How to Cite:

Schelkunov, M. D., Volchkova, O. O., & Krasnov, A. S. (2021). Glocalization as the dominant trend in the development of socio-political being: conflict models and constructs. Linguistics and Culture Review, 5(S1), 460-466. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS1.1431

Glocalization as the Dominant Trend in the **Development of Socio-Political Being: Conflict Models and Constructs**

Mikhail Dmitrievich Schelkunov

Kazan Federal University, Russia

Olga Olegovna Volchkova

Kazan Federal University, Russia

Anton Sergeevich Krasnov

Kazan Federal University, Russia

Abstract---Being a complex dialectical interaction process for differently directed social centrifugal and centripetal movements, glocalization leads to a significant transformation of political being and consciousness (Chumakov, 2016). Being a natural reaction to the developing unification narrative, the localization and differentiation tendencies, on the other hand, become a causal basis of the struggle for overcoming differences. Both trends symbolize, within their frameworks, the basic values of each narrative and create their political mythologies, each of which has an impact on the collective stratum of consciousness and, as a consequence, on a certain model of socio-political behavior of individuals. Political "myths of global unity" lead the core constructions of political and social being - the nation and the state - to a decrease in their authority and legitimacy level; at the same time, the "mythology of difference", while preserving the dominant political values, reorients them to local manifestations, also losing their connection with the central elements of the political matter. Thus, special conflictual forms of development are formed in contemporary society and are conditioned by both real objective preconditions and artificially generated constructs. Socio-political being, therefore, is in a state of dialectical equilibrium and develops within the conflict paradigm.

Keywords---globalization, glocalization, localization, political identity, social identity, social philosophy.

Introduction

In his book "What is Globalization", W. Beck outlined several aspects on the issues of spreading such an important process as globalization to be discussed, noting the positive and negative features of this phenomenon about the political, economic, and social life of Europe and America, where the "effects of globalization" are primarily concerned. Beck himself understands globalization to mean the feature "that everything happening on our planet is no longer reducible to a local and limited event; that all inventions, victories, and catastrophes belong to the entire world, and that we have to reorient and reorganize our lives and our actions, our organizations, and our institutions relating to the axis "local - global". Thus, globalization is believed as a certain objective statement and inevitable totality. In our opinion, the perception of the globalization process as an objective social totality is fundamentally wrong, and it is more logical to consider globalization as one of the interrelated processes involving the modern transformation of socio-political beings (Smith, 1993; Ardashkin, 2015).

The most correct definition of the ongoing transformation processes is "glocalization", which consists of two elements: globalization and localization (Delokarov, 2002). The term "glocalization" voiced by the owner of the Japanese corporation "Sony" Akio Morita, according to the author himself, means cultural cooperation and mutual enrichment of cultures within vast cultural regions, a combination of processes of local cultural modernization and trends aimed at the preservation and development of national values together with the achievements of multicultural development of global civilization. The main semantic component of the term is the idea that integration and territorialization are two sides of one process involving the transformation of social and political reality. However, Morita's explanation shifts the vector of understanding into the cultural sphere, while this process, in our opinion, covers all social life aspects and very clearly reflects the new stage of political existence development. Moreover, in our view, the integration and localization processes are dialectically interconnected rather than represent a single process (Escobar, 2001; Hinrichs, 2003).

Method

Socio-political processes of various orientations are being developed and taking the form of conflicts or social cohesion to take place in total interaction and interdependence. On this basis, a systemic approach to the analysis of practical phenomena and their theoretical foundations will be the main methodological setting of the study (Meir, 2005; Paredes, 2016). The basic research paradigm, in this case, is a neo-institutional approach to the contemporary reality study. In addition, it is impossible to investigate the causes of transforming modern sociality without using the historical method and identifying the fundamental roots. The comparative method is applied by the authors within the context of comparing social constructs of "unity" and "difference".

Methodologically, it should be noted that the term "glocalization" itself was introduced into the academic turnover of the humanities and socio-political sciences by R. Robertson (Robertson & Chirico, 1985). Studying global system theory, Robertson suggested that if the institutional system of the

interconnectedness of states and national economies is conceptualized in Wallerstein's "world-system" approach, then the grounds for including collective and individual consciousness in the globalization process should be found. This led Robertson to the idea of the intersection between the global and the local, the fusion of homogeneity and heterogeneity, universality, and particularity. Robertson also emphasized the study of a spatial layer of culture, noting that global trends in the culture sphere change under the influence of local content and, conversely, local values and traditions embedded in the context of global mass culture modify its form. Nevertheless, his conclusions about the interaction between the institutional landscape, metaphysical foundations, and collective consciousness are effectively applied to the analysis of sociopolitical reality. Thus, methodologically, we are guided by R. Robertson's conclusions and his synergetic interpretation of the 'world-system' approach to the globalization phenomenon (Rugman, 2003; Chiu & Kwan, 2016).

