

Unit 24

Globalisation, Nationalism and Transnational Communities

Contents

- 24.1 Introduction
- 24.2 Globalisation
- 24.3 Ten Theses on Globalisation
- 24.4 Nationalism
- 24.5 Transnationalism
- 24.6 Conclusion
- 24.7 Further Reading

Learning Objectives

After going through this Unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the concepts and nuances of globalisation, nationalism and transnationalism; and
- The interconnectedness and implications of the concepts- nationalism, globalisation and transnationalism.

24.1 Introduction

In their mutual relationships, globalisation, nationalism and transnationalism (GNT) are three processes/phenomena which are at different stages of growth and of varying dimensions and scope. Nationalism is the oldest, Globalisation in its recurring manifestation is a quarter century old and transnationalism has passed under a theoretical scanner for construction of a comprehensive framework of analysis. All the three phenomena have an inter-relationship which is problematic. The gap between popular notion and the real working of these processes, is wide and conceptually not immediately evident. As we delineate these levels, the centre of analysis focuses on an individual or a group of individuals form between the homeland and the host country and this historical engagement at the same time gets mediated by globalisation process and what Arjun Appdurai calls 'ethnoscapes' i.e. a world of imagined identities manufactured by media and one's own fancy. These diaspora or transnationals experience in their host countries 'a grinding of gears between unfolding lives and their imagined counterparts' in which "a variety of 'imagined communities' is formed, communities that generate new kinds of politics, new kinds of collective expression, and new needs for social discipline and surveillance on the part of the elites." Like Capitalism or Socialism, ethnoscape emerges in these contemporary set-ups as a competing 'master narrative' which can offer explanations for the links that hold these three mega-phenomena together. It is only a question of opening out and broadening of the compass of our enquiry in order to adjust to the new global realities which are 'hyperreal' from a perspective of global cultural economy.

If an one-shot answer to this problematic inter-relationship is sought, it would run as follows: with the loosening of nationalism, cross-border movements became easy in an era of globalization giving rise to dispersion

of immigrants chasing jobs. But this is a mechanical explanation, not without deficiencies. For instance, 'nationalism' seems to be hardening, witness Israel's assaults on Lebanon, jobs are getting outsourced to offshore countries and most of the developed countries (USA & EU especially) have resisted the advent of globalisation since they can not bring down tariffs and reduce subsidies to their farmers so as to have a free flow of trade in the world, witness failure in July 2006 of the Doha Development Round.

How does one explain Indo-Pak cross-border terrorism while India and Pakistan are unitedly taking positions against cricket umpire Haire's decision on the ball tampering (by Pakistan) issue? How is it that while major powers are crying hoarse against each other, the global trade is growing at 4 to 5 per cent per annum? There is no dearth of evidence of Prime Ministers and Presidents calling upon their non-resident nationals abroad to liberally donate to their country's development. World Conferences and organisations of ethnic groups across national borders are common place. But these features of the new global socio-cultural reality appear endless. As a strategy in analysis, it sounds reasonable to refer to a day's news to understand some contours of this reality which we get to read daily about ourselves.

Let me invite you to some excerpts cited in *The Hindu* (Sunday 10 Sept 2006) in order to familiarize you with some salient features of this emergent reality happening in the culture space activated by GNT. For reasons of space constraint, we select some news analyses and a few passages to quote.

Dominating the pages of the newspaper was the iconic news of/ 9/11 which has completed 5 years of 'war on terror'. As we know, the 'war on terror' has clearly exposed the Bush administration on whom the latest slap is the news: Saddam Hussein not only was not involved in the Al Qaeda, he actually had "rebuffed overtures" and "had even tried to capture its Iraq chief", a report by the US Senate Intelligence Committee said. As everybody knows, there were no weapons of mass destruction found before USA invaded two sovereign countries (first Afghanistan, then Iraq) *without* Security Council's endorsement. Such an act is as bad as the Al Qaeda attack on 9/11 but what really overwhelmed the global culture space is the way it was flashed (and is continuing to do so) by Fox television and others, and heavily powered policies unilaterally imposed to the effect of alienating the Muslims as a religious group. The title of the open page article says it all: *Targeting a Community for Ethnic Scrutiny*. The writer (who is a medical doctor facing uncalled for discriminations) complains (which is the subtitle): *My being a Muslim Overshadowed My Identity as an Indian*. This culture space is hotting up when one reads his complaints against 'race/ethnic profiling' which is becoming common all over the world.

