

Understanding Globalization: A Review

Preeti Tiwari

Abstract

The present paper is an attempt to understand the notion of globalization which has emerged as one of the most important phenomenon of the contemporary societies. However, the different authors have used it in different manners and have defined it in their own ways which resulted into a kind of camouflage in academic circles. Thus it requires a proper understanding of the concept of globalization in terms of its meaning and definition, characteristic features, dimensions, approaches, perspectives and debates regarding it. The paper is based on the review of existing literature of the theme.

Key words: globalization, hyperglobalizers, anti-globalization, transformationalists

The globalization as a conceptual tool has been used by the social scientists in the last decade of the twentieth century to understand first the economic processes but later on to analyse the changes taking place in the contemporary society in different spheres of social and cultural life. It has generated a debate among the scholars regarding the beginning of a new epoch in human history and about the issue related to modernity. A vast literature on globalization has been generated by the scholars in last three decades. The paper is aimed to understand the concept of globalization on the basis of the review of the relevant literature and makes a comprehensive attempt to define the term globalization in a precise manner, delineate its characteristics, trace the phases of globalization using a historical perspective, major dimensions of globalization, nature of debate on globalization, basic authors on globalization, antecedents and consequences of globalization on the basis of existing literature in social sciences in order to develop a clear understanding of globalization process.

Meaning and Definition

The term 'globalization' appeared in the 'Webster Dictionary' in 1961 and in the 'Oxford English Dictionary Supplement' in 1972 (Kilminster 1997: 257). It was somewhat later that it entered into academic field in a decisive manner in the late 1970s and early 1980s, mainly by thrusting aside 'international' or 'world' or universal process and systems. Most of these initial academic evocations came clearly from a specific North American location and with concordant interests (Lamy 1976). By the late 1970s, the term 'globalization' itself started appearing in various academic and specialist forums (Goreau 1983). It largely connoted the desire to develop the study of sociology

Preeti Tiwari is Research Scholar, Centre for Development Studies, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj-211002, INDIA

in the USA as a world embracing enterprise or to trace the extension of such studies in the territories outside the USA. "More importantly it expressed the desire of US business leaders and management gurus to extend business interests, and exploitation of resources and labour, to a global domain" (Hopkins 1978; Levitt 1983; and Gupta, S. 2010). Since then, the term has gradually been distanced from the specific context and interests with which it was initially associated and understood as gesturing towards an increasingly a contextual world condition. The impetus for this direction was given, to some extent, by left wing intellectuals in the 1970s who were associated with a growing consolidation of global economic process and markets with advanced capitalism - e.g. In Eric Hobsbawm's 'drawing together of all parts of the globe into a single world' (Hobsbawm, Eric 1975).

The tendency towards decontextualizing the term was underlined with Brandt Commission Report, published in 1980 with the title *North-South*. "This was the result of deliberations in an independent think-tank under the chairmanship of former German Chancellor Willy Brandt in order to resolve the impasse between poor and rich nations on terms of loans and assistance through the World Bank" (Gupta, Suman 2010: 7). The report that followed called for a 'globalization of policies' to counter the 'globalization of dangers and challenges'.

Rather, roughly until the end of the 1980s the term 'globalization' usually appeared unambiguously with the ideological weight of its North American- Western European capitalist associations and affirmations, and was located, despite the spread of 'new social movements', in the polarized ideological discourse of the Cold War. With the symbolic end of the Cold War marked by the 'Fall of Berlin Wall' in 1989 the term 'globalization' really came into existence (Gupta, Suman 2010: 7). It seems, according to Gupta (2010), two noteworthy sides to manoeuvres around the term 'globalization' at this point: - (a) "It was adjusted to where with the vocabulary of activist and NGOs, which inturn impinged upon establishment, mass media and academic usage" (Gupta, Suman 2010: 7) and (b) "The terms public, mass media and particularly academic uses proliferated exponentially, essentially with the effect of firmly decontextualizing it and neutralizing its ideologically partisan affirmativeness"(Gupta, Suman 2010: 7). The two sides of these shifting nuances of 'globalization' unfolded simultaneously and with extraordinary speed.

