols. Since cultures and technologies do not necessarily coincide with national boundaries, contemporary *realpolitik* must deal with the complex realities of cultural embededness which explains how economic transactions can be understood as cultural objects. This is what has been referred to as "cultural economy" [6].

Based on the above background, it is important to acknowledge that public debates surrounding cultural globalization can be seen as more than instantiations of culture. Therefore, paying attention to the techno-cultural embededness tells us what kind of technological and cultural resources individuals actors use in their adventure of globalism, and in framing their conceptions of economic processes, as well as how these actors attempt to influence and transform cross-border economic transactions. Besides having important structural implications and material consequences, culture, and technology when mapped onto economic globalization more generally are sites of cultural articulation and contestation. For instance, the spread of culture and technology have less to do with their intrinsic virtues than with the underlying power that promotes them. This is what is meant by the immanent logic of globalism- the ideological creed that tries to extend the Anglo-American model of liberal capitalism and its

underlying norms and values to all regions of the world, Steger according to Wolf Schäfer, (2007:6).This is the reason why one of the five globalist dogmas is impersonal forces (markets and technology) as agents of globalization.

Thus, communication technologies are another aspect globalization which interpellate individuals, impose mandatory ways of surviving, and transform their users into obsessed subjects or subordinates. As one of the propelling forces of globalization, it shape attitudes, creates new notions of style and behaviour and, in doing so, reaffirm or discredit larger social values. Understood this way, what is called communication technology is perhaps the most exemplary case of technology turning into ideology through its interference in daily life and its impact on the mode of production and exchange of commodity. As J. Hillis Miller notes in a different context, "New communication technologies are making a quantum leap in the generation and imposition of ideologies. These technologies, it might be argued, are in a sense ideologically neutral. They will transmit whatever they are told to say. Nevertheless, as Marshall McLuhan reputably noted, the medium is the message.' meaning [that]'the medium is the ideology. In addition to economic relations, technology also contributes to the globalization of social relations.

Whereas communication technology tends to diffuse values from North to South, global migration "moves" values from South to North. Global migration is motivated by the search for better living conditions by the inhabitants of countries in the deprived regions of the South. Whereas television carries the values that define the national histories and identities of the North into the living rooms of the South, migrants carry the frustrations of their own history, as well as their aspirations to the North. In 1993, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimated that every year "150,000–300,000 people are accepted for resettlement on humanitarian grounds and more than 2 million seek asylum in a foreign country." According to the same source (UNHCR 1993, p. 24), "the immediate cause of flight is usually an imminent threat to life, liberty or security."

Because of the transnational character of economic forces, information technology, and migration, they reduce the state's ability to contain the causes of its social, political, and economic evolution within its own boundaries. Furthermore, the administrative machinery of the modern state is quickly being transformed into a "spreading network" of "subtle and direct interconnections and interdependencies that enmesh public administrators from one part of the planet to another" (Luke 1992: 15). Technology not only appears as ubiquitous as an overarching ideology in the twenty first century, but also demands as devoted a passion and dependency of its subjects as ideology does. In fact, in the emergent inforsphere simulation

will be incorporated into the active experience of everyday life, and politics. This has been demonstrated by the United States when it used simulation to deceive the World, and woo support for its intervention in Iraq on the pretense that Iraq had weapon of mass destruction[7]. In so doing technology make individuals mere "dupes" of their society and culture. These descriptions of postmodern culture are not product of a "digital delirium", or "hysterical sublime", they are descriptions of the taken-for-granted nature of the technological embeddness of everyday life, especially with respect to mass mediated technologies

The paraphernalia, and/or products of technoscience are presented as objects of participation in the subsystem of globalism without which one cannot function effectively in the global society. As such, the term "globalization" is not only an expression to portray the trend of our era, but also the dominant logic affecting our daily lives. A cellular phone my village Umuekene, is a cellular phone in South Africa, and Nigeria .What differs is where the products are to be consumed. Thus, the objects of participation are more or less similar around the globe (product homogenization) .In other words; the propagation of technology has universal power that creates potent worldviews which foster reamless identities and responsibilities, within and across boundaries. Understood this way, one can hypothetically assert that globalization is a mediated sociocultura*l* interaction**.**

The expansion of international communications during the 19th century enabled the colonial powers to extend their influence and control over the empire through the medium of the telegraph. In the middle of the twentieth century technological developments in space, micro-electronics and computing have led to the second stage of international communications. The technologies facilitated the growth of global networks and together with deregulation and liberalisation in communications in the latter part of the 20th century were factors that added to the developments in global communications. A new order is emerging within the international communications arena, the transnational media order.

Thus, an international reach is no longer the preserve of Western-based conglomerates, as an increasing number of smaller media companies from the developing world are expanding overseas. Since transnational describes forces that cross or work across the nation's boundaries but do not necessarily disrupt the workings of the nation-state as executive committee, in the prevailing phase of globalization, transnationalism has replaced imperialism The key point being that the idea of the British World in the late 19th century was replaced by the idea of the 'American World' in the late 20th century. In the 21st century, nations like China and India are in the process of creating this vision, and have many more media channels at their disposal for disseminating such ideas. It is for this reason that the shift towards transnationalisation in the

beginning of 21st century can be described "as the third phase in a succession of paradigm shifts in the evolution of international communication from the mid-19th century onwards.

