Globalization and Questions of Post-Colonial Theory

David Slater
Department of Geography
Loughborough University

Introduction

As the literature on globalization continually expands, more emphasis is being given to the diversity of meanings attached to the term 'global'. The global may surface in relation to the importance of flows, whereby the phenomena of monetary transactions, images, information, migrants, drugs and new technologies are viewed as radically transcending the territorial confines of the nation state. Alternatively, the global may be linked to the strategy of a transnational corporation, or constructed as an image to sell a commodity, or deployed as a key symbolic reference in a programme of political mobilization around issues of environmental pollution. Equally, more attention is being given to the need to define the specificity of the global, with suggestions being made that globalization is most usefully conceived as the spread of 'supraterritorial' or 'transborder' relations, where borders are transcended and the world experiences a 'fundamental transformation of human geography' (Scholte, 1997, p. 432).[1] Similarly, for Goldblatt, Held, McGrew and Perraton (1997, p. 271), globalization denotes a shift in the spatial form and extent of human organization and interaction to a transcontinental level; here the various forms of globalization are distinguished according to their geographical extensiveness, the intensity of global interactions, including the infrastructure (transport, legal frameworks, telecommunications) and institutionalization of these interactions, and according to their

differential impact on the power of national and local actors. Furthermore, and crucially, the analysis of globalization and global change is increasingly marked by the delineation of different discourses of interpretation and explanation. Neo-liberal, marxist, post-structuralist, feminist and post-colonialist are only some of the theoretical persuasions that spring immediately to mind, and of course within these broad categories there are many differential shades of conceptual orientation and political positionality.[2]

The above set of opening remarks leads me to underline the idea that the way 'the global' is being thought and conceptualized is itself very much in question - the analysis of globalization is increasingly becoming a site of contention. Indeed it is in this context that King (1996, p. 1958) suggests that 'theories of globalization ..are ripe for deconstruction, not least from feminist and postcolonial critical perspectives, and from scholars outside the parts of the world from which such theories emanate who may well see them as simply the latest neocolonialisms, in the tradition of modernization theory and "stages of economic growth".' The point being highlighted here is not only what is being theorized but also who is theorizing and from where?

These sorts of questions have been raised within post-structuralist, post-modern and particularly post-colonial perspectives, and point to the issue of the *limits* of given theoretical interpretations within what I would call the geopolitics of knowledge. In my following discussion I want to show how the limits and absences within current theorizations of global change can be revealed through the encounter with 'non-Western' contexts *and* 'non-Western' agents of knowledge.[3] More specifically, I intend to construct an encounter between the global and the post-colonial and to employ some of the insights of post-colonial perspectives to enable us to rethink the way we interpret globalization. In the same move, I want to re-consider some of the meanings given to the 'post-colonial' and in particular in relation to its applicability in studies of North-South relations, a categorization which is also open to question.[4] In this way I hope to create an intersection or zone of interconnected contours that may provide a new space in which other lines of enquiry and grounds for dialogue may emerge.[5]

Paradoxes of the Global

Part of the perplexity and uncertainty associated with living in global times can be traced to a number of inner tensions and contradictions that permeate our era. Hence, whilst economies are brought closer together, nations and neighbourhoods are being pulled apart. The more processes of global economic integration proceed apace the more trends towards social and political disintegration become accentuated. The Spanish social scientist and journalist Ramonet (1997) describes this phenomenon in terms of a combined dynamic of fusion and fission, where on the one side there are processes of supra-national economic and commercial integration, as exemplified in the European Union, NAFTA (Canada, the USA and Mexico), Mercosur (Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay) and the Union of the Arab Maghreb (Algeria, Mauretania, Morocco, Libya and Tunisia), and on the other, fuelled by the energies of resurgent nationalism and discourses of ethnic identification, previously-established multi-ethnic states are split open by new political fissures. At the same moment, new connections are juxtaposed with new separations. Whilst on one level, instantaneous electronic movements of money and messages give us the sense of a 'borderless world', in other zones 'fortified enclaves' are erected to stake out separate high-income spaces, secure and fenced off from social worlds of poverty, crime and perceived dystopia (Caldeira, 1996).

Writing from Latin America, Hopenhayn (1997) reminds us of other paradoxes brought by globalization. New forms of 'travel' - surfing the Internet to distant worlds or turning into the submerged and impoverished world of crack cocaine - communication for the well-to-do barrios, cool and light; intoxication for the barrios below, closed in and heavy. The social exclusion, urban tension, and decay of collectivity which come in the wake of neo-liberal globalization spawn deeper forms of alienation and poverty. But also the growing concentration of income co-exists with the elusive transience of new social movements; social divisions co-exist with new social networks, and standardization (dollarization, 'structural adjustment', privatization) co-exists with the proliferation of social diversity, and the insurgent validation of indigenous culture.

Along another line of tension, an explosion of inter-connectivity and immediate planetary circulation of images and messages is contradicted by a turning in, by a tangible reduction in the coverage of foreign affairs by key Western media outlets. In the United States for example, network television has seen a marked shrinkage in the proportion of foreign stories covered - so as a percentage of all topics covered between 1970 and 1995, the share of foreign stories fell from 35 per cent to 23 per cent, and more strikingly still, while the networks devoted on average more than 40 per cent of total news time to foreign items in the 1970s, that share had been cut to 13.5 per cent of news time by 1995 (Moisy, 1997). This is also paralleled by the fact that in the late 1980s only about 2 per cent of all U.S. television programming (excluding Hispanic and 'multicultural' programming) came from abroad (During, 1997, p. 812). Moreover, it is worthwhile noting that the largest global television network, CNN International, retains only 35 foreign correspondents in 23 foreign bureaus, compared with the nearly 500 correspondents and 100 bureaus supported by the major wire services, and it reaches only 3 per cent of the world's population (Moisy, op.cit).[6] Hence, 'going global' can exist side by side with a tendency, certainly visible in the United States, towards the re-assertion of an inner-directed gaze and a return to the national, regional and local. A trend towards introversion can also be associated with a general perception, post-Cold War, that the world outside the 'civilized heartlands of the West' has become an increasingly dangerous, unpredictable, turbulent and intractable place where foreign interventions may serve no durably beneficial purpose. [7]

This sense of turning inward can also be connected to a refusal to recognize the rights of others be they from ethnic minorities, different religions, migrant communities or poor neighbourhoods. In the United States and Europe notions of defending borders and erecting fortresses sit uneasily with counter-notions of the free movement of commodities, open economies, the abolition of economic protectionism, flexibility and deregulation. Thus, whilst on the one hand the opening up of space to the free flow of capital is championed, the free flow of labour is blocked at the border. Within the transnational space of NAFTA (The North American Free Trade Agreement), for instance, the United States places increasing restrictions on the inflow of Mexican labour, whilst re-asserting the centrality

of open economies. [8] For some Mexicans there is a 'new Berlin Wall' exemplified in the intense refortification of the fence along the US-Mexican frontier, with the bolstering of existing physical barriers, the installation of additional surveillance devices and the introduction of far more immigration guards on the United States side of the border. This goes hand in hand with new legislation to reduce the inflow of Mexican and Central American labour. [9] Further, in a not dissimilar context, it is indeed somewhat ironic, as Radhakrishnan (1996, p. 178) reminds us, that whilst U.S. trade policy statements call for the deterritorializations of national spaces by the flow of capital, they also call into question the posited loss of American jobs to cheap labour overseas.

Underlying these kinds of contradictions one can locate a deep sense of unevenness, connected to the combination of integration and disintegration, of inclusion with exclusion, and this unevenness is underscored by Holm and Sørensen (1995), who usefully suggest that the process of globalization (in their formulation the intensification of economic, political, social and cultural relations across borders) is uneven in its intensity and geographical scope, in both the international and domestic spheres. More tellingly for the specific issues of this analysis, Mosquera (1994), in his short but cogent discussion of 'transcultural curating', argues that whilst the word 'globalization' may evoke the idea of a planet in which all points happen to be interconnected in a web-like network, in actual fact, connections occur inside a radial and hegemonic pattern around the centres of power, while the peripheral countries tend to remain disconnected from one another, or are only connected indirectly via and under the control of the centres. For Mosquera there is a structure of 'axial globalisation' and 'zones of silence' which forms the basis of the economic, political and cultural network that moulds the whole planet. Although globalization has undoubtedly improved communication and has facilitated a more pluralistic consciousness, at the same time it has 'introduced the illusion of a trans-territorial world of multi-cultural dialogue with currents that flow in all directions' (Mosquera, 1994, p. 133). Illustrating this position, Mosquera draws the reader's attention to the existence of a highly centralized system of museums, galleries, publications, collectors and market networks which exercises a legitimating power based on Eurocentric or

even Manhattan-centric criteria. These central circuits contain the capital to invest in the construction of 'universal values' from their own particular view, and Western centres not only send their art to the periphery, they also bring back art of their choosing from the periphery, under control, keeping disconnected the zones of silence. For Mosquera there is a phenomenon of 'inverted curating' whereby the countries which host the art of other cultures are at the same time curating the shows; it is rarely the other way around, the world being practically divided 'between curating cultures and curated cultures' (Mosquera, op.cit., p. 135).[10]