Although 'globalization' is a set of processes of changes which are actually happening in the world, it is also a word which has quite recently become prominent in the ways in which such changes are represented. But the term 'globalization' is used in various senses within more complex discourses, which are partly characterized by distinctive vocabularies in which 'globalization' is related in particular ways from other keyword's such as 'modernization', 'democracy', 'markets', 'free trade', 'flexibility', 'liberalization', 'security', 'terrorism', 'culture', 'cosmopolitanism', and so forth. Thus, we can see 'globalization' is represented as an agent which itself causes change in the world, as in 'globalization' opens up new markets'(Fairclough, Norman 2006). These discourses are more than vocabularies as they differ not only grammatically but also as 'forms of narrative, forms of argumentative and so forth'. Thus, we can now attempt to look into the specific definition of the term 'globalization' in academic domain.

Definitions of Globalization

The first systematic formulation of the concept of globalization came from Giddens. According to him, "globalization is about the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (Giddens 1990:). This definition focuses on the intensification of social relationships at the global level cutting across the boundary of the community and nations. he also emphasises on the impact of such process at the local level events.

Robertson's defines globalization as follows: "Globalization as a concept refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole... both

concrete global interdependence and consciousness of the global whole". (Robertson, Rolland 1992:). Robertson on the one hand, talks of the compression of the world in a whole (single social entity) and at the same time, he also intensification of the world as a whole. Thus, both the Giddens and Robertson see globalization as a process of compression and intensification of relationships and consciousness at the global level. However, Giddens also sees its impact on the local events and happenings as well. In this sense Giddens' definition is more wide than of Robertson.

Clark says: "Globalization denotes movements in both the intensity and the extent of international interactions" (Clark 1997:1). In the former sense, globalization overlaps to some degree with related ideas of integration, interdependence, multilateralism, openness and interpenetration; in the latter, it points to the geographical spread of these tendencies and is cognate with globalism, spatial compression, universalization, and homogeneity.

Lubbers (1998) say, "Globalization is a process in which geographic distance becomes less a factor in the establishment and sustenance of border crossing, long distance economic, political and socio-cultural relations. People become aware of this fact. Networks of relations and dependencies therefore become potentially border crossing and worldwide. This potential internationalization of relations and dependencies causes fear, resistance, action and reactions".

According to David Held et al., "globalization may be thought initially as the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the spiritual" (Held et al. 1999:).

Oluabunwa, Mazi S. (1999:29) defines globalization as "an evolution which is systematically restructuring interactive phases among nations by breaking down barriers in the areas of culture, commerce, communication and several other fields of endeavor".

Bauman, Z. explains: "... [globalization] tends towards disaggregation, autarchy and isolation as well as ethnic or nationalistic separatism and regional integration" (Bauman 2000: 156).

According to Held and McGrew, "[Globalization] suggests a growing magnitude or intensity of global flows such that states and societies become increasingly enmeshed in worldwide systems and networks of interaction. As a consequence, distant occurrences and developments can come to have serious domestic impacts while local happenings can engender significant global repercussions. In other words, globalization represents a significant shift in the spatial reach of social relations and organization towards the interregional and intercontinental scale" (2003:).

Singh, V. P. (2007: 1) argues that Globalization in its present form is a process, which has implications not only for social and cultural institutions of developed countries but is also transforming the social fabric of developing countries like India. The process of globalization is not confined to economic and political concerns of these societies. Its impact can also be observed in the field of mass media communication and other social institutions of the society (Singh, V. P. 2004: 4).

Dreher, Axel, Noel Gaston, and Pim Marten (2007), say, "Globalization refers to the intensification of cross-national economic, political, cultural, social and technological interactions that leads to the establishment of transnational structures and the integration of economic, political and social processes on a global scale"

Beck, Ulrich distinguishes between three terms: 'globality', 'globalism', and 'globalization'. 'Globality' refers to the fact that we are increasingly living in a 'world society' in the sense that the notion of closed spaces has become illusory ... from now on nothing which happens on our planet is only a limited local event (Beck 2000); 'globalism' is the view that the 'world market' is now powerful enough to supplant (local and national) political action; 'globalization' is the blanket term to describe the processes through which sovereign national states are crisscrossed and undermined by transnational actors with varying prospects of power, orientations, identities and networks' (Beck 2000).

