

---

## *Reviews of Books*

---

Peter L. Berger and Samuel P. Huntington (Eds.),

---

### *Many Globalizations, Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*

---

MICHAEL KINDLER

Three starting definitions are used by Berger and Huntington. 1. Globalization is used as a term to describe a trend towards a borderless global society, one in which the significance of national borders diminishes as ideas, information, people and money crisscross the globe with increasing freedom. Included in this definition are attempts to standardize environmental and educational management, as well as health, especially concerning rapidly spreading diseases such as BSE (Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy), SARS (Sudden Abnormal Respiratory Syndrome) or the Asian Bird Flu (Influenza A H5N1). To the detriment of this trend, the spread of illegal drugs and terrorism are an unwelcome corollary, as is the dubious role of the IMF (International Monetary Fund), as instanced in the debt management of countries such as Argentina and Brazil), as well as the notion that the poor are getting poorer, and the rich richer.

2. Also implied in this definition is the secondary notion that there may be global standards in such things as trade, financial management, quality of industrial standards and so on. The scope of this review does not allow for such a wide-ranging definition, so the focus here will be on educational concerns of globalization as they affect convergent and divergent thinking: thinking globally, acting locally.

3. Globalization is seen as a term that includes globalism. As an operational term, the concept globalism (eg Toyota, Hollywood, the Internet) stands alongside regionalism (eg ASEAN, APEC, NATO), nationalism (eg Japan) and localisms (eg Aichi, Nagoya). It is the relative influence of the first against the others in respect of education that is the center of attention of this review.

In modern parlance, this field (globalization) is colonized by multiple semantic interpretations, by multiple and varied *Sinne und Bedeutungen*. Differing definitions of the term globalization exist, and these launch into a discussion of various interpretations, approaches and understandings of the term 'globalization'. Bit of a mine field, really, as many ideological definitions abound.

So one could begin by connecting 'globalization' with other themes of recent history, such as modernism, colonialism, neo-liberalism, cultural imperialism, American hegemony, and so on. Another way of approaching the concept of globalization would be to speak of various secular waves of globalization, such as economic Free Trade Agreements (FTA's), feminism, environmentalism, and this would open up ample opportunities to discuss a multitude of secular ideologies, currents and forces at work in globalization today.

Yet another way of conceptualizing globalization could be to do so in religious terms, East versus West, Islam versus Christianity, and much has been made of this 'clash of civilizations' since 9/11 and the wars on terrorism in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Iraq and elsewhere, including Libya, North Korea and countries in various states of having, about to have or not yet having Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Others again see the United States as the only

nation to have used WMD, to wit the atomic bomb. Its recent breach of the SALT (Strategic Arms Limitations Talks) and NNPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty with the development of smart bombs) as well as aggressive stands towards aforementioned countries (the infamous term 'axis of evil', George W. Bush, 2001) do not encourage faith in the United States as a peace promoting country.

While the United States sees itself as a beacon of Christian righteousness and peace in the world of today, there are plenty of people and nations who hold the opposite view, one which considers the United States to be a primary terrorist state, in naked pursuit of its economic advantages in terms of oil, territory, commercial advantage and political and military superiority. President Bush's opposition to family planning programs in countries in desperate need of such underscores a theological orientation that opposes population control. The inhumanity of such an approach to globalization emphasizes an assumed ideological superiority by Americans that many Americans, irony has it, are unable to see for what it is. Theorists talk about a clash of civilizations, East versus West, Islam versus Christianity (S.P. Huntington, 1998).

Forces opposing globalization, such as the World Social Forum articulate a resistance to those who believe that globalization is exclusively a force for good. These met in Brazil in 2002 and in Bombay, India in 2004.

Glib notions of globalization talk about knowledge societies, the technological revolution in terms of communication (internet, e-mail, mobile phones, video communication etc), the lowering of borders between countries, the growth of tourism on a global scale, the development of global standards in education, industry, transport, media, technology and many aspects of society.

Globalization, as most would agree, is a tsunami the relentless onslaught of which is irresistible. Much like the advent of the car, airplane, CD player, telephone or TV was effectively unable to be resisted in the last century. Today, the idea of not having a telephone, fax or TV is unimaginable by most people born into the age of these devices (leaving out a few individuals who for reasons of preferred eccentricity or religious persuasion wish to stay outside this information revolution).

To summarize, globalization contains multiple elements: culture, economics, finance, environmental considerations, technology, politics, terrorism, and so on. So any discussion of how 'globalization' connects with the theme of this journal must begin with a definition of the concept that is helpful. Among the plethora that can be used, I would like to use the historical model articulated by Arnold Toynbee (*A Study of History*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1946). Put simply, he talks about history in terms of challenge and response.

Global Standards: the challenge of preserving local identity while progressing by agreed common standards. For a University studying globalization, what is the main challenge?

Three are here identified: challenges of reaching and maintaining global standards in terms of linguistic proficiency as well as educational and pedagogic ability. That is, enabling this local university community of Nagoya to maintain footage with other, national and international benchmarks. This can be done in several ways.

The most obvious is to respect Japanese educational practices, and conversely, to deconstruct those aspects of the same practices that are inimical to the achievement of global standards. At least those that are consistent with international approaches. Another is to respect Japanese cultural values that populate learning environments, such as silence, relationships between learners and teachers, listening, and problem solving. Not to be forgotten are ways of capitalizing on ways of using modern information technology such as the internet, cell phones and electronic dictionaries to assist learning. So thinking globally while acting locally is a valid axiom in any university-

based languages learning environment as much as in any local community with wider aspirations.