Mosquera's 'axial globalization' and 'zones of silence' highlight another dimension of unevenness whilst also re-introducing the place of the periphery into contemporary treatments of global culture and politics, thus echoing perhaps Hitchcock's (1994, p. 11) question: 'how do theories and theoreticians resist the 'inevitability' that 'thinking global' is the next chapter in the Western will-to-hegemony? What is at issue here is how genuinely global is the new theorization of global politics and culture? In some instances, it is clear that a North-South divide emerges when the question of global change in a post-Cold War era is posed. Nakarada (1994), for example, reporting on a workshop held in Zimbabwe, where the theme was the future of 'world order', notes a fundamental North/South difference between participants, whereby those from the North tended to stress the phenomema of speed and the dissolution of spatial borders, with some underlining the dislocation of power centres while others emphasized the positive potential inherent in the way a state-oriented system seemed to be giving way to a new kind of global civilization. By contrast, participants from the South were far more negative in their diagnosis of the situation, referring to the South as a new object of recolonization and global apartheid - for workshop participants from the South, 'the term "global" refers only to the interests of the North'.[11]

This kind of split raises the question of the possible existence of a North-South divide in terms of the effects of globalization, and also of the presence of a South-North differential in the manner that this divide is diagnosed and explained. The last paradox I want to mention concerns exactly this kind of problem - that in an academic world which has seen a burgeoning of research on globalization there has not infrequently been a circumscription of themes, theories and territories within an

Occidental frame.[12] I do not want to imply that the North-South dimension has been absent, as a range of new contributions bears witness (Dallmayr, 1996, James, 1997, Saurin, 1996 and Wilkins, 1996) but I do want to problematize the way the global has been treated in the West, and in so doing I shall use post-colonial theory as a new reservoir of critical thought.

Re-thinking the Post-Colonial Turn

As with the post-modern, the post-colonial has not lent itself to a singular definition. In the late 1980s, Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (1989, p. 2), in their well-known text *The Empire Writes Back* , gave form to their own approach to the post-colonial by taking the term to refer to all the culture affected by the imperial process from the moment of colonization to the present day. In a more focussed definition, which concentrates on the mode of interpretation, Darby and Paolini (1994, p. 379) suggest that 'postcolonialism seeks to reclaim the moral and emotional highground in its interrogation of Western modernity'; - 'whether it be the Third World intellectual or writer in Western academia, or the subaltern or native voice...the impetus is on the margin as the key repository of a radical and subversive political standpoint'. More recently, Rattansi (1997) in a perceptive intervention, stresses the interactive nature of the post-colonial, writing that the central defining theme of post-colonialist studies is the 'investigation of the mutually constitutive role played by colonizer and colonized, centre and periphery, the metropolitan and the 'native', in forming, in part, the identities of both the dominant power and the subalterns involved in the imperial and colonial projects of the 'West' (p. 481).

From these three definitions of perspective, it is possible to extract four inter-related points:

> a) The post-colonial, unlike other 'posts' such as the post-marxist, post-structuralist or post-modern, can be defined in relation to a period of time that is marked by the power of the colonizing process. There are certain clear historical co-ordinates, although the onset and periodization of colonialism as well as its inner

constitution vary considerably, not least in the crucial distinction between Latin America on the one hand and Africa and Asia on the other;[13]

b) Alternatively, the post-colonial can be associated with the post-modern and post-structural in the sense that it exists as a mode of critical enquiry whereby notions of difference, agency, subjectivity, hybridity and resistance destabilize Western discourses of modernity and emphasize the inseparability of colonialism and imperialism from the projection of Enlightenment values;

c) Equally, the post-colonial can be deployed to foreground the mutually constitutive role played by colonizer and colonized, or centre and periphery - in other words, rather than remain within a frame that only sees a one-way power relation between the dominant and the dominated or the exploiter and the exploited, the post-colonial turn recognizes that in these dynamic interactions both entities in the relation are affected, albeit in different ways, and

d) The post-colonial can be deployed not only to shift the terrain of analysis, or to challenge the history and geopolitics of metropolitan theory, but furthermore as a mode of critical interruption it can yield a series of questions concerning the site of enunciation - who are the agents of theoretical knowledge, where are they located, for whom do they speak and how do they theorize?[14]

From these points it can be seen that one of the more crucial themes of post-colonial analysis concerns the changing relation between imperial power and the politics of theory. Chakrabarty (1992), for example, observes that in the academic discourse of history, as practiced in universities, 'Europe' remains the sovereign, theoretical subject of all histories including the ones referrred to as 'Indian', 'Chinese' or 'Kenyan'. The history of Europe has become a master narrative which is used to locate all other histories, which in contrast are regarded as peripheral. Moreover, whilst 'Third World historians feel a need to refer to works in European history, historians of Europe do not feel any need to reciprocate' (p. 337). Chakrabarty goes on to argue that what is needed is a project to 'provincialize

Europe' which must include the twin recognition that a) Europe's acquisition of the adjective 'modern' for itself is an element of global history, within which the story of European imperialism is an integral part and b) that Third World nationalisms, as modernizing ideologies, have been equal partners in the global development of modernity. This also means that whilst 'Europe' needs to be dismantled as a universalizing project, 'India' must also be problematized - 'the idea is to write into the history of modernity the ambivalences, contradictions, the use of force, and the tragedies and the ironies that attend it' (Chakrabarty, op.cit., p. 352).

Clearly, however, we cannot assume that there is an unproblematic association between post-colonial thought and the Third World intellectual. First of all, as Radhakrishnan (1996, p. 155) indicates, the term 'postcoloniality' rarely surfaces within the formerly colonized worlds of South Asia and Africa.[15] Indeed, in the words of an African political scientist, the current international scene would be better described in terms of a 'recolonization of subject peoples' (Tandon 1994), where it is contended that the imperial North has extended its sources of control (economic, political and military) over the subordinated peoples of the South. Similarly, and also with Africa as the main focus, Ould-Mey (1994) is of the view that the development and strengthening of international institutions under global adjustment is bringing about a new form of 'multilateral imperialism'. Nor is the context singularly African, as the recent text on 'global colonialism' and democracy by the Mexican sociologist González-Casanova (1995) amply demonstrates.

The stress in the above works on the continuity of imperialism and colonialism, albeit in new and re-asserted forms, would seem to take us back to older notions of neo-colonialism, which were produced in a period when dependency perspectives and 'radical underdevelopment theory' were far more influential. It can be argued that the term 'neo-colonialism' overplays the power of the imperial centres and enframes the Third World as passive and continually captured, while correspondingly leaving underexposed the impact of the colonial relation on the societies of the West. It is in this light that writers such as Bhabha (1994) have highlighted notions of ambivalence and irony to move away from what often appear to be overly-simple

binary oppositions. But do the two approaches have to be viewed as essentially incompatible?

What is at stake here is the clash of different theoretical positions within the domain of post-colonial analyis. Put directly, this can be seen as a contest between conceptual and thematic persuasions that base themselves within a Marxist problematic and other positions which more clearly ally themselves with post-structuralist and post-marxist theorizations in which class is no longer central, and concepts of subjectivity, identity, difference and resistance are deployed in ways which tend to by-pass questions of materiality, inequality and economic power. Those writers who adopt a Marxist perspective argue that the post-colonial turn has frequently been associated with eclectic enquiry, an avoidance of political economy, and in particular class politics, and more pointedly an implicit acceptance of global capitalism.[16]

In one sense this theoretical and political contradistinction is somewhat ironic in that if we examine the work of the three writers most associated with the post-colonial as a site of critical enquiry, namely, Said, Spivak and Bhabha, it becomes clear that there is a hybridity of theoretical orientation. Said (1978, 1993), for example, combines conceptual grounding and thematic concentration from Gramsci and Foucault, whilst also being critical of the tendency to turn Marxist categories into terminal abstractions. Spivak (1988, 1990 and 1996), in her work on the subaltern, representation and post-colonial literature, combines Marxist categories with an incisive post-structuralist sensibility, and frequently introduces such categories as 'the international division of labour' , 'neo-colonialism' and 'global capitalism', whilst also deploying an adapted 'Derridean gaze'. Perhaps Bhabha (1994 and 1996) appears to be the least Marxist of the three, but here also there is a re-problematization rather than rejection[17] - in fact, I would suggest that not one of the 'post-colonial trio' is an *ex* - Marxist. Rather one finds shades of theoretical meaning and in my view a genuine hybridity which contrasts markedly with those other interventions which seem to assign to Marxist theory a pre-given, homogeneous and privileged status.[18]