Lash and Urry (1987:1994) see Post-Fordist 'disorganized capital' characterizing globalization, having replaced old-Fordist 'organized capital'.

Characteristics of Globalization

On the basis of above discussion on the concept of globalization now it is clear that the concept of globalization has some specific and meaningful characteristics. These characteristics are found in the works of a number of scholars.

Manfred Steger(2013) pointed out the basic characteristics of globalization as follows:

1. Globalization is a set of processes of social change.
2. One of such processes central to globalization is deterritorialization.
3. Globalization involves a process of stretching or extension of human activities relations and network across the globe.
4. Globalization involves a process of intensification of human activities and relations.
5. Globalization involves a process of speeding up or increasing velocity of human activities and relations.
6. Globalization involves specific impacts on different societies.
7. Globalization produces winners and losers.
8. Globalization involves a process of reflexivity, that is, the growing awareness of living in a single global space.

Waters, Malcolm (1995) characterizes globalization as "... a social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangement recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding". He further goes on to predict that in the future "territoriality will disappear as an organizing principle for social and cultural life ... it will be a society without borders or spatial boundaries. In a globalized world we will be unable to predict social practices and preferences on the basis of geographical location. Equally we can expect relationships between people in disparate locations to be formed as easily as relationships between peoples in proximate ones" (Waters1995).

Waters(1995) is of the view that a number of features of contemporary globalization can be delineated. These are as follows:

1. Increasing speed and volume of goods, messages and symbols in circulation.
2. Shrinking space (space is increasingly expressed in time of travel or communication and appears to shrink as travel and communication time decreases. The messages, images and symbols now have been freed of spatial constraints.
3. Permeable borders-greatly increased relations in the fields like trade, tourism or electronics cut across the rigid political and geographical boundaries which resulted into an increase in the degree of the interconnectedness between all nation states.
4. Reflexivity- people are increasingly orienting themselves to the world as a whole, regarding themselves as both locals and cosmopolitans.
5. Risk and Trust: Globalization increasingly involves everyone everywhere in a web of trust and risk, in that all of us have to place our trust in 'experts' and other unknown persons.

Nick Bisley (2007) differentiates chronological phases of the debate on globalization by delineating the characteristics of globalization by various thinkers over a period of time. He identifies five phases of the evolution of globalization debate, first debate emerged in late 1980s in which globalization was identified as a process driving radical changes in the social realm (Giddens 1990, Harvey 1989, Featherstone1990, Luard 1990); Second phase can be said from early 1990s to mid of 1990s in which claims about globalization amplified and then became increasingly mainstream and key lines of contestants emerged on the scene (Ohmae 1995, Giddens 1994, Camilleri and Falk 1992, Albrow 1996, Mc Grew and Lewis 1992, Scholte1993); The third phase is seen in late 1990s. it was the period when Central claims about globalization are theoretically, empirically and politically challenged

Weiss 1998, Garrett 1998, Hirst and Thompson 1996, Rodrik 1997, Hoogvelt 1997); Early years of 2000s constitute the fourth phase of globalization when consolidation of globalization took place through parameters and set studies of globalization as a site of political contestation (Held et al. 1999, Scholte 2000, Castells 1996, 1997, 1998, Klein 2000, Stiglitz 2000). Fifth stage was in mid 2000s when merits of globalization were defended by the scholars like Bhagwati (2004), Wolf (2004), Bhagwati (2004), Wolf (2004), Legrain (2002), Friedman (2005) in the face of the critics.

Phases of Globalization

Though modern globalization is traced from the end of Cold War, however its antecedents can be traced back to ancient age, particularly in ancient Indian philosophy of 'Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam' a Sanskrit phrase found in Hindu text such as mahaupnishad, which means 'the world is one family' (<http://aboutworldlanguages.com/sanskrit>).