"I would like to draw attention to this fact that Indian Muslims are in more than a single way much different from their brethren in other Islamic nations. Indian Muslims are probably the only ones who lived in and cherished a democratic set up..... The taste of democracy and its addiction has evolved a race of young Indian Muslims who think, believe and practice nationalism with a fervour.... The communal agenda of the so-called Indian Muslim leadership, either it be the defiance to sing Vande Matram or support Pakistan in a cricket match, can only be defeated by a purposeful *nationalist* attitude, which I am sure is evolving among the middle class educated Indian Muslims."

The positive attitude of the writer clearly contrasts against a towering negative attitude of the USA President Mr. Bush who recently set afloat a

dangerous expression 'Islamic fascists'. This only means that, as Newt Gingrich (The former Speaker of the House of Representatives, a Republican like Mr. Bush) followed him up saying, "we are in the early stages of what I would describe as the Third World War." It will not be an exaggeration to say that so much of globalisation of Islam across national borders powered by so much of publicity - through electronic and print media-has generated a huge transnational cultural field for a political endgame. As opinion polls world over show, millions of Muslims now think that America's real aim in Iraq was "to grab its oil, help Israel, or just as Mr. Bin Laden said all along, wage war on Islam."

But a fracture in the American conservative think tank has surfaced showing that it is not Muslims of Asia who are to blame; rather the Muslims who have grown up on European and American soil are showing disaffection, as citizens did in an earlier period against fascism. Led by Prof Francis Fukuyama, this conservative think tank forcefully argues that Mr. Bush has been ill-advised to push the war-on-terror to all the followers of Islam; the national fervour in UK, Spain and other countries are on decline and distraction for some Muslim terrorists who owe their loyalty to Islam over the state of which they are citizens. Writing in the magazine section Page 2, Tabish Khair who by his own admission, is neither an 'Islamic fundamentalist' nor even 'a deeply religious Muslim' offers an important explanation on the disaffection spreading among ordinary Muslims. He gives reference to Israel's mindless shelling of South Lebanon recently which has destroyed all infrastructure and livelihood systems to say that in these circumstances, an ordinary Muslim is more likely to listen to and admire Islamic fundamentalists than someone like me." Thus either way, the global cultural space gets charged up by transnational loyalties and the nationalism becomes either imperial or circumscribed depending on the nodal centre of attraction. Both the phenomena premised on transnationalism have been cocooned inside the trajectory of global capitalism which is often described as globalisation.

The last piece from today's (10 September) newspaper before we take up for discussion in details about G, N & T. This is again about icon 9/11 which has been etched in memories of people across board in the world. Two points we would make about this ? icon status: First, why and how, destruction of New York's twin towers has occupied almost all the collective memory in total forgetfulness of three all-time-great incidents on Sept. 11 in other calendar years? Bapu's Satyagraha was launched on that day against colonial South Africa's racial legislation in 1906 against the Indian community. Swami Vivekananda delivered his famous Chicago address drawing attention to disastrous consequences of sectarianism, bigotry and fanaticism". That was in 1893. The democratic government of Chile led by Allende was dislodged through CIA's machinations again on Sept11, 1973. If these great events of history have been relegated and only 9/11 of 2001 is remembered today, it is due to powerful publicity and policy effects of the world's sole hegemon i.e. USA which now considers that sovereignty is a luxury (and hence can be dispensed with) for those developing countries which are promoting ill-defined cultural areas like Asian values, Arab nationalism and Latino culture. Such nations do not deserve to continue to the extent they suffer from 'freedom deficits' and serve as breeding grounds of terrorism. The second point relates to a claim by *ethnoscape* studies that fancy becomes a social fact in such situations of transnational turmoil. True indeed! How does an Indian explain 9/11? If you ask a school child or an illiterate, it is ninth November. But how has it come to mean Eleventh September which is how Americans write as. Fact is, nobody has ever questioned what these really