Hybridity and Modes of Power

Notions of hybridity frequently surface in relation to discussions of ambivalence, heterogeneity and authenticity. For Bhabha (1994), in his subtle and complex treatments of the term, a number of elements are foregrounded. Along one line of interpretation, where the context is formed by a discussion of the impact of Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* , Bhabha (op cit., p. 225) argues against those 'binary geopolitical polarities' that set Islamic fundamentalists against Western literary modernists, for what is obscured here is the anxiety of the irresolvable, borderline culture of hybridity - the in-between, hyphenated nature of cultural identification that exposes the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference be it class, gender or race. In his consideration of colonial domination, hybridity is theorized as an intrinsic dimension of the colonial encounter. For Bhabha, colonial domination entails a process of discrimination in which there is a splitting - 'the mother culture and its bastards', for instance - but what is disavowed is repeated as something different - a mutation or hybrid, so that when colonial discourse is faced by the hybridity of its objects, the *'presence* of power is revealed as something other than what its rules of recognition assert'. Consequently, 'colonial power is seen to be the *production* of hybridization rather than the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions..', and therefore the ambivalence at the root of discourses of colonial authority 'enables a form of subversion, founded on the undecidability that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention (Bhabha 1994, p. 112). The creation of 'hybrid subjects' can engender new and subversive forms of counter-identification to colonial power.

Bhabha's theorization of hybridity, and in particular in relation to colonial power and discourse, has provoked a series of sharp critiques from a range of Marxist-inclined authors. Parry (1994), in a detailed and wide-ranging evaluation, returns, symptomatically, to the question of class and capital, re-emphasizing the 'real and material (not just 'discursive') differences of interest in the world of 'capitalism-as-transcontinental-imperialism'. In this passage it is argued contra Bhabha's stress on 'difference' and 'hybridity' that the

structural relations of capitalism 'demand that plurally constituted and positioned subjects, with multiple associations, different proclivities and diverse enthusiasm, mobilise around class conceived either as a socio-economic category or as a community engaged in struggle' (Parry, op.cit., pp. 14-15). But it is exactly against this form of centralized theory that Bhabha develops key parts of his conceptual arsenal, and in a passing comment on Jameson's (1991) prioritization of the 'unifying and totalizing force .. of capital itself', Bhabha (1994, p. 220) notes that this kind of reasoning seems 'all too easily visible' and 'too predictably knowable'.

The two forms of hybridity mentioned above can be connected to a wider range of meanings, including the Latin American concept of *mestizaje* , which Martín-Barbero (1993, p. 188) interprets not as a racial fact, but as 'the explanation of our existence, the web of times and places, memories and imagination..' ; it is a notion which underlines the historical significance of interweaving and heterogeneity in cultural forms. Similarly, for García-Canclini (1995), in his work on hybrid cultures, all today's cultures are border cultures which have lost their exclusive relation with their territory, whilst at the same time gaining in communication and knowledge. Also in Latin America we have discussions of the hybridity of 'times' through the complex combinations of the pre-modern, modern and post-modern, or the notion of *la desmodernidad* (from the Spanish noun *desmadre* meaning both being without a mother and living in chaos).[19]

But are all hybridities equal? Radhakrishnan (1996, pp. 159-162) makes a challenging distinction between metropolitan and postcolonial versions of hybridity where the former are seen as being comfortably embedded in both national and transnational citizenship in contrast to the latter which are viewed as being in search of a legitimate political identity. In this context, where geopolitics and power relations are foregrounded, who is speaking and for whom are seen as significant questions since the phenemonon of hybridity does not erase the stubborn realities of power. [20]

In the arena of communications and the media, a global hybridization of TV programmes can co-exist with a continuing concentration of control. For instance, on the one hand a

peripheral country such as Brazil has become the seventh world producer of television and advertising,[21] and the sixth in records, whereas overall the West continues to dominate the use of satellites, telecommunications, remote-sensing capabilities, direct satellite broadcasting and computer-related transmission (Morley and Robins 1995, p. 225). This kind of co-existence raises questions concerning how we formulate our ideas about hybridity when also thinking about power. Where do we locate the *limits* to hybridization? How do we account for the *absence* of the 'hybrid' in relation to certain kinds of global power?

Obviously the answers to these and related questions depend to a large extent on the way we interpret hybridity, and the contexts in which we situate it. In the case of Bhabha's conceptualization of hybridity in relation to colonial power, the argument would be that the 'power over' is deployed in a way that initiates the formation of subaltern subjects who have heterogeneous and ambivalent positionalities, split between the endogenous and the exogenous and their mutations. For Bhabha hybrid subjects are produced through the actual exercise of colonial authority in territories with a mosaic of cultural practices that can never be comprehensively absorbed by the penetrating power. It is this stance that provokes Parry (1994, p. 11) into commenting that such a perspective is contradicted by the dispossessions the West visited on other worlds. But Bhabha does not exclude colonial violence, although clearly this is not analysed in the same degree of detail as ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity, and he is certainly cognizant of the depredations of colonial power. I would argue that hybridity as conceived by Bhabha does not preclude or deny violence but rather gives us a more complex and nuanced view of the colonial encounter, and equally one has to remember that through the duration of a colonial occupation, accommodations and adaptations of authority were a central element in reproducing governmental power.

However, in contrasting domains, it is evident that the will and capacity to penetrate other societies or economies are less affected by the accommodations of hybridity. For example, the imposition of neo-liberal policies in the countries of the South has hardly been an example of the hybridization of the economic. The IMF 'debt squads' of the 1980s did not carry with them any distinctive heterogeneity of economic thought. The

will to re-structure the dependent Third World economy followed a tenacious adherence to an essentialist doctrine of 'structural adjustment' and monetarist policies. Nevertheless, here also it is necessary to re-introduce an element of temporality since over a number of years the detrimental social effects of the deployment of such an essentialist discourse have begun to encourage an adaptation of the original blueprint for 'economic reform'. In addition, within the G7 group the emergence of a Japanese-led critique of neo-liberal policies could be interpreted as a sign of a nascent 'hybridization of the economic'. [22]

In the arena of US - Latin American relations, certain limits to hybridization are reflected in the one-way application of geopolitical power as in the case of the invasion of Panama in 1989, and the continuing US enforcement of the embargo on Cuba, which has received recent re-iteration in the Helms-Burton Act of 1996. Similarly, the US policy of 'decertifying' Latin American countries who are deemed not to have pulled their weight in the fight against drug production and trafficking takes place in a setting marked by a lack of reciprocity and arguments from the Latin American side that their sovereignty is not being fully respected (Tokatlian, 1997). Moreover, within the territorial jurisdictions of particular states, policies of 'ethnic cleansing', violent ethnic or religious divisions, and government persecutions of ethnic minorities obviously underscore the existence in particular places of fierce opposition to a possible politics of hybridity. One could extend such a list - simply my intention is to point to those kinds of circumstances where the exercise of varying modes of power makes a striking contrast with the assumption of widespread and growing hybridization - an assumption which also raises the problem of the actual periodization of hybridization, given the fact that there has never been a time devoid of hybridization in some form. This certainly does not mean, however, that power can only be understood in terms of confrontations and vertical actions. Not only do we have complex interactions, as subtly analysed by Bhabha, but also, as García-Canclini (1995, p. 259) explains, forms of domination only acquire efficacy through a certain 'obliqueness' whereby ethnic power and family power are blurred, or where the borders between economic and political power are difficult to discern - for García-Canclini (ibid) what is important is the 'shrewdness with which the cables are

mixed, and secret orders passed and responded to affirmatively' - not only a resistance to power but also a complicity.

Overall, we can agree with Nederveen Pieterse (1995, p. 64) when he concludes that the 'hybridization perspective' is meaningful as a critique of essentialism, and as an unsettling of introverted and romanticized visions of culture.[23] Also, such a perspective is useful in reminding us of the pertinence of Rattansi's (1997) stress on the mutual imbrication of the colonizer and the colonized, and the continuing political and psychological resonance of the decolonization process for the metropolitan power as, for example, the rise of the Le Pen movement in France demonstrates. Equally, however, the realization that vertical forms of power have not disappeared can help prevent us from romanticizing hybridity, or forgetting that positive views of hybridization can be concomitant with new forms of essentialism, as Sakamoto (1996) shows in his reading of a particular Japanese view of a diverse West on the one side and an essentialized non-Japanese Asia on the other. If an accelerated globalization is indeed generating increased hybridization, especially in relation to the cultural realm, does that include the agents of theoretical knowledge? Who is theorizing, from where, in what ways and for whom?