Other precedents of global trade can be traced to the ancient silk route between Asian and European Countries. Scholars like Robertson claim that the process of globalization is not new, that it predates modernity and the rise of capitalism. However, modernization tends to accelerate globalization and the process has moved to the level of consciousness during the contemporary period. Moreover, European civilization is the central focus for and origin of the development. Robertson³⁵ depicts the path of globalization as a series of five phases:

1. The germinal phase (Europe, 1400-1750)

Dissolution of Christendom and emergence of state communities; Catholic (i.e. universal) churches; Development of generalizations about humanity and the individual; First maps of the planet; Sun-centered universe, Universal calendar in the West; Global exploration; Colonialism

2. The incipient phase (Europe, 1750-1875)

Nation-state; Formal diplomacy between states; Citizenship and passports; International exhibition and communications agreements; First non-European nations; First ideas of internationalism and universalism.

3. The take-off phase (1875-1925)

Conceptualization of the world in terms of the four globalizing reference points-the nation-state, the individual, a single international society, and a single (masculine) humanity; International communications, sporting and cultural links; Global calendar; First ever world war, so defined; Mass international migrations and restrictions thereon; More non-Europeans in international club of nation states.

4. The struggle-for-hegemony phase (1925-69)

League of Nations and UN; Second World War; Cold War; Conceptions of war crimes and crimes against humanity; The universal nuclear threat of the atomic bomb; Emergence of the Third (part of the) World.

5. The uncertainty phase (1969-92)

Exploration of space; Post-materialist values and rights discourses; World communities based on sexual preference, gender, ethnicity and race; International relations more complex and fluid; Global environmental problems recognized: Global mass media via space technology.

The 1990s are uncertain, Robertson argues, because we (the inhabitants of the planet) have little confidence in the direction in which we are heading and only a little more in the direction of the planetary environment.

The particular outcome that separates globalization in the contemporary world from its earlier manifestations is its reflexivity: the world 'moved' from being 'in itself' to the problem or

possibility of being “for itself” (Robertson 1992). Injunctions from the diverse viewpoints of both business consultants and environmentalists to ‘think globally’ mean that the inhabitants of the planet set out to make it, in the terms Robertson borrows from Giddens, to structure it as a whole, to apprehend it as ‘one place’.

To Robertson (1992), however, globalization is neither necessarily a good nor a bad thing as its moral character is to be accomplished by the inhabitants of the planet. Moreover, Robertson does not think that the world is, as a consequence of globalization, a more integrated or harmonious place. He, however, believes that the world has become a more unified and systematic place as a result of globalization.

6. Capitalist-Neoliberal Globalization (1995-2001)

From the previous mapping of Globalization by Robertson, we get a systematic, if not exhaustive, picture of the process of globalization up to 1992 and thereafter.

Approaches for the Study of Globalization

One of the most quoted definitions of Globalization is of David Held et al. (1999). For them, globalization is “the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary life, social life, from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the spiritual” (1999:2). However, beyond a general agreement of a real or perceived intensification of worldwide interconnectedness, there are substantial differences in the views of scholars on globalization. On the basis of the debates on various issues three different orientations on globalization have emerged in the literature. These orientations constitute three different approaches to the phenomenon of Globalization. The scholars can be classified into three broad schools of thought- The Hyperglobalizers, the Skeptics & the Transformationalists (Held et al. 1999: 3). Each of these schools may be said to represent a distinctive account of globalization as discussed below:

1. Hyperglobalizers

Hyperglobalists define globalization as a new epoch of human history in which “traditional nation-state has become unnatural, even impossible business units in a global economy” as assaulted by Ohmae (1995), Wriston (1992), Guehenno (1995). This view of globalization is generally based on economic reasoning and represents a neo-liberal approach to economic globalization. The followers of this approach celebrate the emergence of a single global market which will bring prosperity and high quality of life among the masses particularly in the developing countries. Global competition in trade is the basic principle of globalization. They argue that economic globalization is to bring about de-nationalization of economies by establishing a trans-national network of production trade and finance. Thus, global economy is borderless in which the national governments have to play a minor role of promoting the investment of the global capital or operating as intermediate institutions between local, regional and global mechanisms of governance. This phenomenon is elaborated by Susan Strange (1996) as follows:

“The impersonal forces of world markets.....are now more powerful than the states to whom ultimate political authority over society and economy is supposed to belong ... the declining authority of states is reflected in a growing diffusion of authority to other institutions and association and to local and regional bodies”.

