Jan Rek
University of Lodz, Poland

Studying How the World Has Been Won: About Two Sides of One Approach to the Process of Globalization and the Media Today

Globalization is a concept that has made a dazzling career lately. It is reiterated so often that an unusual "inflation effect" is created. Because of the surplus of this word, language appears to be used in its magic form. Seemingly, the concept of globalization functions almost like a magic formula: a text with the word inserted in it appears to have just been finished, and is now being spell-checked for final touches. In other words, the reader is led to believe that the time of reading almost coincides with the time of *writing*. Furthermore, due to the frequency with which the concept appears in various contexts, its meaning hardly stays within a relatively fixed framework; it is often changeable, and its scope equivocal.

It may be accepted that the concept *globalization* becomes operationalized when it is used to mean either "the most accomplished mode of domination to date… a new type of centralized power,"[1] or the connectedness between people of the globe, making them integrated into a whole, even though they remain physically isolated.

Even though the recurring presence of the burning towers on almost all possible screens would encourage one to believe that 11th Sept. 2001 was a particularly significant proof of the communication unification of the inhabitants of the world, the history of globalization goes far beyond the date of the annihilation of the Trans World Center. As some scholars believe, the attack only provided a reliable argument to corroborate the claim that Marshal McLuhan was right when he announced in the 1960's, „We now live in a global village..."[2] For many critics and researchers

Special thanks to Yosefa Loshitzky, whom I have never met but whose critical analyses and interpretations of phenomena at work in modern culture, first of all globalization, have not only greatly contributed to this paper but also helped achieve reflexivity of research methods used to explore the media in the contemporary world.

[1] Randy Martin, "Globalization? The Dependencies of a Question", *Social Text* vol. 17, no 3 (Fall 1999), p. 2.
[2] Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, *The Medium is the Message*, New York: Bantam, 1967, p. 63.

of cultural studies, the declaration seemed utopian at the time: it more designed the future than described the actual condition.

Recent headline-making events have shown that McLuhan's concept of the "global village" is by no means a myth only. The model of the world that has become "wired" with people linked together, once a mythical possibility, has become a *fait accompli*. Obvious premises make one accept as a thesis what used to be a hypothesis only: we live in a global village. It must also be concurred that the process of globalization, because globalization is a process[3], and temporality is one of its fundamental attributable features, has gathered speed. Earlier on, in McLuhan's times, during the explosion of both public and research interest in the media, television in particular, the governing doctrine of globalization assumed the type of communication and social relationships that implemented an authoritarian model. It was "one way" communication based on the unquestionable hegemony of the sender who did not want to share his competence with the audience.

The sender's advantageous position traditionally stemmed from the dominator's strategy in which the sender acquired or assured for himself a superior position by the very fact of acting in the role of a privileged body. This position remained unshaken even when the number of senders increased. Pluralism of senders did not initiate egalitarianism. Quite the opposite; its absence was the norm. Access to communication technology has always been restricted, thus endorsing the privileged position of the few only: it has helped them introduce a new model of social order or to retain the existing order in which they have already participated.[4] Currently, new technologies, such as the Internet with instant messaging or mobile telecommunication, give the audience greater access, facilitating the interchangeability of the roles of the sender and the addressee; both parties are given, as it were, "human rights" to a greater extent than before.

---

[3] See among others Rico Lie, „What's New About Cultural Globalization?… Linking the Global from Within the Local", in Jan Servaes and Rico Lie, eds., *Media and Politics in Transition. Cultural Identity in the Age of Globalization,* Acco Leuven: Amersfoort, 1997, p. 152.

[4] On this issue, see James W. Carey, „The language of technology: talk, text and template as metaphor for communication", in M. J. Medhurst, A. Gonzalez & T. R. Peterson, eds., *Communication and the culture of technology,*

History has provided yet another argument: controlling communication and access to it means controlling society. Analyzed from this perspective, communication appears to be a generator of social differentiation, governing centers that offer control over the distribution of power.[5] The exclusive, monopolized power of the elite.