Critical Thought and the Agents of Knowledge

Said (1983, pp. 226-227) has described theory in relation to travel, suggesting that it is possible to identify a number of phases common to the way a theory or idea travels. First, there is a point of origin, or initial circumstances in which the idea entered discourse. Second, a theory or idea moves across a certain distance, from a previous point to another time and place. Next, one has a set of conditions, both of acceptance and resistance which affect the introduction or toleration of the transplanted theory or idea, and finally the full or partially incorporated idea is in varying degrees transformed by its new uses and new historical and geographical position. Said's schema can provide us with a starting point to this section of our discussion, but in addition we need to keep in mind the significance of three other factors: i) diffusion is not only one-

way, since theory produced in the South, for example *dependencia* perspectives, has travelled northwards; ii) there are of course a variety of ideas and discourses travelling in both directions in a veritable criss-crossing of intellectual influences, and iii) such interactions occur in a global context of power and knowledge which crucially affects the overall configuration of the intellectual landscape. An initial example, which has a broader significance, might be taken from the spatial diffusion of Western feminism.

An underlying point of departure for much of Western feminism has been the notion that Third World women had something to learn from Western feminism, which in the eyes of the latter was viewed as being universally relevant.[24] Western feminism set the agenda, and presupposed that the Third World was an empty space as far as feminist theory and issues were concerned.[25] The idea of an empty space for theory represents a form of erasure that still continues to resonate in the contemporary feminist literature, as Spivak (1996) has recently emphasized, and equally in other literatures concerning post-modernity, social movements, globalization and modernity similar absences are apparent. Although the implicit notion that the Third World is an empty space for theory is being increasingly challenged (Castells, 1996, Santos, 1995), its occurrence is still widespread, and it is combined with the dominant assumption that Western theory has a universal relevance. Symptomatically, the tendency to erase the presence of the Third World as a producer of theoretical knowledge is often accompanied by a recognition of the importance of other non-Western worlds in relation to the validation of traditional or popular or indigenous knowledges, or to the significance of resistances, political action and mobilization (Franco, 1988).[26] In other words when the Third World is introduced in these kinds of contexts it is not infrequently done so as a signifier of tradition and revolt, rather than as a possible contributor to a critical thought and reflection which could be significant beyond its immediate geographical origin. In other instances, ideas and conceptual approaches produced in the Third World have been appropriated by Western authors and subsequently disseminated as part of their own evolving intellectual contributions to an international audience.[27] Thus, we have a combination here of exclusion and inclusion where the inclusion is part of another metropolitan process of appropriation.

The diffusion of ideas and concepts from the West, in areas of knowledge such as feminism, post-modernism, social movements theory, globalization and development, is characterized by a certain plurality, since for example with reference to the analysis of globalization different visions of this process are being diffused at the same time, and the process of adaptation within the non-West is also characterized by heterogeneity. Hence, for example, we can posit a continuum from overall acceptance through partial agreement on at least some of the basic ideas of an externally-produced theory through to outright rejection. Across this range there will of course be nuances of interpretation and the emergence of a variety of hybrid forms of analysis. The importance of diversity cannot be over-emphasized since there is always a possibility that a critique of the erasure of theory can be replaced by a romanticization of the theoretical other as characterized by a sameness and homogeneity rooted in a uniform image of a resistant and rebellious presence.[28] Furthermore, in relation, for instance, to the neo-liberal reading of the state and the informal sector, the dominant view did not simply diffuse from North to South. Other agents of knowledge, based in the South, produced neo-liberal interpetations which were well-diffused *and* the subject of fierce disagreement within their country of origin and beyond; in this case the debates around the Peruvian writer Hernando de Soto's (1989) *The Other Path* provide a striking example.

Thinking about the content and orientation of Third World literatures, as for example in relation to the way we go about studying globalization or the politics of the post-colonial, can lead us into highlighting three interrelated elements.

a) First these literatures have a history and they are heterogeneous, combining indigenous concepts with ideas and constructs imported from abroad.

b) Second, how we relate to this heterogeneity will be influenced by our own theoretical and political positionalities, as is the case in general, so clearly a neo-liberal economist based in the United States or Britain would be inclined to cite the work of correspondingly oriented economists based in the South, whereas one would expect that a Western marxist would be inclined to

refer to analysis originating within related theoretical currents in the Third World, whilst at the same time critically assessing the neo-liberal tendency. In addition, as is evident in the debates around post-colonial theory, differences in theoretical and thematic emphases as between Third World intellectuals still based in the South and those who have moved to universities in the United States or Western Europe may be at least partly connected to international variations in the nature of academic debates which themselves are not unconditioned by the changing political circumstances of the countries in which they are embedded.[29]

c) Third, if in the North it can be accepted that there are agents of theoretical knowledge based in the South,[30] and if there is a genuine desire for our understanding of globalization to take into account a variety of sites of enunciation, recognizing that as Mignolo (1993, p. 131) puts it, 'the Third World produces not only "cultures" to be studied by anthropologists and ethnohistorians but also intellectuals who generate theories and reflect on their own culture and history', then arguably it might be useful to look for the differences in thematic prioritization, contextual settings and theoretical and political orientations that emanate from those other sites of analysis. Potentially, these differences can help to stimulate a re-thinking of many of the customary approaches to globalization in the West, whereby the limits of much of the theorization current in North America and Western Europe may be better perceived. This does not mean that other territories of analytical persuasion exist in splendid isolation from the intellectual centres of Euro-America; there is no 'uncontaminated periphery' waiting to be identified and claimed for its alternative authenticity. Rather what can be found are different sites or sources of interpretation which are rooted in historical and geopolitical experiences that provide a counter to the universalist narratives of the dominant Western-based conceptualizations. These other sites can help us look for different engagements and new border zones from which thinking across and within can be merged into more hybrid conceptual frameworks.

Thinking about globalization in Latin America and elsewhere in the South leads a number of social scientists based in peripheral societies to prioritize a series of themes that focus on the effects of strategic decisions made outside their regions, although always implemented through alliances made within.[31] For the Mexican sociologist Zermeño (1995), neo-liberal globalization and increased transnational competitiveness have resulted in a continuing attack against the actors of 'our modernity'. The erosion of civil society, increasing impoverishment and social polarization, the de-unionization of the labour force and the accentuation of socio-political exclusion generate a situation where national identity is radically fissured and the possibilities for an independent project of social and economic development are drastically curtailed if not extinguished altogether. Moreover, in Zermeño's view there is no longer a split between modernity for the affluent and successful and tradition for the backward sector; instead, the two sector model has been transformed so that the 'informal sector' and the 'creative poor' also become part of the new wave of neo-liberal modernization. The point here is that in contrast to the earlier wave of modernization and industrialization from the 1950s and 1960s, the neo-liberal discourse of modernization downgrades the economic role of the nation state and privileges open markets, privatization and deregulation as the essential prerequisites for progress and development. In this context, all economic spaces are to be integrated into world markets, and dualistic conceptions are replaced by an all-encompassing logic of accelerated insertion into the global economy.

Zermeño's critique of neo-liberal globalization, which emphasizes new forms of dependency and increasing poverty and polarization, finds support in a range of similar interventions in the Latin American literature (Campodónico, 1995 and Saxe-Fernández, 1997), and is a position which carries with it a specific portrayal of the geopolitical and historical circumstances that are vital to any understanding of the periphery's subordinated involvement in globalization processes. This does not mean that these kinds of issues do not receive attention in the North,[32] but rather that the thematic domain within which questions of globalization are debated and analysed in societies of the South is significantly constituted by the examination of the relations between the exacerbation of poverty, polarization, exclusion and

inequalities on the one hand and neo-liberal globalization on the other .

This kind of critical analytical priority is intimately linked to interpretations of sovereignty and marginalization in a global context. Brazilian writers such as Ianni (1994 and 1996) and Santos M (1994) have stressed the connections between globalization and the fragmentation of peripheral societies, and Ianni (1994) argues that as the power of the nation state in societies of the South is increasingly eroded, one can envisualize situations in which the nation in the South will become a 'province of global society'. This sense of growing marginalization from the sites of global decision-making is present in a recent text on Cuba-US relations which interestingly locates the dynamic of conflict between Cuba and the United States in the wider context of globalization. The Cuban authors Chailloux, López and Baró (1997) draw attention to the increased marginalization of Third World nations from the key decision-making bodies of global affairs and in many senses put back on to the agenda issues of dependency and exclusion that were characteristic of debates in the 1970s. Here questions of sovereignty and international power are enframed in a way that prioritizes the changing geopolitics of empire and poses questions relevant to our conceptualization of US hegemony in an increasingly globalized world.[33]

The question of sovereignty is also linked to debates concerning the constitution of national identities in global times. Ortiz (1997), for example, considers the relation between nation state and modernity, suggesting that the globalization of culture breaks the nation state's monopoly over the meanings of social life within its own territory. Along one route, globalization 'liberates' local identities from the weight of national culture, and in another move, the development of a globalized cultural horizon opens the possibility for the formation of transnational identities in the field of cultural consumption, so that, for example, through the spread of satellite and cable television throughout Latin America, daily information about news events and social trends enables transnational cultural proximity to become an intrinsic part of every day experience. In this context, Ortiz argues that whilst modernity is increasingly associated with the global and the transnational, the national, as a marker of independence, autonomy and sovereignty, becomes

increasingly unstable, being more associated with notions of the traditional than the modern. At the same time, as Ortiz stresses, this does not mean that the nation state no longer has a key role within the peripheral society, since, for example, within specific territorial limits, the nation state still maintains a monopoly over bureaucratic authority and the legitimated use of violence, so that within a globalizing world there are still sites of centripetal power. Moreover, as Calderón, Ottone and Hopenhayn (1996) remind us, the nation state ought to have an essential role in the formulation of policies to confront poverty and different types of exclusion within Latin American societies.[34] What is crucial here of course is the need to re-think the role and function of the nation state in a rapidly changing world, and to distinguish, which perhaps Ortiz does not do in sufficient detail, between the nation and the state. Obviously, in societies characterized by multi-national communities and a plurality of symbolic traditions, there is no singular legitimation of national authority and power, and no one meaning for citizenship.