We have also witnessed tremendous changes in the global economy and in the political climate that contextualises In terms of power relations, like any other major transformative process, globalization has produced a redistribution of power both within societies and within the world. . It produces politics of resistance as well as politics of compliance in which both states and NGOs take party.

Today one can talk of the *Peer –To-Peer Culture* (P2P) as a cultural phenomenon in the shape of a variety of anti-systemic groups and movements as site of both intellectual and actual struggles to deconstruct the false totality and Universalist pretensions of global liberalism. This deconstruction, conjures several paradigms to the management and organization of the international system providing a variety of alternative visions of transnationalism[8] already manifest in the peer to peer(P2P)phenomenon concerned with seeing and organizing the world not in a strict hierarchical or centralized system, but as a 'network of networks' of equal participants. There seem to be an ongoing virtual 'transfer of power loyalties to an invisible apolitical community out there as the growth of global civil society seem to aim at reconstructing, re-image[ing] and re-mapping world politics.

Once world politics has been reconstructed, re-imaged and re-mapped, he who says that terrain of the *realpolitik* of the Information Age will be driven by one of the plates of globalization-the "Global Information Infrastructure,[9]says the obvious because power which will be defined by setting technological standards, defining software standards, producing the most popular information products, and leading in the related development of the global trade in services, all of which are as essential to the well-being of any would-be leader of the such an infosphere.Thus, any nation that controls the emerging infosphere will be giant organic culture processor, democratic empowered, universal connector, and ultimate communicator. By virtue of the control of the infosphere, such a leader will shape the nature of both culture of globalization and character of global politics.

Global Complexity and the autonomous instrumentalist status of culture and technology

The autonomous instrumentalist status of culture and technology derive from their usage by one actor to affect the behaviour of another actor. As such, societal dynamics are essentially controlled through the agenda setting power of the techno-cultural elite. This power is not exerted through overtly forcing people to act in certain ways or make certain decisions. Rather, it is exerted through the manipulation of the cultural and idea production in such a way as to

affect the common sense notions of the general public, according to Ritzer, George(2000).If culture is the expression of people's attitudes and beliefs that come together to form a society of mutual reciprocity as Althusser,Louis noted in "*Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses",* then the presupposition is that globalization and its technologies has an instrumentalist imperative.

This status of technology and culture can be "reduced to an instrumental one*"* Parsons, Talcott and Kroeber (1958: 582-583), especially, *as* personal and social life unfolds and realizes itself within objictified cultural forms. Thus, culture and technology are therefore, products as well as means of the pursuit of political and/or economical interests. This is more so because, capitalism itself is a cultural form (or forms) embedded in the universalistic teleological cultural logic of capital that underlay liberalism as both theory and practice.Thus just as culture is the people's way of life, every human being experience global capitalism in his/her everyday lives. It is for this overarching nature of global capitalism that makes the culture of capitalism to be in tension with the larger culture.

It is this kind of techno-cultural autonomy that allows for a rediscovery of how culture intersects with other social forces, such as power. In other words, culture has a relationship to social stratification and power", according to Scott, Allen (2002).Thus, culture and technology perform both constitutive and regulative function. The former consists of categories shaping thought and the latter consists of norms shaping the market and society (DiMaggio, Paul 2000:38-62).Let us end this section by hypothetically positing that if globalization of culture or global culture were to be a social fact, then globality will require imposing a new culture or a superior ideology and social structure that must have an overarching autonomous instrumentalist status that surpasses any cultural encumbrance.

Globalization, Inequality among Nations and Nationals: Globalization, Culture and the Developing Nations

Globalization does not create homogeneous social conditions around the world .In fact, the impact of globalization on the developing nations is not a matter of simple statistics and reports; it is in essence a diagnostic line of analysis to consider its pluses and minuses on the developing nations. One of the problems of globalization and cultural borrowing and cultural mimicry, according to Benjamin Barber**,** is that they depend not on isolated cultures, but on authentic cultures whereas the "authentic" culture is itself a cultural product of earlier cultural interactions, so it's not the fixed item that critics sometimes suggest. When we borrow across cultures, we are, as Plato would suggest, on a second or even a third level of reality, so we're distancing ourselves (Benjamin Barber **,**2003)**.**It would be an excessive form of cultural

fundamentalism to suggest that Africans should try to keep everything exactly as it is, rather than allowing culture to develop. However, nothing can be further than the truth. To talk about the developing nations` engagement with globalization is certainly first of all to talk of the displacement of the developing nations from their traditional ethnoscapes, technoscapes, financescapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes, to speak to their geographical, social, and cultural, and institutional deterritorialization.

Each culture has its own personality. For example, the European beckons while holding his hand with the fingers uppermost, while the African does so with the fingers pointing down. It is the specificity, and peculiarity of culture to individual societies that one can say that the tidal wave of the worst Western culture is creeping across globe bringing with it new challenges to local cultures and values in Africa and other non-Western societies. Globalization tends to increase difference, but it liberates difference from geography by socializing and acculturating virtually everybody to alien culture. Thus Africa and other non-Western societies are implicated in imbibing materialistic and individualistic values previously associated with Western culture.