mean to us in our own context. This precisely is the publicity effect through which fancies, imagined communities and effects take shape and enter collective memory. Sudhir Kakkar calls popular family dramas which aim at re-inventing traditions (Films like *Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge*, *Kabhi Khushi Kabhi Gam* and *Kabhi Alvida Na Kehna* are a few examples) targeting the NRIs for profit as 'collective daydream' which most, withheld from their motherland, would like to indulge in giving the threads of their imagination a free float. This phenomenon needs to be conceptualized in India but it is a 'reality' with NRIs settled abroad. In its shifting complexities, it is a hyperreality.

24.2 Globalisation

Quintessentially, globalisation refers to a process of inter-connectedness on a global scale. But it involves more than growing connections or interdependence of nation-states. It has been defined as "a historical process invoking a fundamental shift or transformation in the spatial reach of human organization that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across regions and continents." The distinguished Professor of Diplomacy and a close observer of the global scene, Henry Kissinger was straight and apt when he chose to title his address to the Trinity College on 12 October 1999 as: "The basic challenge is that what is called globalization is really another name for the dominant role of the US." Amid a complex mosaic of its features, we should focus discussion of globalisation on understanding of what happened to nationalism and the emergence of several transnational phenomena which constitute our scope here.

What Kissinger was saying at the turn of the century was brilliantly pointed out by Marx and Engels one hundred and fifty years ago. Writing in the *Communist Manifesto*, they had observed:

"In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations..... The bourgeoisie by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian nations into civilization.

It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production..... i.e. to become bourgeois themselves, in one word, it creates a world after its own image."

Box 24.1: Global Interconnectedness

Between 1950 and 1998, the world export of goods increased seventeen fold - from \$311 billion to \$ 5.4 trillion - while the global economy expanded only six-fold. Exports of services which have surged during this period represents one-fifth of the total world trade. The main driver of this trade expansion are the Transnational Corporations whose number has risen from 7,000 in 1970 to 53,600 in 1998 with some 4,49,000 foreign subsidiaries. The sales of TNCs outside their home countries are growing 20-30 percent faster than their exports; and sales of goods and services by foreign subsidiaries - valued at \$ 9.5 trillion in 1997 - surpass total world exports by nearly 50 percent. More than 80 percent of these TNCs are homed in USA only. (See Hilary French: *Vanishing Borders-Protecting the Planet in an Age of Globalization*, World watch Institute, 2000, P. 6.

But Kissinger's version is important in the sense globalisation is what US makes of it. The failure of trade talks (Doha Development Round) in July 2006 bears it out. It was a promise given to the developing countries that

“globalisation will be more inclusive and help the world’s poor, particularly by slashing of barriers and subsidies in farming” by the US and EU countries. This was a promise given in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 2001 but while the war-on-terror campaign is continuing on top gear, the assurance of trade justice to the world’s poor has been allowed to lag behind. Therefore, the survey result of the World Bank Report of 2001 to the effect that global inequality has widened is correct but the World Bank’s inference that globalization holds “the key to social justice” is only politically correct, and not universally so. The rise in economic growth (due to globalisation) has come not, as Larry Elliot’s survey shows, with social justice but with “costs in terms of internal democracy, human rights and equality.”