Most of the hyper-globalizers share a conviction that as a result of economic globalization traditional nation-state will be weakening in terms of their economic and political power as new forms of social organizations will emerge to control the economic activities and political policies of the nation-state.

Under this approach there is considerable ideological diversity between the Neo-liberal and the radicals or Neo-Marxists. On the one hand, the Neo-liberals welcome and celebrate the ‘triumph of individual autonomy and market principle over state power’ (Held et al.

1999:3). On the other hand, the radicals and the Neo-Marxists are critical of contemporary globalization for whom it represents to the triumph of 'the oppressive global capitalism' (Held et al. 1999:4). However, both set of theorists having divergent ideological convictions share a set of beliefs: "globalization is primarily an economic phenomenon"; that an increasingly integrated global economy exists today; that the needs of global capital impose a neoliberal economic discipline on all governments such that politics is no longer the 'art of the impossible' but rather the practice of 'sound economic management' (Held et al. 1999:4). Hyperglobalizers also claim that economic globalization is capable to produce a new pattern of a binary division- winners and losers in global economy. Thus, those who are left behind in this process and have no chances to move forward at their own need specific measures by the government to manage the negative consequences of globalization (Ohame 1995).

The global financial and competitive disciplines of the global economy generate certain constraints. As a result, social democratic models of social protection become untenable and make the social welfare policies of the state unwarranted (Gray 1998). While the neo-liberals view economic competition in a positive sense despite some of the persons as losers, nearly all countries are comparatively in an advantageous position as they can produce certain goods which can be used for gain in the long run. On the other hand, radicals and neo-Marxists disagree with the highly optimistic view of neo-liberals and emphasize that global capitalism creates and reinforces structural patterns of inequality within and between countries (Held et al. 1999:4). However, the scholars of the both categories are agreed that options of social welfare which provided social protection to certain classes and local traders are now become increasingly difficult to continue and sustain.

Culturally a world-wide diffusion of consumerist ideology has imposed a new type of identity by displacing traditional ways of life and culture.

"The liberal democracy has now become a global ideal and it is helping in the emergence of global civilization, defined by universal standards of economic and political organizations. At the same time new mechanisms of global governance-like IMF or the disciplines of world market such that and peoples are increasingly the subjects of new public and private global or regional authorities (Gill 1995; Ohmae 1995; Strange 1996; Cox 1997).

Thus, the hyper-globalizers see the rise of global economy in terms of a number of other structures and processes in the form of the emergence of institutions of the global governance, and the global diffusion and hybridization of cultures forming a radically new world order, and order which is based on the demise of the Nation-state (Luard 1990; Ohmae 1995; Albrow 1996).

On the basis of above discussion, it can be said that hyper-globalizers mainly focus on neo-liberal approach to the process of globalization in which a new global economy is integrating the trading activities through supra-national structures and have a number of consequences not only for national polity and economy by weakening them but also for the cultural milieu of these societies and advocate for a global market, supra-national structures of global governance and world-wide diffusion and hybridization of a consumer culture.

2. Skeptics

The Skeptics also focus on economic aspect of the globalization like hyper-globalizers. However, they are totally disagreed with them, and argue that there is nothing new about this international economic integration. This kind of situation is comparable to the period preceding to First World War (Hirst and Thompson 1996; Weiss 1997). In their view, globalization is a myth. They consider the hyper-globalist thesis as fundamentally flawed and naïve as they underestimate the power of national government to regulate international economic activity (Castells 1996).

They also prefer to use the term 'internationalization' rather than globalization. They also pointed out that what is called world economy/global economy, is in fact evolves in the direction of

three major financial and trading blocs, namely Europe, Asia-Pacific and North America (Hirst and Thompson 1996). They also conceive globalization and regionalization as contradictory tendencies (Gordon 1988; Weiss 1997). They also argue that the role of the nation-states remain as stronger as ever. Thus, they completely reject the notion of globalization and represent a contradictory approach to the hyper-globalist approach of globalization.