The ultimate challenge is to forge the future by blending global benchmarks with local communities in ways that advance individual participants, be they learner or facilitator. To do so means to define language education in pioneering new ways. A traditional definition of language learning is to suppose that a second language is simply a skill that enables the second language speaker to participate in another language culture in pursuit of their first culture objectives. These can range from simple commercial gain to leisure pursuits. Such an approach to second language learning is limited.

A more proactive definition of second language learning is firstly not to stop at second language learning, but to develop a multilingual approach to understanding today's world. Further, to consider that learning another language enables a broadening of outlook, a widening of personal philosophy, a proliferation of multiple values which collectively have a liberating, potentially transforming, revolutionizing potential. In other words, multi-lingualism adds to a person's life choices in ways which are liberating, enabling, widening, capable of transforming the individual in ways that are revolutionary.

There are four parts to this book: In the first part, four contributors examine the thrust and counterthrust, the challenge and response, the action and reaction, the cause and effect of forces of globalization in the respective countries of China, Taiwan, Japan and India. Others (see bibliography) have written about the antithetical positioning of such intellectual/religious themes as western versus Eastern, individual versus collective, Protestant work ethic versus Eastern concepts such as Islam, Hare Krishna, Falun Gong and Soka Gakkai.

As an overview, the table at the end of this review shows some of the models by which the authors of this book have conceptualized globalization. For the sake of simplification, agents for globalization are listed on the left while factors countering globalization appear on the right.

In this book, globalization is described as a force for modernization that counters the force of tradition. It is too simplistic to suggest that modernization is a force for progress and light, while traditional inhibition is a force for conservatism and darkness. Clearly, the coexistence and blending of the best ingredients in each makes for the most viable progress, rather than selling out one for the other. Be open to change, but keep your values.

The second part of the book examines the phenomenon of sub-globalizations using the country case studies of Germany and Hungary. The third part looks at peripheral globalizations using the cases of South Africa, Chile and Turkey. The last part examines the conflicting vanguard of globalization as practiced by the American Vortex.

Sub-globalizations are mentioned in the book in such geo-political and economic groupings as the European Union, Latin America, the Hispanic United States, South East Asian economic consortiums (ASEAN) and South Africa. Individual corporate examples within these sub-globalizations are Adidas, MacDonald, MTV, Disney, as much as Sony, Suntory, Shiseido and Hello Kitty, and of course Japanese car manufacturers like Toyota, Honda, Subaru and Nissan.

What Berger and Huntington do, they do well. Certainly, this book recognizes the complexity and diversity of multiple globalizations more readily than was done in Huntington's earlier, somewhat bipolar book that was mentioned. So because this volume was edited by two people with contributions from 13 writers from different continents, it manages to avoid a monocular (biased) imperialist view. That, especially from Huntington, is refreshing. As a three year study across ten countries, it shows the kaleidoscopic dimension of globalization well.

What this review has tried to show is that it is not possible to deal with such a gargantuan topic as globalization within the covers of one volume or, for that matter even by any small group

of authors in any one volume. Globalization may, to paraphrase a Japanese proverb, be one flower, but it gives off many scents. So anyone interested further in this topic is encouraged to read across a range of globalizations, fiscal, economic, geo-political, environmental, cultural, security, terror, health, military, religious, local, and related disciplines. Doing so will enrich a multi-faceted understanding of a multifarious concept which is challenging us all.

**Table 1. Models promoting and countering globalization**

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | Metastasized <b>Disneyland</b> : a view of the world as being taken over by the products of Walt Disney Corporation   | <b>“Cultural Chernobyl”</b> : the French reaction to the global onslaught of American culture  |
| 2 | <b>American imperialism</b> : a view of global control in economic, military and political terms by the United States   | <b>A Hellenistic</b> phase of Anglo-American Civilization, in which the language but nothing more permeates globally   |
| 3 | <b>Davos Culture</b> as espoused by the annual World Economic summit in Davos, Switzerland  | The Confucian merchant as exemplified by the economic success of Chinese, Japanese and other Far East Asian economic multinationals and traders  |
| 4 | <b>Kyoto Treaty</b> as an attempt to control global environmental factors such as global warming  | <b>South Africa</b> banned smoking but has done very little to combat AIUDS and HIV. Included here is the monopolization of pharmaceuticals and drugs.   |
| 5 | <b>Faculty Club Culture</b> that agree on human rights, feminism, environmental issues like whale hunting   | <b>Child labor</b> in India, China and South Korea fort multinationals like Nike, Adidas and clothing manufacturers.   |
| 6 | <b>Protectionism</b> This 19 <sup>th</sup> and 20 <sup>th</sup> Century economic practice has existed in order to safeguard domestic industries, especially in manufacturing and agriculture by the imposition of tariffs.          | <b>Free Trade Agreements (FTA’s)</b> . As a result of the World economic forum (2003 Mexico) and the growing disparity between rich and poor economies, some dismantling of trade barriers is being implemented, although still hesitantly.  |
| 7 | <b>Modernism</b> This view of globalization is one of economic growth and freedom as perceived to occur in an orthodox laissez faire free market model.   | <b>Postmodernism</b> By this view, power is scrutinized for its location in gender, in culture and in particular structures, patriarchal, capitalistic, hegemonistic and so forth.   |
| 8 | <b>Nationalism and regionalism</b> Typically, regional and national governments continue to exist to safeguard their territories through managing immigration, customs and excise and the free movement of goods and services (tax) | <b>Multi-nationalism</b> This is a reference less to blocs such as the Un or NATO, ASEAN or APEC, but more a reference to multi-national companies that are expanding globally. For example, Toyota is producing vehicles in 26 countries and marketing the vehicles in even more. |