The ‘jobless growth’ which resulted out of globalization was not of much help to the world’s poor whose number and rank swelled aggravating the crisis of migration. In those dire circumstances, you move instinctively to places where you have people of your own community. Under globalisation, borders became porous and national economies became open. Whereas 80 per cent of the world’s population lived in closed, non-market economies in 1950s, 87 percent of the world population moved into open economies by 1995. Fear and anxiety, insecurity and unemployment have goaded people to leave their homelands. Add to this, changes in job profiles and relaxed entry facilities for people from the labor - intensive economies and outsourcing of jobs (IT, BPO and now, engineering services) by the developed countries. The flow of capital, labour and job architectures has vastly increased in speed and configuration. The underside of this process of globalisation is full with filth: arms, drugs and human trafficking has carved out (in that order) large chunks of economic activities entailing heavy flow of persons and workers.

Globalisation is different from *internationalization* which is but an expression of growing interdependence among discrete but bounded nation-states. Under globalisation, the world is increasingly emerging as a shared social space. There is a significant shift in the scale of social organisation in every sphere from the economic to the security, transcending the world’s major regions and continents. Central to this structural change are twin features of unavoidable consequences: the revolution of Information and Communication Technologies which have triggered changes beyond anticipation and recognition. The second feature as Anthony Giddens has brilliantly highlighted lay in the abandonment of the welfare state and discontinuation of social security packages which were part of a social compact between the society and the state ever since the World War II. What has taken its place is popularly known as the Washington Consensus articulated by another British (developmental economist) John Williamson who had listed ten reforms for the Latin American economies so that they could attract private capital back to the region after the crippling debt crisis of 1980s. This ‘neo-liberal agenda’ for developing countries mostly in Africa and Latin America came to be known as “economic reforms’ which mostly consisted of liberalization, privatization and globalisation (LPG). But economic reforms are not sufficient in themselves and therefore, second-generation reforms were introduced under the rubric of ‘good governance’. Currently, ‘good governance’ is being used as a conditionality by the IMF and the World Bank for loans to the developing countries.

The performance records of most countries from these two continents were disappointing whereas China and the East Asian Tigers managed to collect benefits of globalisation with innovative re-moulding of this neo-liberal

package. India, Brazil and Russia are also counted as cases of successful globalizing. An important lesson out of these experiments lay in a challenge to the national leaders not to blindly kowtow but to design and evolve institutional and policy packages sensitive to local opportunities and constraints. Another major call of restraint on unfettered globalisation came from Francis Fukuyama who had predicted in 1989 (roughly the same time when the Washington Consensus was articulated) that history has ended, the liberal democracy has triumphed world-wide and the world is ready for democratization across political boundaries and popular resistance. "Democracy and free markets will continue to expand as the dominant organising principles for much of the world", he wrote in 2001 after the September attack. But Fukuyama changed his opinion, circa 2004 and asked for restoration of the nation states to the centre stage of world politics. In other words, nation state was never dead and globalisation waves which swept them under, found their importance sooner than later.

However, nation-states and nationalism as a political force have been deeply impacted giving rise to a new phenomenon called *detrterritorialisation*. This meant that boundaries became porous and open for moving of goods, capital and labour. In its concrete form, detrterritorialisation meant "bringing laboring populations into the lower-class sectors and spaces of relatively wealthy societies, while sometimes vesting exaggerated and intensified senses of criticism or attachment to politics in the home state." Deterritorialisation is now at the core of a variety of global fundamentalisms. As Arjun Appadurai has perceptively observed, "in The Hindu case, for example, it is clear that the overseas movement of Indians has been exploited by a variety of interests both within and outside India to create a complicated network of finances and religions identifications by which the problem of cultural reproduction for Hindus abroad has become tied to the politics of Hindu fundamentalism at home"(Appadurai, 1999).