3. Transformationalist Approach

Third perspective on globalization is represented by transformationalist approach. According to them, "globalization is a central driving force behind the rapid social, political and economic changes that are reshaping modern societies and world order (Giddens 1990; Castells 1996). The proponents of this view see contemporary processes of globalization historically unprecedented and as a powerful transformative force which is "responsible for 'massive shake-out of societies, economies, institutions of governance and world order" (Held et al. 1999: 7). This transformation, however, is not linear but dialectical and uncertain, as it is an outcome of historical contradictions. In contrast to hyper-globalizers and skeptics, the proponent of transformationalist approach makes no claims about the future trajectory of globalization. They also do not seek to evaluate the present form of social relations into a fixed ideal type of globalized world (such as: a global market or a global civilization). Rather they see it as a long-term historical process full of various contradictions and various conjunctural factors. Although they emphasize the process of globalization as historically unprecedented in which all countries in the world virtually in one or more respects are part of a larger (global system) but the existence of a single global system is not considered by them as an evidence of global convergence or the emergence of a single world society. For them, 'globalization is associated with new patterns of global stratification in which some states, societies and communities are becoming increasingly enmeshed in the global order while others are becoming increasingly marginalized" (Held et al. 1999: 8).

As a result, "the traditional dichotomies North and South or divisions like First World and Third world are no longer in existence but all societies and communities are stratified into the elites, the contended and the marginalized cutting across national boundaries" (Hoogvelt 1997).

The restructuring of global stratification gives rise to the process of deterritorialization of economic activity as production and finance increasingly acquire a global and transnational dimension and national economic space is no longer coincides with national territorial borders (Castells 1996).

The core belief of transformationalist is that "contemporary globalization is reconstituting or 're-engineering' the power, functions and authority of national governments" (Held et al. 1999: 8). Furthermore, global infrastructures of communication and transport have been developed and are capable to support cross-border flows of the people, goods and ideas for the functioning of new forms of supra-national social and economic organizations without diminution of efficiency or control (Held et al. 1999: 8).

Thus, world order can no longer be conceived as purely state-centric or even primarily state governed because authority has become increasingly diffused among public and private agencies at different levels- the local, national, regional and the global. Therefore, nation-states are no longer the soul centers of governance or authority in the world as stated by Rosenau (1997) and upheld by others (Held et al. 1999: 8).

Dimensions of Globalization

The dimensions of globalization can be analyzed in two ways: at the conceptual level and at the level of the fields of interaction involved in the process.

1. Conceptual Dimensions and Typology of Globalization

The first category of analysis can be found in the work of David Held et al. (1999). According to them, “the historical forms of globalization can be analyzed in terms of eight dimensions ... collectively, they determine the shape of globalization in each epoch. The concept of globalization has broadly two sets of dimensions- Spatio-temporal dimensions and organizational dimensions” (Held et al. 1999: 8). Among the spatio-temporal dimensions, they include the extensity of global networks; the intensity of global interconnectedness; the velocity of global flows; and the impact propensity of global interconnectedness. Among the organizational dimensions, they point out-the infrastructure of globalization; the institutionalization of global networks and exercise of power; the patterns of global stratification and dominant modes of global interaction. They are of the view that “global flows, networks and relations can be mapped in relation to their fundamental spatio-temporal dimensions: extensity, intensity, velocity and impact propensity” (Held et al. 1999: 8). On the basis of these spatio-temporal dimensions, Held et. al. (1999: 8) developed a typology of globalization consists of four types: Type-1 *Thick Globalization* having high extensity, high intensity, high velocity, high impact (for some sceptics the late 19th century era of global empires comes close to this type): *Diffused Globalization* having high extensity, high intensity, high velocity, low impact. This type of globalization has no historical equivalent): *Expansive Globalization* – characterized by high extensity, low intensity, low velocity, high impact (the early modern period of western imperial expansion can be identify in this category ‘in which European empires had acquired a tentative global reach with considerable inter civilizational impacts’) and *Thin Globalization*- high extensity, low intensity, low velocity, low impact (the early silk and luxury trade circuits connecting Europe with China and the East).