The place of the national in critical discussions of globalization and new world orders is also intimately connected to issues of ethnocentrism and Western universalism. This is not a new theme, nor is it a theme which only surfaces in literatures of the South, but it is a theme which receives greater priority in the societies of the periphery than elsewhere and this again is to be explained in the context of the history of geopolitical penetrations and imperial projects. In his book on culture and civilization in Mexico, Bonfil Batalla (1996) writes that the West envisages itself as the carrier of *the* universal civilization, and as something ostensibly unique and superior it entails the negation and exclusion of other, different civilizational projects. This underlying critical position can be found in a wide range of writing on globalization and modernity. For instance, Ake (1995), Dussel (1997) and Kothari (1993) all question, within their own perspectives and priorities, the dissemination of Eurocentric biases in the treatment of modernity, political order, development and globalization and they do so as a central element of their overall theorization.

The above selection of themes does not by any means exhaust the critical array of contributions that are available, and all I have

done here is to identify a number of thematic priorities with particular reference to the Latin American literature, which I know in more detail than work from Africa, Asia and the Middle East. In all cases, I would argue that whilst the thematic priorities vary the contexts contain at least one constant which is captured by the changing historical impact of geopolitical penetrations and subordinating forms of insertion into the global capitalist system. Whilst again such theoretical and political concerns are by no means absent from the Western literature,[35] just as conversely more conservative positions are also found in non-Western texts, I would nevertheless argue that there is a significant difference. This difference can be seen in the light of the fact that from the geopolitical location of the non-West or South, the historical experiences of being subjected to a variety of forms of exclusion and inclusion, and of being the object of subordinating modes of representation which justify the maintenance of unequal power relations in the world system, tend to generate a subjectivity that is more resistant, and more critically conscious than is generally the case within societies that have benefitted, no matter how differentially, from initiating and controlling such processes of expansion and incorporation. This is not to advocate any implicit closure of positionality whereby the periphery would be situated as innately oppositional whilst the centre remains intrinsically dominating. Subjectivities are always constructed and can be most appropriately seen as un-fixed, dynamic and mobile, irrespective of geographical location. However, there are certain nodal points of meaning and positionality, where a common sentiment (anti-imperialism) or vision (autonomy) or moving idea (the struggle for social justice) become socially sedimented, even if that sedimentation is always subjected to the varied currents of political change. In the context of the agents of knowledge and the analysis of globalization, it can be reasonably argued, as I have illustrated above, that being on the periphery, or 'at the margins' can stimulate the production of critical openings that provide us with an enabling ethic of contestation, the relevance of which is genuinely global.

Global Visions and the Politics of the Post-Colonial

In his thought-provoking intervention into the debate on post-coloniality and global capitalism, Dirlik (1994) makes the point that there is a need to go beyond the crisis of understanding that has been produced by the inability of old categories to account for the world. For Dirlik, post-coloniality represents one response to such a need in a world characterized by an unprecedented proliferation of new tendencies and instabilities, including the de-centreing of capitalism nationally, the weakening of boundaries, the disorganization of a world once conceived in terms of three worlds, the flow of culture which is at once homogenizing and heterogenizing, the re-articulation of native cultures into a capitalist narrative, the emergence of new global information technologies, and trans-national communities, the presence of cultural fragmentation and multi-culturalism, and the transnationalization of production. However, this important connection between one key meaning of the post-colonial and the changing world of global capitalism is then reduced to the stark assertion that 'postcoloniality is the condition of the intelligentsia of global capitalism" (Dirlik, 1994, p. 356). It is this kind of economic reductionism and the necessary critique which it has engendered that has helped to create a mood in which all economic analysis is seen as being tainted in the same way, and as a consequence much post-modern and post-structuralist literature has been characterized by the evasion of critical economic analysis in general.[36]

One of the crucial questions to emerge from the post-colonial intervention relates to the ways one can theorize the history and geography of imperial encounters. Do we have to subscribe to a universalistic language that reduces the explanation of difference to capital and class?[37] Conversely, being disenchanted by the theoretical inadequacy of Marxist economism, is it justifiable in an era of market triumphalism to ignore the social effects of the deployment of neo-liberal doctrine? Poverty, polarization, exclusion, inequalities and hunger are hardly withering away in the wake of a revivified global capitalism, but are we always bound to analyse these phenomena through the prism of a pre-determined method of explanation? As Hall (1996) questions, is it not possible to

integrate critical social and economic analysis within an amplified post-structuralist and post-colonial frame. Further, when situating these kinds of questions in the context of West/non-West, North-South, centre-periphery, First World/Third World relations do the problematizations of these terms, associated with the difficulties attached to all binary divisions, lead us into regarding such categories as obsolete in a world of flux, fluidity and hybridity?

Let us for a moment refer to one of Bhabha's passages in his treatment of the commitment to theory. Bhabha (1995, p. 5) writes that 'I am convinced that, in the language of political economy, it is legitimate to represent the relations of exploitation and domination in the discursive division between First and Third Worlds', and subsequently he states that, 'I am equally convinced that in the language of international diplomacy there is a sharp growth in a new Anglo-American nationalism...that increasingly articulates its economic and military power in political acts that express a neo-imperialist disregard for the independence and autonomy of Other peoples and places, largely in the Third World'. At the same time, it is argued that the position Bhabha seeks to take stands on the 'shifting margins of cultural displacement', and the 'cultural and historical hybridity of the post-colonial world is taken as the paradigmatic place of departure' (Bhabha,1995, p. 6).

Symptomatic of many post-structuralist approaches, what we encounter here, and in Bhabha's work as a whole, is a form of double inscription in the sense that whilst the language of radical political economy is still validated, at the same moment it is displaced and re-drawn within a problematic that introduces other concepts of difference, hybridity and ambiguity. This is a manoeuvre that is not free of tension since the post-structuralist emphasis on the de-centring of the social subject, the unpredictability of political identities and the ethos of pluralization displaces the centrality of class and questions the prioritization of materiality in the analysis of political positionality. But this kind of conceptual tension and dissonance can also be seen as creative and productive since instead of making either or choices, of introducing an ossifying polarity into the way theoretical analysis is undertaken, new combinations and syntheses can be developed which may well be more attuned to the times in which we live. Thinking in the

'spaces in-between',[38] going beyond fixed meanings and engaging with polysemic categories such as the 'post-colonial' is more likely to open up new and constructive modes of understanding.

The politics of post-coloniality encourages thinking on the edge, along the margins but equally its ambiguities and dissonances, clearly evident in the uneasy combination of going beyond the colonial with new forms of re-colonization, as well as in the application of the post-colonial term to societies as different as the United States, India, South Africa and Australia, provoke a series of concerns and criticisms that are relevant and important (Frankenberg and Mani 1993 and McClintock, 1992). The post-colonial domain, as examined here, has been treated in terms of the geopolitical trajectory of societies that have been subjected to varying forms of both colonial and imperial domination, and although the actual periodization of the emergence from colonial rule remains a significant factor for discussion, the association of the post-colonial marker with a decolonization of the imagination needs to be highlighted as an enabling perspective on the way we think about the global. Global visions do not have to be focussed on the Occident, nor deprived of an historical memory of colonial and metropolitan power. Moreover, as mentioned earlier the unequal imbrication of centre and periphery, of colonizer and colonized, of North and South, can help us to see the importance of the post-colonial within the centres, of the politics of diasporas and new borderlands of engagement and cultural interaction (Gilroy, 1993).[39]

In returning to the way we think about the paradoxes of the global, it is perhaps possible and desirable to give greater priority to the unevenness of global processes both in terms of the object of analysis as well as the agents of knowledge. Whilst the post-structural and post-modern may help us to move away from the inflexibilities and certitudes of previously influential modes of interpretation, the post-colonial can help us go beyond the limits of universalist Western approaches to globalization and global politics. In this way our understanding of global trnasformations may become more genuinely global and more critically vibrant.