24.3 Ten Theses on Globalisation

1. Anti-globalisation protests are not about globalisation since these protests are among the most globalised events in the world.
2. Globalisation is not new; nor is it just westernization.
3. Globalisation is not in itself a folly, it has already enriched the world. What is needed is fairer distribution of the fruits of globalisation.
4. The central issue, directly or indirectly, is inequality.
5. The primary concern is the level of inequality, not its marginal change for the better. Appalling poverty and staggering inequalities demand urgent attention.
6. The question is not just whether there exists some gain for all parties, but whether the distribution of gains is fair.
7. Market economy is consistent with many different institutional conditions and, in conjunction with the latter, can produce different outcomes. Aside from the need for pro-poor public policies, the distribution of benefits depends on a host of global arrangements (e.g. trade agreements, patent laws, environmental protection etc).
8. The world has changed since the Bretton Woods agreement. Decolonisation, human rights, NGOs and movements for gender and environmental equity and justice have come up anew.
9. Both policy and institutional changes are needed. Global governance is changing under open leadership of the World Bank and the UNO but

the Third World governments have been found to be indulging in violence and waste.

10. Finally, we have reason enough to support globalisation in the best sense of that idea since some institutional and policy issues deserve to be addressed more.

Amartya Sen in *The Los Angeles Times*

The political milieu of the Westphalian Treaty-based modern state has also changed with other structural changes accompanying globalisation. It was a myth to say that state lost sovereignty (how much of it USA state lost? for example) but political authority came to be distended by economic onslaughts released by globalisation. If the social space turned out to be a shared one, continuous fragmentation of political space, (disintegration of Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia etc.) spawned ethno-nationalisms previously held in subordination by the state administrative authorities. Participation-deficit models of national integration run the dangers of secessionism in these days of transnational turmoil.

24.4 Nationalism

Modern idea of nationalism emerged from the early 19th century Western Europe out of a combination of three strands which composed it:

1. Enlightenment as a liberal conception of political self-determination (Rousseau, J., S Mill and others)
2. The French revolutionary idea of the community of equal citizens; and
3. The German conceptions of a people formed by history tradition, and culture.

As a final process-product, nationalism thus was found tied to principles of freedom, equality and collective sharing of a history and culture. One of those who most vigorously espoused the cause of nationalism was the Italian Giuseppe Mazzini for whom three requisites are non-negotiable in nationalism: independent territory, a moral obligation for all to the nation one belongs to, and the notion that world is but 'a family of nations'. For the French romantic revolutionary, Ernest Renan, nationalism represents 'a daily plebiscite', a historical process of renewal on a daily basis.

Despite all that it stands to promote an identity of uniqueness, nationalism has never emerged as an alternative to globalization. It has been a part of it, though the relationship between nationalism and globalisation has never been free from tensions. These interactions however are variously perceived. For instance, one school of thinking holds Mazzini and Woodrow Wilson an 'old hat' and they are not for having more number of states which will only add 'disorder' to the international comity of nations. Another school thinks that the major developed countries of the OECD cannot afford another war which is always feared, and is the worst consequence of nationalisms. Eric Hobsbawm has argued that the old belief of a self-contained 'national' economy has been substantially eroded and its place has been taken by another nationalist idea, namely that "separate statehood can provide the best means of negotiating a favourable position in the international marketplace."

Box 24.2: The Core Themes Of Nationalist Ideology

1. Humanity is naturally divided into nations.
2. Each nation has its peculiar character.
3. The source of all political power is the nation, the whole collectivity.
4. For freedom and self-realization, men must identify with a nation.
5. Nations can only be fulfilled in their own states.
6. Loyalty to the nation-state overrides other loyalties.
7. The primary condition of global freedom and harmony is the strengthening of the nation-state.

Adam Smith

All these were arguments from a political economy perspective. Arjun Appadurai has however ventured an explanation of this problematic interrelationship between globalisation and nationalism from the perspective of global cultural economy.