What is happening to gender roles?. In many countries, it has always been the responsibility of the man to go out and fend and provide for his family. This has changed. Men and women both leave home in search of the available laboring fact, in cases where there are massive retrenchments, you now find men at home while the woman goes to work. This has hence affected the household responsibilities, where you find change of roles when a man has to wash and look after the children. In cases where the man goes to work, the woman is forced to become involved in supplementary activities such as sewing, selling vegetables and knitting to complement her husband's salary. In these countries, women have suffered disproportionately from the impact of globalization. There are very many men who have been retrenched too, but when you look at the statistics you can see the difference. A company in Lesotho, for instance, was required to lay off 50% of its work force, and it ended laying off all the women workers. The immediately affected areas are health and education. In most of our African societies, it is the responsibility of the women to take care of the health not only of themselves, but also of the children in the house.

Many girls have dropped out of school because their families cannot afford to pay all the school fees. Zimbabwe has not yet seen the extent to which this can go, but people from Ghana or Uganda who have lived under SAPs for many years and whose countries have been quoted by the World Bank as "success stories" will tell you of the majority of a whole generation who have not gone to school - the majority of whom are women. In Africa, there is a limit to your

capacity to enjoy your rights if you have not gone to school. It means that you may not get a job and therefore your economic rights (which are basic human rights) are affected. The first challenge facing women today is education. Education must empower women with knowledge of their rights and how to seek redress should such rights be violated

Part of the critique of globalization is the globalized media's cynical manipulation of symbols to disguise its real impact: the very concept of "free trade" reduces the meaning of liberty to little more than corporations' unfettered access to world markets. While the processes of infinite displacement, differentiation or splitting certainly give rise to increasing cultural diversity, they end up, ironically, engendering a universal consumerist psychology and ideology. No matter what ethnic passport one carries, no matter where one is located in the networked global space, as long as one is involved in the capitalist processes of production and consumption one way or the other, one is within the sphere of the cultural logic of commodity reification and fragmentation, production for profit, and work for money, which is the true supranational logic of globalization.

In fact no one captures this cultural borrowing and cultural mimicry than Robertson, Roland.(1995.),who describe it as " glocalization." ,which explains how local cultures absorb global ideas and processes ,and reconstruction of local culture according to specific social meaning of taste. This has been made possible through among other things by the structural change in the world economy such as the flood of goods dumped in poor countries and marketed by mass seductive advertising. These finished goods often much cheaper than those locally manufactured ones are brought in by eestablished and large companies such as transnational corporations(TNCs)This ultimately lead to folding up of many local industries. In Zimbabwe, for example, the clothing sector was hardest hit with the closure of the local Cone Textiles, which retrenched hundreds of workers. These workers were family breadwinners with children in schools and houses to pay rent for. Most of the workers were frustrated and disillusioned with no work and money. The importation and cheap selling of second-hand clothes (okirika /bend-down) from Europe has forced many women out of their businesses. Similarly, in Kenya, the women who were involved in the manufacturing of sisal bags(("kiondos") were negatively affected when the sisal bags were produced en masse in Japan and sold in East Africa and the surrounding countries at low prices.

In more strategic terms, global capital towards the end of twentieth century could be adjuded as wiser than the British warships in the 1840s.Unlike erstwhile forms of capitalism; global capitalism is conquering the developing nations through multinational capital and through the complicity of its people's uncritical acceptance of Western culture. Hence a

general, multiple displacement and deterritorialization happening in the developing nations: Geographically, tens of millions of its population are moving from the country to the city, becoming the lumpenproletariat -- the mobile, shifting, homeless, placeless, and faceless *liumin* (migrant workers).In its present phase, this is the first time in history that virtually every individual at every level of society is affected by the impact of globalization. These changes can be seen and heard it in their media, tasted in consumption of goods and services, and touched   in the products bought. One is either someone who is threatened by these changes or someone who will profit from it. It is almost impossible to conceive of a significant group that will remain untouched by it.

Globalization knocks open the doors of Africans, and people from other developing nations not with cannons but with Canons; it invades the country notorious for its center mentality not with troops, fleets, and artillery but with ideas, images, and consumer goods. This is only one of the examples of how global capital is penetrating every social and political space with the resultant effect that developing nations are becoming fully commodified societies integrated into the global capitalist mode of production and exchange relations. Not even the human body is sparred from this commoditization. For instance, with rapid developments in reproductive medicine, transplant ethics and bioethics, a new 'ethic of parts' has emerged in which the body is increasingly seen as a commodity which can be bartered, sold or stolen, either wholesale or in divisible parts. Increasingly the body is a possession that does not belong to us. This accelerating commodification of live and dead human organisms is carried out under the guise of healing or research contributing to a new "ethic of parts" for which the divisible body is severed from the self, torn from the social fabric, and thrust into commercial transactions — as organs, secretions, reproductive capacities, and tissues — responding to the dictates of an incipiently global marketplace.

Ipso facto, globalization inculcates consumerism. For instance, it tantamount to market segmentation — rather than active participation in community cultural life when mass-produced imported products are substituted for indigenous cultural production, and market forces determine what aspects of culture that will be preserved and supported It This works on the same principles as the logic of imperialism: by reducing culture to commerce, globalization not only robs Africans, and people from other developing nations so much of their connection to their own histories; but also their ability to reconceived their past for the benefit of the future as well as the ease of exploring their boundless creativity. As a result, socially, the people of the developing nations find themselves displaced from their traditional and familiar spatial, communicational, communitarian, interpersonal language, discourse, and relations.