Results and Discussion

Nevertheless, supporting the thesis that globalization and territorialization of the world are interrelated phenomena, Z. Bauman emphasized their autonomy and the connection of these processes in a single system of transformation of social beings. According to Z. Bauman, glocalization is "...a process combining the trends of globalization and localization, based primarily on the redistribution of privileges and discrimination, wealth and poverty, power and powerlessness, freedom and dependence. In this process, what for some is the result of free choice, for others looks like an inevitable stroke of fate" (Bauman, 2001). Thus, the definition of glocalization proposed by Z. Bauman seems to be the closest to the essential interpretation; dialectically linking the unification and distinction processes, glocalization forms a new system of redistribution of resources, values, and the political one. The paradigms of "unity" and "difference" appear to be dialectically interlinked and interdependent.

Trends in the search for a new identity and the return of the political essence to the collective consciousness due to the reaction to the globalization development have inevitably led to the imposition of alternative "myths of difference" that form a different model of behavior and socio-political actions. When attempting to maintain the unity of a political group, social, economic, cultural, and religious aspects of social life are subjected to mythologization; the process of mythologizing everyday life in the context of strengthening national and ethnic identity is especially noticeable; it is a natural manifestation of anti-globalization sentiment and a factor of forming binary opposition "us/them", expressing the political essence in the public space (Toporkov, 2000). The politicization of the economy is no less intense, in the context of which we can also observe the use of the economic factor in the formation of identity and the autonomization of communities.

Summary

Anti-globalization myths are opposite to globalization myths in meaning but identical in symbolic content, 'myths of difference' are just as multidimensional in the context of mythologems and are also decomposed into discursive codes:

- Economic code (globalization leads to resource exploitation of the Third World, widens an economic gap between North and South, and contributes to economic stratification within nation-states);
- Cultural code (it implies a threat to the cultural identity and uniqueness of nations and ethnic groups);
- Ideological code (globalization is seen as synonymous with imperialist reaction);
- Political code (transformation of democratic values, growth of fundamental movements and anti-government organizations, ontological shift of the nation-state concept).

The myth of unity is mirrored in the narrative of the clash of civilizations, which was conceptualized in the famous work of the same name by S. Huntington (Huntington, 2000). "The Clash of Civilizations" does not abandon the idea of global political and socio-economic development and the thesis of the necessary modernization, however, according to Huntington's ideas, the symbolization of this mechanism should have a purely political - that is, a conflicted character. Antiglobalism is in one way or another symbolically similar to globalism, and it exists in a mythological form only fed by the iconic manifestations of globalization; nevertheless, it is conceptually distinct from it in content.

Antiglobalization mythology is first of all aimed at counteracting the myth of unity on the metaphysical plane, as well as at influencing collective consciousness and transforming the matrix of individual behavior (Putrayasa, 2021; Woodlove & Vurly, 2017). Affecting changes in political consciousness, myths of difference, as well as myths of unity, lead to the embodiment of mythological ideas and thought constructs in the space of reality. New binary political oppositions are reflected in several embodied forms, the most significant of which are the following trends:

- Regionalism is characterized by the strengthening of intra-state regions and the concentration of greater powers in the regions;
- Regionalization consisting in the isolation of regional groupings of states, the creation of profitable and unprofitable economic zones not coinciding with the borders of national states; as a result, most political power is concentrated in the hands of the authorities of subnational regions or the heads of transnational corporations, operating within such subnational regions; thus, the supranational regions themselves become the structural elements of the new political map of the world;
- Autonomisation, i.e. the revival of national, ethnic centers within countries and regions;
- Traditionalism as a denial of the modern civilization concept, return of archaic images, cultural fetishes, national traditions, and customs in the everyday life of society
- Particularism as the displacement of society's interests by the constructed interests of an individual manifested most fully in the stimulation of consumer behavior patterns, which replace identification with a social group with a false consumer form of self-identification.

• Localization, which implies consolidation and isolation of national-ethnic and civilizational formations, is a policy of "cultural isolation", which aims to preserve cultural identity.