As Scott Lash and John Urry have pointed out, globalisation represents 'a disorganized capitalism' which at present is outside the compass of enquiry available today. The new global cultural economy is 'a complex, overlapping disjunctive order which as distinguished from its previous *avatars*, is so striking by its 'sheer speed, scale and volume' that the disjuncture (between economies, cultures, polities etc) have become central to the politics of global culture. "The world we live in now seems rhizomic, even schizophrenic, calling for theories of rootlessness, alienation, and psychological distance between individuals and groups on the one hand, and fantasies (or nightmares) of electronic propinquity, on the other." In this world of the hyperreal, we enter a 'new condition of neighborliness' or what Marshall MacLuhan famously called 'a global village'. The media however keep creating at the same time, communities with "no sense of place". It is also called Communities caught in the media scape giving these new perceptions a further globalizing twist, Fredric Jameson points out a "nostalgia for the present" which refuses to die despite change in the living context and conditions. One important new feature of this global cultural politics marked by disjunctive relationships is that "state and nation are at each other's throats, and the hyphen that links them is now less an icon of conjuncture than an index of disjuncture." Appadurai insightfully explains this phenomenon: "This disjunctive relationship between nations and state has two levels: at the level of any given nation-state, it means that there is a battle of the imagination, with state and nation seeking to cannibalize one another. Here is the seedbed of brutal separatisms - majoritarianisms that seem to have appeared from nowhere and microidentities that have become political projects within the nation-state. At another level, this disjunctive relationship is deeply entangled with various global disjunctures: ideas of nationhood appear to be steadily increasing in scale and regularly crossing existing state boundaries, sometimes, as with the Kurds, because previous identities stretched across vast national spaces or, as with the Tamils in Sri Lanka, the dormant threads of a transnational diaspora have been activated to ignite the micropolitics of a nation-state."

Unyoking of 'imagination' from the 'place' constitutes the critical differential feature of living in such a world. The space released for imagination in this process is neither small nor large, micro or macro since it is not a 'problem of representation'. But day-to-day routine living cannot escape but face this space. The challenge thus becomes one of embedding large-scale realities

of the transnational world in the concrete life worlds of immediate experience. This is so because their lives cut across national boundaries while bringing two societies into a single constituted social field.

Box 24.3: Nationalism and Globalisation

- Nationalism was only fully recognized as relevant by International Relations in the past two decades.
- Nationalism is both opposed to globalization and a product of it.
- The spread of nationalism is a result of the transformation of the international system over the past two centuries.
- Nationalism is now the moral basis of states and of the international system.

Fred Halliday

24.5 Transnationalism

Transnationalism (TN) refers to a process by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin with their country of settlement. These immigrants who maintain simultaneous presence in two or more varieties can also be described as transmigrants. The transnational social field thus constituted comprises, in part, family ties sustained through economic disbursements and gifts and in part, by a system of legalized exchanges, structured and officially endorsed by the home state. Till recently, migrant experiences in different areas of the world were studied as discrete and separate phenomena unrelated to fast emerging hyperreality which has overwhelmed the world in the process of globalisation. The growing demand is to study these migrant population dynamic and fluid social relatives with in combination an analysis of the global context and dimensionality. As discussed before, global restructuring of capital has deeply affected economies of the developed countries (e.g. swelling un - and under - employment of the labour force). In order to comprehensively grasp these problems besetting migrant populations ever on rise, a transnational framework of analysis has become necessary. While developing such a framework of analysis, Nina Glick Schiller Linda Basch and Cristina Blanc - Szanton (SBB) have identified six premises which are central to conceptualization of Transnationalism:

- 1) bounded social science concepts such as tribe, ethnic group, nation, society, or culture can limit the ability of researchers to first perceive, and then analyze, the phenomenon of transnationalism;
- 2) the development of the transnational migrant experience is inextricably linked to the changing conditions of global capitalism, and must be analyzed within that world context;
- 3) transnationalism is grounded in the daily lives, activities, and social relationships of migrants;
- 4) transnational migrants, although predominantly workers, live a complex existence that forces them to confront, draw upon, and rework different identity constructs - national, ethnic and racial;
- 5) the fluid and complex existence of transnational migrants compels us to reconceptualize the categories of nationalism, ethnicity, and race, theoretical work that can contribute to reformulating our understanding of culture, class, and society; and
- 6) transmigrants deal with and confront a number of hegemonic contexts, both global and national. These hegemonic contexts have an impact

on the transmigrant's consciousness, but at the same time transmigrants reshape these contexts by their interactions and resistance.