Culturally, they find themselves radically shocked out of and displaced from their previous horizon of imagination and expectation, their previous modes of feeling and representation, their conventional literary and artistic repertoire and topography.

In terms of policy choices, the demands of globalization is that whatever the nature of their economies, their level of development, and whatever their location in the global economy, all countries must pursue a common set of economic policies. In particular, they must permit the free and indiscriminate operation of transnational corporations in their economies: open their economies freely and indiscriminately to imports and concentrate on exporting what they are supposed to be good at; reduce the role of governments in the economy to that of supporting the market and private enterprise; and leave the determination of prices of goods, currencies, labour, as well as the allocation of resources to the operation of the market.

Seen in this way, globalization is primarily not an impersonal process driven by laws and factors of development - such as technology - operating outside human control and agency. Rather it is a conscious programme of reconstructing international economic and political relations in line with a particular set of interests (the profit motivations of the businesses, especially the transnational corporations of the advanced industrial countries) and vision (the dogma of the primacy of the free market and of private enterprise in all processes of human development).

For Africa, all the central planks of the process of globalization have been implemented over the past decade-and-a-half as structural adjustment programmes. Before the advancement of free economic activity on the national, regional and global levels, most of the African economies were heavily regulated by the state. Under this system, they introduced such import and export restrictive business practices as import and export licencing, increased import duties, taxes or levies on import transactions, allocation of foreign exchange to essential goods, import and export quotas and other prohibitions. This forced the creation of local and locally manufactured goods produced from local materials. Self-reliance was encouraged. However, this has now been replaced by donor-driven deregulation, economic liberalisation and privatisation of the national economic activities. The argument has been that this new policy will bring about faster export and economic growth, which will enable developing countries to repay the mounting external debt burden accumulated since the independence of these countries. Nations have deregulated foreign investment, liberalised their imports, removed currency controls, and emasculated the direct economic role of the state, and so on. The results have been to further undermine the internal, national productive capacity, social security and

democratic integrity these countries. So that is basically how globalization has impacted on Africa.

Perhaps by far the most important far-reaching effect of cultural globalization is the commercialization of culture. In a way very similar to economic globalization, most people (and especially the poor) do not experience cultural globalization on terms they have decided for themselves. Culture - whether it is music, food, clothes, art, sport, images of age or youth, masculinity or femininity - has become a product, sold in the market place. The commercialization of culture has a disturbing impact on people. What once was an element of their way of life becomes a product, rather than something unique they had made to suit their own specific needs and circumstances. At the same time, people are increasingly bombarded with new images, new music, new clothes and new values.While there was cultural change long before globalization, there is a danger that much will be lost simply because it is not valued by global markets. In Ghana [West Africa],says Siapha Kamara, formerly of the Ecumenical Training and Consultancy Centre, "traditional values have been overtaken by Coca-Cola culture. Consequently, it has been observed, globalized "cultural" industries are taking over traditional forms of creation and dissemination of culture. It was for this reason that the United Nation's 1999 Human Development Report noted that "mass produced products of American popular culture are the U.S.'s biggest export" Hence, a huge, well organized coalition has been formed that links the U.S. entertainment, media and information-technology sectors together in a "common front" to oppose cultural protectionism.

As a result, local culture's role as a spontaneous and integral part of people's life is eroded and it ceases to serve as the means of constructing societal values, reproducing group identity and building social cohesion. The end point ultimately becomes global integration at the expense of local disintegration. The common aspect of the globalized culture is that it pursues the same "one size fits all" ideal: the archetypical middle-class family according to the American model in which consumerism is the norm. The result of this cultural process of homogenization is that a large section of the world's population dreams of living like Cosby & Co. or like the characters in any other stereotype American soap opera. In addition, the dream of living a better life causes thousands of people to migrate to already overcrowded cities like Lagos, Nigeria's sprawling commercial capital; this city has grown from a population of 18,000 in 1901 to over 12 million in 2001.The majority of these new immigrants end up in slum quarters leading to poverty, pollution and misery.

Such a radical undermining of people's existing values and cultures has a corrosive impact on their sense of who they are, what they want and what they respect. It attacks spiritual

values and faith traditions. The cumulative effect in Africa is a crisis of cultural confidence, combined with the increased economic uncertainty and crime which global integration often brings. This creates real problems for social solidarity, whether it is at the level of nation, community or family. While it offers shiny new goods as compared to old faded ones, the market offers no replacement for such community solidarity. Globalization has brought into focus the power of culture in this global environment - the power to bind and to divide in a time when the tensions between integration and separation tug at every issue. All these are strategies of globalization contrived to open markets. While people remain divided by boundaries, however porous, they have realized that to compete in the global marketplace they must conform to the culture of that marketplace. By defining globalisation in terms of cultural homogenisation, advocates of Mcdonaldised consumer culture have lured and/or coerced Africans, their cultures and creativity to be consumed by the giant compressors of the West.