Notes

[1] For a related treatment of globalization, which connects to the theme of the 'geography of collective identities', see Scholte's (1996) earlier article.

[2] For recent Marxist-orientated interpretations of globalization, see, for example, Amin (1997), Burbach, Núñez and Kagarlitsky (1997), and Robinson (1996); neo-liberal approaches can be found in Ohmae (1990) and Rothkopf (1997); post-structuralist persuasions are to be located, inter alia, in Appadurai (1996) and García-Canclini (1996); feminist theorizations of the global are exemplified in Marchand (1996) and Spike Peterson (1996), and post-colonial interpretations of global change may be found in Bhabha (1994), Kapur (1997) and Said (1993). It needs to be stressed that these references are included only as one possible selection from literatures which are already quite extensive.

[3] In her general treatment of a range of post-colonial questions, Spivak (1990, p. 8) argues this point in an all-encompassing manner, stressing the notion that it is through an interaction with non-Western material that the dominant Occidental theories of interpretation can be challenged and re-drawn.

[4] I shall return to the problem of such binary categorizations later on in the analysis; for a stimulating treatment of key aspects of this theme see Coronil (1996).

[5] In a not dissimilar manner Darby and Paolini (1994) have attempted to generate a dialogue between authors linked to international relations on the one hand and the post-colonial on the other.

[6] In addition, in the Post-Cold War period, surveys conducted every four years by the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations show that the percentage of respondents who perceive "foreign policy problems" to be a high U.S government priority has dropped from almost 26 per cent in 1986 to 11.5 per cent in 1994 - in contrast, protecting the jobs of American workers has come to be seen as a central objective of foreign policy - see Moisy (1997, p. 83).

[7] The doyen of the American foreign policy establishment George F. Kennan has recently argued against strategies of foreign intervention, preferring instead, in the spirit of John Quincy Adams, to help smaller countries by the 'power of our example', avoiding direct interventions to help solve other countries problems. Whilst Kennan's views may not be universally accepted, they do capture an emerging mood within the "lone superpower's" domestic sphere - see Kennan (1995).

[8] Although here too there have been restrictions on Mexican imports, as witnessed in the conflict over the importation of Mexican avocados into California in 1995, when opposition was mounted on the grounds that the avocados would bring harmful pests (including seed weevils) into the United States - reported in The News, Mexico D.F , 20-8-95, p.1.

[9] I am referring here to the *Illegal Immigrant Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996* which aims to restrict the access of legal immigrants to social security support and food coupons, and new immigrants will be deprived of social support during their first five years in the country; for illegal immigrants, deportation will be immediate; - for a critical discussion see *La Jornada* , Mexico D.F. 14-4-97, p. 29.

[10] Mosquera is not alone in voicing such arguments with their stress on questions of power and domination in the field of art and cultural production - see, for example, Fisher (1995), Kapur (1997) and Yúdice (1996).

[11] For this citation from Nakarada see the Editor's introduction to the special issue on global apartheid and world order - *Alternatives*, Vol.19, No. 2, 1994, p. 142.

[12] In an earlier paper (Slater 1995), I have looked at certain aspects of this issue in relation to the literature up to early 1995 - for a connected argument see Santos (1995, especially pp. 506-519).

[13] I would not want to over-emphasize this distinction, but it is quite often the case that the implications of Latin America's earlier colonization by Spain and Portugal, and its later and crucially important links with an expanding Empire north of the Rio Grande, are left out of account in broad generalizations about post-coloniality.

[14] These are not questions that are only associated with post-colonial writing. Feminist theorists of various persuasions have previously raised similar questions over gender, patriachy and sexuality, and in the context of women and the Third World, Lazreg (1988) and Mohanty (1991), amongst many others, have criticized the universalization of Western theory, and an intellectual division of labour that prioritizes Western positions and practices.

[15] This point may also be applied to Latin America where the term 'post-colonial' is much less frequently used than the 'post-modern'; for a recent exception see the article by the Bolivian anthropologist Rivera (1997).

[16] I do not have the space here to include a review of this stream of the literature, but I would mention the following authors as representative of the Marxist intervention in post-colonial studies - Ahmed (1995), who notes, for example, that 'postcoloniality is also, like most things, a matter of class' (p.16), Dirlik (1994) who, in a stimulating article, re-asserts the point that capital continues to structure the world, and that 'postcoloniality is the condition of the intelligentsia of global capitalism' (p. 356), and Miyoshi (1993), who suggests, for example, that the 'current academic preoccupation with "postcoloniality" and multiculturalism looks suspiciously like another alibi to conceal the actuality of global politics' (p. 728). For other similar orientations, see Goss (1996)and Shohat (1992), although in the latter case more attention is given to the need for dialogue and a cross-fertilization of ideas.

[17] Without wishing to over-simplify Bhabha's subtle theorization he does clearly write that socialist democratic politics and policies need to be organized and conceptualized since there is ' no given community or body of the people whose inherent, radical historicity emits the right signs' (Bhabha 1994, p. 27) - in other words, he is arguing for a re-thinking and re-positioning of Marxist thought, including displacement, rather than a denial of its analytical or political relevance.

[18] And here one is reminded of a comment made by Sartre over 30 years ago, where he is at pains to distance himself from that method which does not derive its concepts from new experiences that it seeks to interpret; for Sartre (1963,p. 37) the Marxist method ' has already formed its concepts; it is already certain of their truth; it will assign to them the role of constitutive schemata'. This quotation is referred to in Lazreg's (1994) study of the history and politics of women in Algeria.

[19] The term comes from the Mexican anthropologist Roger Bartra.

[20] In relation to the politics of hybridity, Radhakrishnan (1996, p. 162) wonders why in the West, for example, it is more acceptable to transgress Islam toward a secular constituency rather than the other way around - he goes on to suggest that metropolitan hybridity is underwritten by the stable regime of Western identity, whereas postcolonial hybridity has no such guarantee.

[21] There is also of course diversity here in that for instance with Brazilian *telenovelas* the firm Protele has been successful in the Swiss and French markets, as well as in Mexico, Turkey, South Korea and Russia but a relative failure elsewhere in Europe - why also are Bombay movies popular in Greeece but not elsewhere in Europe? - see During (1997, p. 810)

[22] For a relevant discussion of the conflicts between Japanese visions of state-led economic development and the 'market-friendly' doctrine of orthodox American and British economists, and their impact within World Bank deliberations, see Wade (1996).

[23] Cultural hybridization can be well illustrated in the Bolivian case, where as Castells (1997, pp. 328-333) suggests a form of 'electronic populism' pioneered by Carlos Palenque and his CONDEPA (*Conciencia de Patria*) party showed how identity-based communalism, connected to a form of religious millennialism, could access and in the process create a more hybridized 'mainstream media '. For a more critical view of cultural hybridization in Bolivia where its structural limits are emphasized, see Rivera (1993).

[24] Grewal and Kaplan (1994, p. 17), for example, write that the term "global feminism" has tended to silence the diversity of women's agency in favor of a 'universalized Western model of women's liberation that celebrates individuality and modernity' - see also Mohanty's (1991) well-known critique.

[25] This kind of ethnocentrism has its roots in the colonial past, as Leila Ahmed (1992) shows in her analysis of gender and Islam; she notes, for example, that colonialism's use of feminism to promote the culture of the colonizers and undermine native culture imparted to feminism in non-Western societies the stigma of having served as an instrument of colonial domination.

[26] In a recent and critical text on US - Latin American relations, it is interesting to note that whilst the author stresses the importance of listening to Latin American voices this is situated in a context of their 'feelings, attitudes, and actions' and not in relation to their analysis or critical thought, see Smith (1996, p. vii).

[27] Two examples, coming from different fields of research, can be mentioned, and one has to say that there are many more. The concept of 'transculturation' was invented by the Cuban writer Fernando Ortiz, and subsequently taken over by Malinowski, who did on one occasion allude to its origin but in the passage of time the origin with Ortiz was lost in Malinowski's work - for an excellent discussion see Coronil (1995). A second example can be taken from Frank's (1967) book on capitalism and underdevelopment, where all the key ideas originate in earlier Latin American literatures, especially Bagú's (1949) text on the colonial economy. Although Bagú is mentioned in passing, the full scale of Frank's reliance on this earlier text is not recognized, and since Bagú's book was not translated, the link to Frank's later work is not widely appreciated except in Latin America itself.

[28] For one important and illustrative example of the presence of theoretical and political difference within one particular zone of engagement, Gates Jr. (1991, pp. 469-470) brings to our attention Memmi's sharp critique of Fanon's overly optimistic view of decolonization. Naturally, there are many more examples, and the very fact that one feels bound to refer to one such illustration is in itself testiment to the continuing power of essentializing modes of thought.