2. Substantial Dimensions of Globalization

The substantial dimensions of the globalization can be identified on the basis of the field of interactions which are being affected by process of globalization or in which the process has taken place. On this basis, we can identify five dimensions of globalization.

i. Social Dimensions of Globalization: This dimension of globalization is related to the process related to social structure and stratification system of the society which are being transformed by the forces of globalization. It includes caste and status groups, family, kinship and marriage patterns, migration, social mobility and so on.

ii. Political Dimensions of Globalization: This dimension of globalization is related to power dimension of globalization. It includes the issues like the demise of nation-state (as emphasized by hyper globalizers), sovereignty, global democracy, global civilization, global organized crime, tension and partisan politics, reorganization of the world (impact of international non-governmental organizations), global social movements, global governance and international security regime, global arms dynamics and so on.

iii. Economic Dimension of Globalization: Economic globalization constitutes core area of globalization process. It includes issues like the rise of global economy, pays attention to both, the practices and networks of production, distribution and consumption of commodities and to the revision of central concepts in the economic usages of the term globalization.

iv. Cultural Dimension of Globalization: Cultural dimension of globalization is centered upon the role of the media and the role of religion shaping globalization. It also focuses on the notions of cultural diversity, cultural uniformity and cultural imperialism. Issues like growth of westernization world over, challenged by the rise of religious fundamentalism, terrorism and Islamic revolution can be put under this dimension of globalization.

v. Environmental Dimension of Globalization: It includes a number of environmental and ecological issues related to sustainability of the planet earth. The global environmental movements,

opposition of globalization by environmental activists at the global level, rise of global environmental organizations, issues related to climate change and global warming and sustainable development practices are the major areas come under this dimension of globalization.

The Debates on Globalization

The major debates on globalization can clubbed as:-

i. Globalization/Anti-globalization – The debate on globalization and anti-globalization is related to the macro-dynamics in the world economy with particular reference to development in Latin America and Asia (Veltmayer 2004). The context of this debate is provided by an (epoch-defining) shift in social and economic organizations with what has become known as 'globalization' the process of integrating societies across the world and their economies and cultures into one system, The debate revolves around the basic question whether the term 'globalization' describes at all the major dynamics of change and development in the world, Petras and Veltmeyer (2004) argues that the term 'imperialism' provides a better short hand description of what is going on in the world and thus a better explanations of its major dynamics. The term globalization and Anti-globalization are used as short hand complex dynamics of world developments, for one thing, these terms dominate the theoretical discourse in the field. For another both terms do make reference to and allow for description of several important dimensions of analysis both in regard to structural change and the forces of resistance against this change against the forces that derives the system for world (anti-globalization). In these terms, globalization has the appearance of process that is irresistible, irreversible, inevitable and inescapable – all countries and peoples having to adjust to it the best way they can, to insert themselves into the process under the most favourable conditions or to make the best deal possible.

In contrast to this, there are some strategic and political responses to these dynamics which give rise to a contrary argument that 'globalization is neither inevitable nor immutable'. Diverse groups of people are increasingly organized, although divided and fragmented, global civil society are coming together to mobilize the forces of resistance into an anti-globalization movement played out on the world stage in Latin America and Asia.

Conclusion

On the bases of above discussion it can be said that globalization is a multi-dimensional phenomenon and is viewed differently by different scholars according to their own theorretical orientations which resulted into various perspectives and various approaches for understanding the complex processes involved with globalization. It requires a thorough knowledge of different theoretical strands of not only of social sciences but also of science and technology. Thus, it has to be studied both at the local (micro-level) and the global (macro-level) level with a multi-disciplinary orientation.