And thus capitalism as a way of life cannot leave the Africans free to perform their work at home, nor their duty in the world, in terms of promoting cultural diversity and conviviality. The outcome is that peoples of different cultures, often of poorer societies, are inducted into this unequal cultural exchange. This cultural exchange is osmotic. In this way, Western cultures have been forced onto the peoples of Africa. According to Professor Andah, the resultant cultural disorientation and consequently the continuing cultural invasion manifests itself in one or two extreme forms: 1) exaggerated attachment to often reinvented past in the name of tradition and culture; or 2) attempts at wholesale adoption of anything and everything foreign. Where only an industrial and commercial understanding of culture is left, and where social, economic, and political life has been reduced to the semiotic interplay of signs and symbols, "people around the world are connected by brand-name consumer products as much as by anything else" to paraphrase former chairman of Coca-Cola, Robert Goizueta West. Louise Frechette, The UN Deputy Secretary-General, was right to have noted (while addressing UN delegates, in 1999) that the phenomenon of globalization "brings up many opportunities to learn from each other, and to benefit from a wider range of choices, but can also seem very threatening.''

Thus, the identity and power conferred by consuming foreign made explains why despite much rhetoric about cultural renaissance in many an African country (e.g. the authenticité of Mobutu (Zaire), négritude of Senghor (Senegal), Consciencism of Nkrumah (Ghana), Ujamaa of Nyerere (Tanzania), Harambee of Kenyetta (Kenya), African Renaissance and Ubuntu of Mbeki (South Africa),the ruling elites continue to acculturate themselves and to progressively take on the look of strangers in their own country due to their daily lifestyle, modeled on that

of homo consumens universalis. By implication, the more aggressive exportation of Western cultural products through the mass media to developing nations, the more the people tend to know more about the rest of the world than and less about themselves and their own environment, the more *enwesternized* Africans become. The corporate assault on cultural diversity is part of a larger political, social and economic global watershed transformation. Economic globalization is the creation of a single global economy with universal rules set by big business for big business in which a seamless global consumer market operates on free-market principles, unfettered by domestic or international laws or standards. This is how Maude Barlow, national chair of the Council of Canadians watchdog organization, sums up the agenda behind globalization

In the sense, instead of widening our choices, globalization seem to be forcing us all into the same shallow, consumerist culture giving us the same appetites but leaving us more than ever unequal in our ability to satisfy them. For instance, the success of the Zee network channel with 225 million viewers in over 80 countries was that it offered a different vision to the middle class viewers in India. This is a vision of consumerism where personal choice become the new ideology', and the broadcast of programmes of most satellite televisions cover less topics from human-interest perspectives and more and more 'infotainment' rather than information and education. It is for this reason that children from wealthy homes are too actively involved in video games, and Hi-Fi music.

To say that, globalization like capitalism feeds on difference is to say that nation-states, and communities of different races, cultural practices and ethnic traditions are indirectly forced into uniform membership in the capitalist club, that is ,to subsume them into the global Empire of capital, and ultimately to integrate plural trajectories of modernity into one single route of development. When we say that globalization feeds on difference, we refer to those concrete strategies and practices of customizing commodities to suit local preferences and tastes. Globalization influences the tastes, lives, and aspirations of virtually every nation. In some, they are viewed as corrupting. It customises, modifies, and renames itself to make it to be welcomed by the global consumers. For instance, in China when Coca Cola and Pepsi were first imported to China, few people liked them, for they taste so different from Chinese tea, which has been China's national soft drink for over two thousand years. To capture the Chinese market ,Coca Cola and Pepsi had been transliterated into "*Kekou Kele*" and "*Baishi Kele*," by transnational corporations (TNCs) which respectively mean in Chinese "good taste and great joy" and "all enjoyable."Hence they quickly became popular in China, because the Chinese set

great store by "symbolic wish-fulfillment", that is, sounds and names of things according to Western cultural critics.

Understanding globalization not as an atavistic enterprise allows us to "recognize how cultural spaces experienced today-- segregated, contested and hybrid cultural spaces--sustain historically forged relations of unequal power" (Tomlinson, 1999; Young, 2001). Similarly, explicating the contours and dynamics of these relations exposes the context of unequal power that structures intercultural relations today and reveals the transformational potential of intercultural communication in the global age. For example:

> Starting in the sixteenth century, Western adventurers made a conscious effort to undermine the cultural heritage of various peoples around the world; this has been accomplished by imposing Western religion and cultural practices on those with a different way of life. Justified initially as a civilizing mission and subsequently dubbed modernization, in practice it was wholesale Westernization with very little room for any viable middle ground… until the late twentieth century, it was assumed that development for the colonized peoples must involve a denial of their history, a rejection of their cultural heritage and the adoption of Western cultural practices (Wole Akande, (2002)"The Drawbacks of Cultural Globalization" Yellow November 10, 2002 http://www.yellotimes.org).

While an important feature of globalization today is its de-Westernization (with the emergence of some non-Western nations - like Japan - as key actors), the reality is that in many important respects, Western culture (some would say American culture) remains the domineering force in the world today. Western culture fuels globalization today and, as it did during the age of imperialism and colonization, helps to reinforce the hegemony of the West. Information technology, as the driving force of economic globalization, has also become a veritable instrument for propagating Western culture. This is what critiques have described as Americanization [10]-the decline of traditional, participatory cultural practices in favour of consuming *Westmade*. Thus, a key assumption underlying the course that globalization is taking is that the cultural products, customs and values of the U.S. marketplace are precisely what the rest of the world should and will have.