[29] For a pertinent consideration of the 'postcolonial intellectual', wherein this kind of question is discussed, see Rajan (1997).

[30] Spivak (1996, p. 258) suggests, when reviewing some recent Western feminist theorization, that ' in the house of theory there is still a glass ceiling', and in this context she sets out a long critique of certain Western readings, observing, for example, in a long and important footnote that 'US-based feminism cannot recognize theoretical sophistication in the South, which can only be the repository of an ethnographic 'cultural difference'' (op.cit., p. 266).

[31] The Indian writer Kothari (1997) is particularly keen to underline this aspect of the globalization debate, arguing that a variety of Third World elites have adopted a highly distorted version of the Western liberal democratic vision since it permits them to find a convenient place in the global nework of elite dominance while pushing out of the economic domain their own masses; for Kothari, it is this political accommodation that lies behind the growing legitimacy of the globalization model.

[32] Griffin and Khan's (1992) monograph on globalization and the developing world provides one excellent example of such a connection and a recent edition of the journal *Millennium* is devoted to a series of similar issues - see, for example, Saurin (1996) and Pasha (1996).

[33] For a detailed analysis of sovereignty and quasi-sovereignty in international relations, where the historical context is provided by Africa's insertion into the world system, see Grovogui (1996).

[34] Calderón, Ottone and Hopenhayn (1996, pp. 39-40) identify three types of exclusion: cultural discrimination, socio-economic exclusion and marginalization with respect to the mechanisms of political representation and participation. For the development of inter-cultural democratization they argue that these forms of exclusion need to be tackled through the formulation of national strategies of social intervention.

[35] Of the more recent interventions into this aspect of the globalization debate, I have found contributions by Falk (1997), Gill (1995) and Robinson (1996) to be particularly useful.

[36] For some excellent comments on Dirlik's article and the analysis of the temporality of the post-colonial, see Hall (1996).

[37] Prakash (1992), as one example, has responded very effectively to some of these interpretative and political problems, indicating, inter alia, that if the contradictions and ambivalence in colonial productions of all kinds were reduced to their origins in capitalism, history would be little more than a perpetual return to origins.

[38] For a brilliant exploration of the 'darker side of the Renaissance' in which such thinking is applied to an analysis of literacy, territoriality and colonization, see Mignolo (1995).

[39] In relation to the theme of agents of knowledge, the presence of erasure is not only relevant within the peripheries of the South, as discussed in the text, but also within the centres the history of writing by black people has been made invisible by the dominant discourses of nationalism; its recovery is now, as Mike Phillips argues in the British case, a key political issue - see Mike Phillips, Brit-Black, in New Times London, 8 November 1997, pp. 8-9.

References

Ahmad, A. (1995): The politics of literary postcoloniality, *Race and Class*, 36 (3), 1-20.

Ahmed, L. (1992): *Women and Gender in Islam*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Ake, C. (1995): The new world order: a view from Africa, in H-H Holm and G. Sørensen (eds.), *Whose World Order? Uneven globalization and the end of the Cold War*, Boulder and Oxford, Westview Press, pp. 19-42.

Amin, S. (1997): *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization*, London and New Jersey, Zed Books.

Appadurai, A. (1996): *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis and London, University of Minnesota Press.

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths,G., and Tiffin, H. (1989): *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*, London and New York, Routledge.

Bagú, S. (1949): *Economía de La Sociedad Colonial*, México D.F. Ediciones Grijalbo (1992 edition).

Bhabha, H. K. (1994): *The Location of Culture* , London and New York, Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. (1995): The commitment to theory, in E. Carter, J. Donald and J. Squires (eds.), *Cultural Remix: Theories of Politics and the Popular*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 3-27.

Bhabha, H. K. (1996): Unpacking my library...again, in I. Chambers and L. Curti (eds.), *The Post-Colonial Question*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 199-211.

Bonfil Batalla, G. (1996): *México Profundo: reclaiming a civilization*, Austin, Texas, University of Texas Press.

Burbach, R., Núñez, O. and Kagarlitsky, B. (1997): *Globalization and its Discontents*, London and Chicago, Pluto Press.

Caldeira, T.P.R. (1996): Fortified enclaves: the new urban segregation, *Public Culture*, 8, p. 303-328.

Calderón F., Ottone, E. and Hopenhayn, M. (1996): Las dimensiones culturales de la transformación productiva con equidad, *Pretextos*, Lima, No. 8, p. 7-47.

Campodónico, H. (1995): El proceso de globalización y los intereses nacionales, *Pretextos*, Lima, No.7, Julio, 7-45.

Castells, M. (1996): The net and the self, *Critique of Anthropology*, 16(1), 9-38.

Castells, M. (1997): *The Power of Identity*, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, Volume II, Oxford, Blackwell.

Chailloux, G., López, R. and Baró, S. (1997): *Globalización y Conflicto - Cuba-Estados Unidos*, La Habana, Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, (printed in Madrid).

Chakrabarty, D. (1992): Provincializing Europe: postcoloniality and the critique of history, *Cultural Studies*, 6, 337-357.

Coronil, F. (1995): Introduction, in F.Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: tobacco and sugar* , Durham and London, Duke University Press, (original edition 1947), pp. ix-lvi.

Coronil, F. (1996): Beyond Occidentalism: toward nonimperial geohistorical categories, *Cultural Anthropology*, 11(1), 51-87.

Dallmayr, F. (1996): Global development? Alternative voices from Delhi, *Alternatives*, 21(2), 259-282.

Darby, P. and Paolini A.J. (1994): Bridging international relations and postcolonialism, *Alternatives*, 19(3), 371-397.

Dirlik, A. (1994): The postcolonial aura: Third World criticism in the age of global capitalism, *Critical Inquiry*, 20, (Winter), 328-356.

During, S. (1997): Popular culture on a global scale: a challenge for cultural studies?, *Critical Inquiry* 23 (Summer), 808-833.

Dussel, E. (1997): Modernidad, globalización y exclusión in H. Dieterich (coord.) *Globalización, Exclusión y Democracia en América Latina*, Mexico City, Editorial Joaquín Mortiz, pp. 75-98.

Falk, R. (1997): State of siege: will globalization win out?, *International Affairs*, 73(1), 123-136.

Fisher, J. (1995): Editorial: some thoughts on 'contaminations', *Third Text*, 32, (Autumn), 3-7.

Franco, J. (1988): Beyond ethnocentrism: gender, power and the Third World intelligentsia, in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana, University of Illinois Press, pp. 503-515.

Frank, A.G. (1967): *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York, Monthly Review Press.

Frankenberg, R. and Mani, L. (1993): Crosscurrents, crosstalk: race, 'postcoloniality' and the politics of location, *Cultural Studies*, 7(2), 292-310.

García-Canclini, N. (1995): *Hybrid Cultures: strategies for entering and leaving modernity*, Minneapolis and London, University of Minnesota Press.

García-Canclini, N. (coord.), (1996): *Culturas en Globalización*, Caracas, Editorial Nueva Sociedad.

Gates Jr., H.L. (1991): Critical Fanonism, *Critical Inquiry* 17, (Spring), 457-470.

Gill, S. (1995): The global panopticon? The neoliberal state, economic life and democratic surveillance, *Alternatives*, 20(1) (Jan.-Mar.) 1-49.

Gilroy, P. (1993): *The Black Atlantic: modernity and double consciousness*, London and New York, Verso Books.

Goldblatt, D., Held, D. McGrew, A. and Perraton, J. (1997): Economic globalization and the nation-state: shifting balances of power, *Alternatives*, 22(3), (July-Sept.) 269-285.

González-Casanova, P. (1995): *O Colonialismo Global e a Democracia*, Rio de Janeiro, Civilização Brasileira.

Goss, J. (1996): Postcolonialism: subverting whose empire?, *Third World Quarterly*, 17(2), 239-250.

Grewal, I. and Kaplan, C. (1994): Introduction: transnational feminist practices and questions of postmodernity, in I. Grewal and C. Kaplan (eds.), *Scattered Hegemonies: postmodernity and transnational feminist practices*, Minneapolis and London, University of Minnesota Press, pp. 1-33.

Griffin, K. and Khan, A.R. (1992): *Globalization and the Developing World: an essay on the international dimensions of development in the post-cold war era*, UNRISD, Geneva.

Grovogui, S.N. (1996): *Sovereigns, Quasi Sovereigns and Africans*, Minneapolis and London, University of Minnesota Press.

Hall, S. (1996): When was the 'post-colonial'? Thinking at the limit, in I. Chambers and L. Curti (eds.), *The Post-Colonial Question: common skies, divided horizons*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 242-260.