Summarising the various manifestations of globalization, researcher L.G. Kiryanova fixes five main types of response to the challenges of globalization:

- The openness of a local culture and non-conflict perception of global information flows (as a rule, it is realized in the countries that do not have a stable historical and cultural tradition unable to oppose open protest actions to the globalization process);
- Coexistence of local forms with global ones (this occurs without the significant mutual influence of local and global elements of cultural, political, and economic life, for example, the implementation of "managed globalization" in China);
- Adaptation and transformation of global flows as a result of a strong local reaction (this refers to countries with strong national-cultural and sociopolitical traditions, where the transformation of global programs, goals, and myths with local specificity takes place);
- Local culture protection from globalization processes, struggle, and denial (this occurs, as a rule, in closed states with authoritarian or totalitarian regimes, as well as in countries with an entrenched conservative cultural paradigm: North Korea being the most prominent example);
- Regionalization (the emergence of supranational and regional forms of association and integration, as exemplified by the European Union, which seamlessly combines national and regional identities)

As can be seen from the classification, the types of reactions can range from strongly negative to neutral or approving ones. All these processes are manifested in parallel with the emergence of supranational state associations, the creation of transnational corporations, and the growth of economic interconnectedness between countries (Fuad, 2014; Van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003). In order not to dissolve into the global system of socio-political values and not to lose its own identity, each region, or each ethnic group has to create its own "brand" recognizable by other political actors. In ontological terms, such forms of localization can be assessed as an assertion of the community's "I am" within the framework of political being. Any local identity is constructed based on the conflict of distinctions between one's political group and all other political communities (Blaser, 2014). Antiglobalist currents oppose the unifying and the conflicting natures of development, which makes them more "viable". The manifestation of conflicting and antagonistic forms of social development embodies the deeper nature of the mythology of difference.

Conclusion

As of today, we can safely say that the myth of difference triumphs over the myth of unity, surpassing it in its ontological aspect and its purely mechanistic realization process. Globalization, lacking a rooted relationship to the traditional archetypal myth and a sustainable identity, disintegrates into multiple processes (economic, social, cultural, and ideological), has left its central myth of unity

unsupported and ungrounded, which has meant that globalization has never managed to create sustainable political mythology and a new political symbolization. Nevertheless, despite the current tendency for the mythology of difference to prevail, the process of globalization and international integration is developing, but at a significantly slower pace; it can be said that the mythology of political unity is stagnating: it is reproduced in the space of collective political consciousness, but, through low symbolic capacity, it is losing its mobilizing power and cannot organize communities to implement any political action. The economic effectiveness of the globalization mythology is undeniable, but the ideas of unity recede into the background in the socio-political reality space.

Acknowledgments

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

References

- Ardashkin, I. B. (2015). Philosophy of education as a social development factor: World trends and prospects for Russia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 166, 277-286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.12.524
- Bauman, Z. (2001). Identity in the globalising world. Social anthropology, 9(2), 121-129.
- Blaser, M. (2014). Ontology and indigeneity: on the political ontology of heterogeneous assemblages. *Cultural geographies*, 21(1), 49-58.
- Chiu, C. Y., & Kwan, L. Y. Y. (2016). Globalization and psychology. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 8, 44-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.09.010
- Chumakov, A. N. (2016). Globalization from a Philosophical Point of View: Russian Vision. *Value Inquiry Book Series*, 288.
- Delokarov, K. K. (2002). Values of the globalizing world.
- Escobar, A. (2001). Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political geography*, 20(2), 139-174. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(00)00064-0
- Fuad, A. B. (2014). Political identity and election in Indonesian democracy: A case study in Karang Pandan Village–Malang, Indonesia. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 20, 477-485. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.060
- Hinrichs, C. C. (2003). The practice and politics of food system localization. *Journal of rural studies*, 19(1), 33-45. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0743-0167(02)00040-2
- Huntington, S. P. (2000). The clash of civilizations?. In *Culture and politics* (pp. 99-118). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Meir, A. (2005). Bedouin, the Israeli state and insurgent planning: Globalization, localization or glocalization?. *Cities*, 22(3), 201-215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2005.03.008
- Paredes, M. (2016). The glocalization of mining conflict: Cases from Peru. *The extractive industries and society*, 3(4), 1046-1057. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2016.08.007
- Putrayasa, I. B. (2021). Political language variation: stylistic based study. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 1-9.

- Robertson, R., & Chirico, J. (1985). Humanity, globalization, and worldwide religious resurgence: A theoretical exploration. *Sociological analysis*, 46(3), 219-242.
- Rugman, A. M. (2003). Regional strategy and the demise of globalization. *Journal of International Management*, 9(4), 409-417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intman.2003.08.004
- Smith, E. R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualizations of prejudice. In *Affect, cognition and stereotyping* (pp. 297-315). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-088579-7.50017-X
- Toporkov, A.L. (2000). Myth: Tradition and Psychology of Perception. In *Myths and mythology in modern Russia* (pp. 39-64).
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior*, 25, 243-295. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(03)25006-1
- Woodlove, G. M. ., & Vurly, M. E. . (2017). Political discourse approach applied the current study issue occurred. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 1(1), 26-37.