The vast majority of community cultural development practitioners would welcome the globalization — the universal extension — of human rights, self-determination, the means to livelihood, health and safety. But it is the globalization of consumerism, as Fredric Jameson has written, that inspires dread [11].Globalization in Africa involves one fundamental project: reductions in public expenditure (often achieved through job cuts, wage freezes or cuts in

health, education and social-welfare services); privatization of public services and industries; currency devaluation and export promotion, leading to a conversion from local food production to cash crops, which in turn leads to greater impoverishment as citizens are forced to buy imported food; and so on, all of which are aimed at opening up the economies of all countries freely and widely to the global market and its forces.

The effect globalization has had on culture is immense and diverse. It has affected people's cultural behaviours in different ways. People have had to change their way of living. Culture is a continuous process of change but in spite of the change, culture continues giving a community a sense of identity, dignity, and continuity, security and binds society together. Therefore, any phenomenon that does not promote these is anti-developmental because economic growth without social and cultural justice cannot be our idea of development. The merchants and marabouts of globalization must revise their conception of development. It is imperative that development is measured in terms of the quality of human life, which can be reflected in, for example, better education, health and life expectancy for every single member of society. This is only possible if men and women are equally empowered, in theory and in practice. Anything that falls short of restoring peoples' dignity, sense of identity, continuity and security can only invoke idea that globalization is not everyone's dream.

Globalization, Gender and Inequality in developing nations

The "globalization orthodoxy" assumes that all players, men and women, rich and poor, will be affected equally. It also assumes, furthermore that international trade opportunities open up equally to small scale firms, infant industries and the giant transnational corporations and cartels. Yet, it is like a poor man belonging to the Billionaires' Club, what is his contribution, and his benefit?.However available evidence indicates otherwise because for millions of Africa's poorest people, trade is part of daily life, and a crucial determinant of welfare. When a people's social and economic rights and patterns are affected, their culture is overall affected too. Trade which is built on the unacceptable levels of social inequities to vulnerable communities and groups, or causes global ecological or environmental damage and disregards our obligations to future generations is not conducive to sustainable development. This is the reason why African market has become the dumping ground for all kinds of goods from developed countries and from the East, all in the name of free trade.

At the end of the story, it is a bifurcated society because everybody is not "affected equally" as claimed by hyper-globalists. The observation is a redefinition of class, one that replaces the measurement of class based on whether is attuned with the new cultural norms of

globalization such as knowing how use the internent,and GSM communication system. Evidently, it is a divided world since class, is not really about money or birth or even occupation, rather about what one drives and where one shops and how one prays, and only secondarily about the work one does or the income one makes. By framing social class in this manner, one can measure one's distance from or affinity with another person by what products one consumes or how compliant one is with the new norms. The multi-millionaire who drinks beer, drives an M-Class, and watches football and Wrestling at MGM Las Vegas is effectively on the same social footing as the meat-packer.

Thus, social meaning of taste is used for non-aesthetic purposes to symbolize status and power; hence inequality is retrospectively reproduced through consumption. For example, people who smear perfume made in Paris and shoes from Italy tend to be accorded more respect than those wearing a locally Aba-made manufactured brand in Nigeria. In an already class society globalization is likely to lead to an increase in segregation and inequality. It does nothing to suggest that the gains of globalization will be equally shared by all .Thus, globalization has helped in creating different class situations i.e. class habitus,the internalized form of class condition and of the conditionings it entails. It placed the class in homogeneous conditions of existence, impose homogenous conditionings and produces homogeneous systems of dispositions capable of generating similar practices..

In terms of gender basis of the impact of globalization, women seem to be having their own brunt. Women constitute 60% percent of the communal farmers in Zimbabwe, for instance. In rural areas the impact has been so serious that rural urban migration has increased to lamentable proportions. Data gathered from research in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean, the Middle East and Latin America on the impact of structural adjustment programmes on women summarizes gender and inequality as:

> More women than men may become unemployed; wage differentials between men and women grow; an increasing number of women look for income-generating work outside the home to compensate for the husband's loss of job, less steady income and/or sharp fall in family purchasing power as the formal sector of employment diminishes more women enter the informal sector; ; working conditions for women deteriorate; women do not experience increasing employment as a result of export promotion of manufactured goods; progress in girls' education slows as women's unpaid work becomes heavier and mothers ask them to assist in the home; food consumption diminishes as a result of rising food prices and changing agriculture policies; girls' health and mortality rates worsen as a result of the above; women's reliance on credit places them under greater pressure by creditors to pay back debts; an increased number of women are heads of household; and many women lose the support of the extended family as families become nuclear. (Pamela Sparr, 1994: 20-29)

This has in turn led to the increase of squatters mostly women and children leaving in uncompleted buildings in urban areas. As of necessity, some women have resorted to cross-border trade. Once they crossed the border some married women get involved in extra-marital affairs while the spouses they have left behind indulge in the same. This has had its own social and cultural repercussions in the sense that it complicates and worsens the AIDS pandemic situation. Where this is the case, children are left out of parental care, a reason for which among other things the number of rape cases on young children has become a social fact some families had to with .For instance, there is an average of four reported cases of rape every day in Zimbabwe alone. Children no longer sit around the fireplace in the evening to listen to stories that promote the values of respect, integrity, peace, love and unity, even in the rural areas where this sort of environment would fit best. People - men, women and children - are all engrossed and embroiled in the struggle for survival - the struggle to get a bowl of mealie-meal to fill the tummy at least for the day.