Hitchcock , P. (1993/94): The othering of cultural studies, *Third Text*, 25 (Winter), 11-20.

Holm, H-H. and Sørensen, G. (1995): Introduction: What has changed? in H-H. Holm and G. Sørensen(eds.), *Whose World Order? Uneven Globalization and the End of the Cold War*, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, pp. 1-17.

Hopenhayn, M. (1997): Globalización y Cultura: Cinco Miradas para un Solo Texto, Paper presented at the XXth Congress of the LASA (Latin American Studies Association) Guadalajara Mexico, april 17-19.

Ianni, O. (1994): Naçâo: provincia da sociedade global? in M. Santos, M.A. de Souza and Silveira, M.L (eds.), *Território: globalizaçâo e fragmentaçâo*, Sâo Paulo, Editora Hucitec, pp. 77-84.

Ianni, O. (1996): *Teorías de la Globalización*, Madrid and Mexico, Siglo XXI.

James, P. (1997): Postdependency? The Third World in an era of globalism and late- capitalism, *Alternatives*, 22(2), 205-226.

Jameson, F. (1991): *Postmodernism, Or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London and New York, Verso Books.

Kapur, G. (1997): Globalisation and culture, *Third Text*, 39 (Summer), 21-38.

Kennan, G. F. (1995): On American principles, *Foreign Affairs*, 74(2), March/April, 116-126.

King, A .D. (1996): Opening up social sciences to the humanities: a response to Peter Taylor, *Environment and Planning*, 28, 1954-1959.

Kothari, R. (1993): *Poverty: Human consciousness and the amnesia of development*, London and New Jersey, Zed Books Ltd.

Kothari, R. (1997): Globalization: a world adrift, *Alternatives*, 22(2), (April-June), 227-267.

Lazreg, M. (1988): Feminism and difference: the perils of writing as a woman on women in Algeria, *Feminist Studies*, 14(1) 81-107.

Lazreg, M. (1994) *The Eloquence of Silence: Algerian Women in Question*, London and New York, Routledge.

Marchand, M. H. (1996): Reconceptualising 'Gender and Development' in an era of 'globalisation', *Millennium*, 25(3), 577-603.

Martín-Barbero, J. (1993): *Communication, Culture and Hegemony*, London and New Delhi, Sage.

McClintock, A. (1992): The angel of progress: pitfalls of the term "post-colonialism", *Social Text*, 31/32, 84-98.

Mignolo, W.D. (1993): Colonial and postcolonial discourse: cultural critique or academic colonialism?, *Latin American Research Review*, 28(3), 120-134.

Mignolo, W.D. (1995): *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: literacy, territoriality & colonization*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.

Miyoshi, M. (1993): A borderless world? From colonialism to transnationalism and the decline of the nation-state, *Critical Inquiry*, 19 (Summer) 726-751.

Moisy, C. (1997): Myths of the global information village, *Foreign Policy*, Summer 78-87.

Morley, D. and Robins, K. (1995): *Spaces of Identity: global media, electronic landscapes and cultural boundaries*, London and New York, Routledge.

Mosquera, G. (1994): Some problems in transcultural curating, in J. Fisher (ed.), *Global Visions: towards a new internationalism in the visual arts*, London, Kala Press, pp. 133-139.

Nakarada, R. (1994): Report from Zimbabwe, quoted in Editor's introduction, *Alternatives*, 19(2), Spring, 141-143.

Nederveen-Pieterse, J. (1995): Globalization as hybridization, in M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds.), *Global Modernities*, London and New Delhi, Sage, pp. 45-68.

Ohmae, K. (1990): *The Borderless World*, London, Collins/Fontana.

Ortiz, R. (1997): Notas sobre la mundialización y la cuestión nacional, *Nueva Sociedad*, Caracas, No. 149, (Mayo-Junio), 88-99.

Ould-Mey, M. (1994): Global adjustment: implications for peripheral states, *Third World Quarterly*, 15(2), 319-336.

Pasha, M.K. (1996): Globalisation and poverty in South Asia, *Millennium*, 25(3), 635-656.

Parry, B. (1994): Signs of our times: a discussion of Homi Bhabha's, *The Location of Culture*, *Third Text*, 28/29, (Autumn/Winter) 5-24.

Prakash, G. (1992): Can the "subaltern" ride? A reply to O'Hanlon and Washbrook, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 34, 168-184.

Radhakrishnan, R. (1996): *Diasporic Mediations: between home and location*, Minneapolis and London, University of Minnesota Press.

Rajan, R.S. (1997): The Third World academic in other places; or, the postcolonial intellectual revisited, *Critical Inquiry*, 23, (Spring) 596-616.

Ramonet, I. (1997): *Un Mundo sin Rumbo: crisis de fin de siglo* Madrid, Editorial Debate S.A.

Rattansi, A. (1997): Postcolonialism and its discontents, *Economy and Society*, 26(4), (November), 480-500.

Rivera, S. (1993): La raíz: colonizadores y colonizados, in X. Albó and Barrios, R. (eds.), *Violencias Encubiertas en Bolivia*, La Paz, Ediciones Aruwiyiri, pp. 27-139.

Rivera, S. (1997): La noción de "derecho" o las paradojas de la modernidad postcolonial: indígenas y mujeres en Bolivia, *Temas Sociales: Revista de Sociología de U.M.S.A.*, La Paz, No.19 (Mayo), 27-52.

Robinson, W.I. (1996): Globalisation: nine theses on our epoch, *Race and Class*, 38(2), 13-31.

Rothkopf, D. (1997): In praise of cultural imperialism?, *Foreign Policy*, Summer, 38-53.

Said, E.W. (1978): *Orientalism*, London Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Said, E.W. (1983): *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.

Said, E.W. (1993): *Culture and Imperialism*, London, Chatto and Windus.

Sakamoto, R. (1996): Japan, hybridity and the creation of colonialist discourse, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 13(3) 113-128.

Santos, B. (1995): *Toward a New Common Sense: law, science and politics in the paradigmatic transition*, London and New York, Routledge.

Santos, M. (1994): *Técnica, Espaço Tempo: globalizaçâo e meio técnico-científico informacional*, Sâo Paulo, Editora Hucitec.

Sartre, J-P. (1963): *Search for a Method*, New York, Vintage Books.

Saurin, J. (1996): Globalisation, poverty and the promises of modernity, *Millennium*, 25(3) 657-680.

Saxe-Fernández, J. (1997): La globalización: aspectos geoeconómicos y geopolíticos in H. Dieterich (coord.), *Globalización, Exclusión y Democracia en América Latina*, Editorial Joaquín Mortiz S.A. Mexico City, pp. 53-73.

Scholte, J.A. (1996): The geography of collective identities in a globalizing world, *Review of International Political Economy*, 3 (Winter) 565-607.

Scholte, J.A. (1997): Global capitalism and the state, *International Affairs*, 73(3) 427-452.

Shohat, E. (1992): Notes on the "post-colonial", *Social Text*, 31/32, 99-113.

Slater, D. (1995): Challenging Western visions of the global: the geopolitics of theory and North-South relations, *The European Journal of Development Research*, 7(2) 366-388.

Smith, P.H. (1996): *Talons of the Eagle: dynamics of U.S.-Latin American relations*, New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Soto, de H. (1989): *The Other Path: the invisible revolution in the Third World*, New York, Harper&Row Publishers.

Spike Peterson, V. (1996): Shifting ground(s): epistemological and territorial remapping in the context of globalization(s), in E. Kofman and G. Youngs (eds.), *Globalization: theory and practice*, London and New York, Pinter, pp.11-28.

Spivak, G.C. (1988): Can the subaltern speak? in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Chicago, University of Illinois Press, pp. 271-313.

Spivak, G.C. (1990): *The Post-Colonial Critic*, ed. Sarah Harasym, London and New York, Routledge.

Spivak, G.C. (1996): Diasporas old and new: women in the transnational world, *Textual Practice*, 10(2), 245-269.

Tandon, Y. (1994): Recolonization of subject peoples, *Alternatives*, 19(2), (Spring), 173-183.

Tokatlian, J.G. (1997): Condicionalidad y certificación. El caso de Colombia, *Nueva Sociedad*, Caracas, No.148, (Marzo-Abril), 98-107.

Wade, R. (1996): Japan, the World Bank, and the art of paradigm maintenance, *The East Asian Miracle* in political perspective, *New Left Review*, 217, 3-36.

Wilkins, P. (1996): New myths for the South: globalisation and the conflict between private power and freedom, *Third World Quarterly*, 17(2) 227-238.

Yúdice, G. (1996): El impacto cultural del Tratado de Libre Comercio norteamericano, in N. García-Canclini, *Culturas en Globalización*, Caracas, Editorial Nueva Sociedad, pp. 73-126.

Zermeño, S. (1995): Los hijos del libre comercio, *Pretextos*, Lima, No.7, 83-119.