References

- Albrow, M. 1996: *The Global Age*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Zygmunt 2000: *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich 2000: *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, London: Sage Publications
- Bisley, N. 2007 *Rethinking Globalization*, Bisingstcke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Castells, Manuel (ed.) 1996: *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, New York: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Castells, Manuel (ed.) 1996: *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*, New York: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Clark, I. 1997: *Globalization and Fragmentation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, R. 1997: 'Economic globalization and the limits to liberal democracy' in McGrew, A. G. (ed.) *The Transformation of Democracy? Globalization and Territorial Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Dreher, Axel, Noel Gaston, and Pim Marten 2007: "Measuring Globalization and Its Consequences", *Globalization and Labour Market*, Department of Business Enterprises and Regulatory Reform, 13 December 2007.
- Fairclough, Norman 2006: *Language and Globalization*, London: Routledge.
- Giddens, Anthony 1990: *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gill, S. 1995: "Globalization, Market Civilization and Disciplinary Neo-liberalism", *Millennium*, 24.
- Gordon, D. 1988: "The global economy: new edifice or crumbling foundations?", *New Left Review*, 168.
- Goreau, Fredrick H. 1983: "The Multinational Version of Social Sciences", *International Social Science Journal*, 35/2: 379-90.
- Gray, J. 1998: *False Dawn*, London: Granta.
- Guehenno, J. M. 1995: *The End of the Nation State*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Gupta, Suman 2010: *Globalization and Literature*, London: Polity Press.
- Held, David, Anthony Mc Grew (eds.) 2003: *Global Transformation Reader: An Introduction to Globalization Debate*. Cambridge: Polity (2nd edition).
- Held, David, Anthony Mc Grew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Parraton 1999: *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Hirst, Paul, and Grahame Thompson 1996: *Globalization in Question*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Hobsbawm, Eric 1975: *The Age of Capital 1848-1875*, London: Weidenfield and Nicolson.
- Hoogvelt, A. 1997: *Globalization and the Post-colonial World: The New political Economy of Development*, London: Macmillan.
- Hopkins, Raymond F. 1978: 'Global Management Networks: The Internationalization of Domestic Bureaucracies', *International Social Science Journal*, 30/1, 31-46 (<http://aboutworldlanguages.com/sanskrit>).
- Independent Commission on International Development Issues 1980: 19.
- Jones, Andrew 2010: *Globalization: Key Thinkers*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kilminster, Richard 1997: 'Globalization as an Emergent Concept', in Alan Scott (ed.) *The Limits of Globalization: Cases and Arguments*. London: Routledge.
- Lamy, Paul 1976: "The Globalization of American Sociology: Excellence or Imperialism?", *American Socialist*, 11/2: 104-13.
- Lash S. & Urry, J. 1987: *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Cambridge, Cambridge: Polity.
- Levitt, Theodore 1983: "The Globalization of Markets", *Harvard Business Review*: 19.
- Luard, E. 1990: *The Globalization of Politics*, London: Macmillan.
- Lubbers, Ruud and Koorevaar, Jolanda 1998: "The Dynamics of Globalization", paper presented at a Tilburg University seminar on 26 November 1998 (available at <https://koorevaa.home.xs4all.nl/html/dynamic.html>).
- Ohmae, Kenichi 1995: *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*, New York Harper Collins.
- Ohuabunwa, Mazi S. 1999: "The Challenges of Globalization to the Nigerian Industrial Sector", *Nigerian Tribune*, December, 14, pp. 19-21.
- Petras, James, Henry Veltmeyer 2004: *Globalization and Antiglobalization*, Routledge (First Edition).
- Robertson R. and Garret W. (eds.) 1991: *Religion and Global Order*, New York: Paragon.
- Robertson, Rolland 1992: *Globalization: Social Theory and Culture*, London: Sage Publications.
- Rosenau J. 1997: *Along the Domestic Foreign frontier*, Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Singh V. P. 2004: "Globalization, New Communication Technologies and Socio Cultural Change in India", *Emerging Trends in Development Research*, Vol. 11. No 1&2, January & July, 3-9.
- Singh V. P. 2007: "Globalization and Social Stratification in India", *Emerging Trends in Development Research*, Vol. 14. No 1&2, January & July, 1-8.
- Steger, Manfred. 2013: *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, (3rd edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strange, S. 1996: *The Retreat of the State the Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Veltmyer, H. (ed.) 2004: *Globalization and Anti-globalization: Dynamics of Change in the New World Order*, Burlington: Ashgate.
- Waters, M. 1995: *Globalization*, London: Routledge.
- Weiss, Linda 1997: "Globalization and the myth of the powerless state", *New Left Review*, 225: 9-32.
- Wriston W. 1992: *The Twilight of Sovereignty*, New York: Charles Scribners Sons.