Women's economic activities have therefore been highly affected by globalization. In Malawi, whereas before rice was produced in Malawi and sold in most Southern African countries, rice is now brought in from Asia and sold at much cheaper prices than the locally produced one. The production of the local one is therefore forced to stop. Women are very concerned about the impact of economic structural adjustment programmes on their human rights. It is not just a question of economics; it is the whole issue of human dignity.

In fact the underlying logic is "no free meal". For instance, children as young as six(6) years are seen selling oranges, tomatoes and other basic foodstuffs as late as 8.00 pm. During the period we had groundnut pyramids in Nigeria, a walk through most villages, one finds silos in each family compound. Today, however, the pyramid has disappeared just as the silos are now empty .Food security has been replaced with living from hand to mouth as   people has to buy the   basic foodstuffs from the market as foreign goods. Finally, to talk about the developing nations` engagement with globalization is certainly first of all to talk of the displacement of the developing nations from the developmental landscape upon which their civilization would have been built upon.

Conclusion

To recapitulate, throughout our discussion, we have attempted to present a more nuanced and credible picture of the political economy of the techno-cultural economy, and how it affects developing nations. We have argued that it is apriori analytically more helpful seeing culture and technology as domains not separable from politics and economics in the analysis of globalism. In addition, we observed that the sociological implication of globalization for both

nations and their nationals is that they can be categorized according to the place they occupy in the production process in the techno-cultural economy, either as producers, or consumers. Finally, our conclusion is that the developing nations` engagement with globalization displaces them from the developmental landscape upon which their civilization was to be built.

Notes

[1] Some seminal works brought about the development of a sociological interest in culture of and a "cultural revival" within sociology (see Works of Smith, 1998; Ritzer, 1990; Wuthnow and Witten, 1988; Lamont and Wuthnow, 1990; Alexander and Smith, 2001, Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, 1992; and During, 1999 and the cultural studies of the British Birmingham School during the 1980s and 1990s

[2] Robertson, Roland coined the term *"glocalization"* to describe how local cultures absorb global ideas and processes and adapt them to their particular circumstances. (see also his "Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity." In *Global modernities*, edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson, published in London by SAGE Publications in 1995. See Pp. 25-44.

[3] Anthropological definition of culture was given by Sir Edward Tylor in the late 19th century as, essentially, all the products of humankind. By 1952, Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn had cataloged over 100 different definitions of this word. Culture. Culture is not static; it grows out of a systematically encouraged reverence for selected customs and habits. The long-standing sociological tension between culture and agency is shattered as both are denied privilege, and even stable existence. Culture clearly is to be understood as the product of action but it constitutes an order in its own right, transcending the social and individual forces by which it is produced. Culture is an ideational superstructure determined by the former but referring to completely different categories of action as classified by Parsons according to fundamental modes of orientation or action dimensions. Culture is a reality sui generis, in a Durkheimian (Durkheim, 1982) sense, but it is also a   reality that exist   primarily for it's own sake and with its own logic

[4] Interest in issues of culture had grown substantially, including emerging frameworks such as cultural rights, but remaining focused on the more established concern about the cultural.However,the works of Boyd Barrett (1977), Boyd- Barret, (2002) and Gerbner, Mowlana & Nordenstreng, Mattelart (1979, 1983), Schiller (1971, 1976), and Tunstall (1977) shifted concern on ways to redress the structural framework of global inequality in the context of the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO),while Fejes` (1981)  called for a renewed understanding of culture and the formulation of theoretical  bases  and  methodological  approaches  to  understand  culture  and communication as everyday life processes infused with power differentials and negotiated meanings. Fejes` (1981) call led to many cultural schools of thought that coalesced in what is now commonly referred to as "global media studies" (see Murphy & Kraidy, 2003b, for a systematic treatment).

[5] Classic articles are arguing that economic action is embedded in networks of social relations. Some recent work in economic sociology or the "new economic sociology" as inspired by the work Mark Granovetter's (1985) who adopted a cultural approach in treating other economy-related phenomena as cultural objects. Central to, Granovetter's focus is "structural embeddedness"(For a detailed analysis of this see   the following:Zukin and DiMaggio 1990: 17-18; cf. DiMaggio 1994; Zelizer 2003). Zukin, Sharon and Paul DiMaggio. (1990). "Introduction." Pp. 1-36 in *Structures of Capital: The Social Organization of the Economy*, edited by Sharon Zukin and Paul DiMaggio.

Cambridge University Press;Zelizer, Viviana. 2003. "Enter Culture". Pp. 101-128 in *The New Economic Sociology: Developments in an Emerging Field*, edited by Mauro Guillen, Randall Collins, Paula;England, and Marshall Meyer. NY: Russell Sage Foundation.,and DiMaggio, Paul. 1994. "Culture and Economy." Pp. 27-57 in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg. New York and Princeton: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton University Press. Cultural embededness as used in this article underscore how economic transactions can be understood as cultural objects...At a more strategic level of analysis, Swidler, Ann. "Culture and Social Action." in: *The New American Cultural Journal (*1998:172) and "culture as a toolkit published in 1986" informed what I have called the autonomous instrumentalist status of culture in this article.