To the extent that transnationalism is a product feature of world capitalism, the identity of the transmigrants has remained a contested terrain. The global flow is determinative of the class profile of these migrants who normally crowd the lower echelons of the dominant society they migrate into. The Chinese transmigrants may have a small component of the Hong Kong capitalist class but the Indian, Caribbean and Filipino populations have important petit bourgeois and professional strata. But all the strata of these migrant populations live and grow in a transnational world constantly created, reenacted and reconstituted by hegemonic constructions and practices in their daily routine existence.

In such a contingency, the transmigrants find their options usually *subordinate* to the dominant ideology of the host country, and *open vis-à-vis* the homeland so that they can "continuously translate the economic and social position gained in one political setting into political, social and economic capital in another." Internal class differentiations of the hegemonic states often play a crucial role in the constitution of the transnational social field. The American multinationals, for instance, prefer transnationalism over the American poor and middle class who prefer nationalist protection. *The Economic Times* of 26 September 2006 carries this news: 449 Indian have been given a 10 year multi-entry visa to Malaysia on payment of just 75,000 US dollars with all other conditions waived. Though sufficient research is warranted to confirm, an important hypothesis can be formulated in this context that the gifts and activities which flow across the borders carry with them social relations embedded in them. As SBB argue, these social relations take on meaning within the flow and fabric of daily life, as linkages between different societies are maintained, renewed, and reconstituted in the context of families, of institutions, of economic investments, business, and finance and of political organizations and structures including nation-states.

In the absence of deep-going researches, we can only conclude at this stage with a formulation that a true understanding of Transnationalism is not possible without a global perspective. The latter comes, as we have seen above, in a basket of nationalisms disjointed from their states and activated through a larger-than-life imaginative mode fashioned and facilitated by the revolutions in media technology and loosening/widening of the national features of a sovereign state. Understood in this sense, Transnationalism and Globalisation have created a new world of reality which is awaiting rigorous conceptualization.

24.6 Conclusion

The contours of future research of this area remains ill-defined but three broad approaches merit consideration since they are doing rounds lately. The first such approach is **cosmopolitanism** which seeks to promote the idea that all human beings are equal and the international community should defend the victims of war crimes and punish the perpetrators regardless of the places of their origin. Many cosmopolitans therefore welcomed the UK House of Lord's ruling that the leaders guilty of human rights violations can not claim immunity from prosecution by appealing to the member of sovereign immunity. That is how General Pinochet, the Chilean dictator was brought to book by the UK Courts. The other approach is **post-modernism** which emphasizes a peculiar point that knowledge

designed to progress contains the danger of domination. The diversity, according to this approach, should be respected against homogenization which usually leads to new forms of power and exclusion. In other words, appropriation of reality for creation of knowledge doesn't have to follow a given dominant model. The third salient approach is communitarianism. Michael Walzer has criticized cosmopolitanism on the ground that individuals acquire their most fundamental rights and responsibilities as members of particular communities inhabiting across the national borders (i.e. group rights and not as members of the human race). This point received sharpened focus from W. Kymlicka who with the help of a path-breaking analysis to establish a respect point of view that the rights of indigenous people depend effectively on curtailment of some individual rights which lie at the heart of the liberal democratic polities of the West.

As you can see from the above, a new vista is opening out privileging theorizations in the new context of globalisation, nationalism and transnationalism in their active authentication and signatures. The world appears to be fast growing into a different place now.

24.7 Further Reading

Appadurai, Arjun. 1999. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." In Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (eds.), *Migration, Diasporas and Transnationalism*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

Schiller, N.G., Linda Basch and Cristina Blane-szanton. 1999. "Transnationalism: A New Analytical Framework for Understanding Migration." In Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (eds.), *Migration, Diasporas and Transnationalism*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.