[6]   The term "cultural economy" describes the intertwining of capitalist production and the cultural content of its outputs, and the ways in which these effects make themselves felt.William Tabb, for example, uses the term "cultural economy" while reporting on the special features of Japan's economy to argue that the separation of economists from the varieties of culture shaping systems of production and distribution in different countries is no longer viable. The phrase the "cultural economy" has been also used by Allen Scott of the Department of Policy Studies and Geography at UCLA, to outline a method for studies of global cities. He sees cities as sources of innovative change and compares them around the world. He looks at the stylization of life and the aesthetic values in the markets of different metropolises. He also looks at the status of prestigious goods, the fashions, and the method of advertising, the nature of mass consumption, different corporate cultures, and personal identities at work.

[7]   During the mediatized United States` rationalization of its intervention in Iraq on the charges that Iraq had weapon of mass destruction (WMD) it is allegedly acknowledged that a physicist was used to design a sixty feet nuclear bomb on a special trailer that was continuously moving around in Iraq as was telecast to the world by VON, CNN .The physicist who did the simulation was quoted to have committed suicide after he discovered that his work was used to deceive the world.

[8]   Alternative visions of transnationalism include transcommunitarianism, responsive political communitarianism, and the East-Asian authoritarian communitarianism.All these have led to the proliferation of Transnational Voluntary Associations (TVAs,), characterized by a virtual sense of collegiality which exists among its members, and a modicum of social fabric(see Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye,1975;Dain Stone 2002 Ronnie Lipschutz, 1992:391; Andrew Linklater, 181:27, 35).Conceptually, this phenomenon is all about seeing and organizing the world not in a strict hierarchical or centralized system, but as a "network of networks" of equal participants. It has been hypothetically theorized that Peer to Peer(P2P) would led to a virtual transfer of power loyalties to an invisible apolitical community out there (see Richard Falk, 1995:212),as the growth of global civil society seem to aim at reconstructing, re-image[ing] and re-mapping world politics

[9]   Francis Fukuyama (Professor of public policy at George Mason University, and consultant to the RAND Corporation as well as author of "The End of History and the Last Man") responded to the question of whether globalization is really a euphemism for Americanization by saying the following*:* I think that it is, and that's why some people do not like it. I think it has to be Americanization because, in some respects, America is the most advanced capitalist society in the world today, and so its institutions represent the logical development of market forces. Therefore, if market forces are what drive globalization, it is inevitable that Americanization will accompany globalization. However, I think that the American model that people in other cultures are adopting is

from the America of two or three generations ago. When they think of globalization and modernization, many people think of America in the 1950s and '60s… The culture that we exported in the '50s and '60s was idealized. It really presented quite an attractive package. The culture we export now is cynical, and a much less attractive model for other nations to follow.

[10]   The Clinton administration has dubbed the "Global Information Infrastructure," as the real site of the *realpolitik* of the Information Age which will be defined by setting technological standards, defining software standards, producing the most popular information products, and leading in the related development of the global trade in services. All these are essential to the well-being of any would-be leader of the infosphere

[11]   Fredric Jameson has wrote that, it is the globalization of consumerism, that inspires dread::...not the globalization that entails — the universal extension — of human rights, self-determination, the means to livelihood, health and safety. The origin of globalization of consumerism that inspires dread, according to him are North American in origin and result from the unchallenged primacy of the United States today and thus the "American way of life" and American mass media culture. As such is it certain that all of human history has been, as Fukuyama and others believe a tortuous progression toward the American consumer .If the benefits of the emergent market is not extended so as to make this "new way of life" available for everyone on the globe, then the cultures of the consuming nations will have been destroyed without offering any alternatives.

References

Benjamin Barber "globalization and culture" *Cato Policy Report* May/June 2003

DiMaggio, Paul. "Social Structure, Institutions, and Cultural Goods: The Case of
    the United States.". in The   *Politics of Culture: Policy Perspectives for Individuals, Institutions, and Communities*, edited by Gigi Bradford, Michael Gary, and Glenn Wallach. New York: The New Press (2000):38-62

Indra & Rosaldo, in . Sorrells, Kathryn."(Dis) placing Culture and Cultural Space in the Global Context" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NCA 93rd Annual Convention, TBA, Chicago, IL, Nov 14, 2007 Online accessed on 2009-02- 12 http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p18984

Jameson, Fredric. "Globalization and Political Strategy." *New Left Review* 4 July-
    August (2000): 49-68;   see also Burchill, Scott 'Liberal Internationalism', in Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater (eds.) *Theories of International Relations.* Houndmills: Macmillan. (1996):28-66.

Pamela Sparr, editor (1994). Mortgaging Women's Lives. London sand New Jersey: Zed Books Ltd.: 20-29.

Parsons, Talcott and A. L. Kroeber. "The Concepts of Culture and of Social
    System."*American   Sociological Review* 23(1958): 582-583.See also, Malinowski's *"Scientific Theory of Culture.*

Ritzer, George.. *Sociological Theory.* New York: McGraw Hill,(2000)

Robertson, Roland. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*, London: Sage
    (1992)

Robertson, Roland. 1995. "Glocalization: time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity." In *Global modernities*, (ed.) Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash, and Roland Robertson, 25-44. London: SAGE Publications.

Scott, Allen J. *The Cultural Economy of Cities.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers
    (2002).

Shaw, Martin. 2000. *Theory of the global state: globality as unfinished revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wole Akande, (2002)"The Drawbacks of Cultural Globalization"Yellow November 10, 2002 http://www.yellotimes.org).