The world cannot be fully and comprehensively described with one discourse only and a multiplicity of them exists. Each endeavors to produce texts in its unique way and to establish the ways in which they are enunciated. Discourses „differ with the kinds of institutions and social practices in which they take shape, and with the positions of those who speak and those whom they address."[6] Political discourse traditionally emphasizes overstepping boundaries[7], whatever they may be. For the authority, or any body associated with the authority, to emphasize that history begins afresh, from a new starting point in the history of the world, is another opportunity to delineate for itself a relatively permanent niche, to become emblazoned in collective memory "for good." Therefore it may be suspected that the television series showing the TWC towers enshrouded in smoke and then tumbling down was a successful attempt to involve the audience in political discourse.

After 11th Sept. 2001, the world has become a united entity within globalization discourse. Paradoxically, events that reverberate in the media, such as the Gulf War or street protests against globalization (Seattle, Dec. 1999, Prague, Sept. 2000, Gothenburg June 2001) have contributed to the legitimization of it.

Pullman: Washington University Press, 1990; also his „Technology as a totem for culture", *American Journalism,* 1990 no 7, pp. 242-251.

[5] See Albert Bressand & Catherine Distler, *Le prochain monde*, Paris: Seuil, 1985.

[6] Diane Macdonell, *Theories of Discourse: An Introduction* , Oxford: Blackwell, 1986, p. 1. See also Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language.* Trans. A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972; Jacob Torfing, *New Theories of Discourse: Laclan, Mouffe and Zizek,* Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.

[7] The concept of liminality may be of use here. For the discussion on it, see Victor Turner, *The Forest of Symbols*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967; Arnold Van Gennep, *The Rites of Passage*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1960; Victor Turner, *From Ritual to Theatre; The Human Seriousness of Play*, New York, PAJ Publications, 1982.

As Masao Miyoshi claims, „Discourse and practice are interdependent. Practice follows discourse, while discourse is generated by practice."[8] Current globalization-related social practices that have just been discussed have brought about a reconfiguration of discourse on globalization.

It is evident today that globalization also brings about a reconfiguration of space. It comes as a result of the operation of new technologies which, acting like "space machines," allow the addressee to travel in space and to establish various systems of exchange that function against, or outside, legal, political or customs boundaries, beyond the authority's competence. Those travels „take place within a distinctive perceptual mapping of the globe," as Michael Shapiro states.[9]

Current academic discussions on globalization unanimously accept Arjun Appadurai's belief that this process takes place on at least three levels: economic, financial and cultural.[10] It is indeed the area where true „close encounters of the third kind" occur: technologies, people, capital, genres and works of art meet and enter new relationships, regardless of national and cultural divides. As the aim of this paper is to describe the world that has been conquered by the media, cultural issues will be explored in greater detail while economic and financial matters will be left aside for the time being. In other words, the effects that globalization has on communication and cultural contacts will be examined.

Theorizing about the point at which the process of globalization is currently does not bring us any closer to a "global society." Instead, it facilitates understanding that subnational and supranational interactions take away or greatly restrict the right of "power centers"[11] to exist and function, which coincides with the domination of transnational corporations.[12]

The need to remain in contact seems to be an intrinsic ability characteristic of humankind. Remaining in contact is manifest in a continual expansion of the boundaries of an individual's

[8] Masao Miyoshi, "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State", *Critical Inquiry* vol. 19, no 4 (Summer 1993), p. 726.
[9] Michael J. Shapiro, "Globalization and the Politics of Discourse", *Social Text* vol. 17, no 3 (Fall 1999), p. 117.
[10] See Arjun Appadurai, "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy", *Public Culture* 2 (Spring 1990), pp. 1-24.
[11] See Frederick Buell, *National Culture and the New Global System",* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994, p. 10.
[12] See Masao Miyoshi, op. cit., in passim.

social existence, or, in other words, it is contained in initiating contacts with others. The scale of satisfying these desires is not unlimited. History has shown that the scope of communication between people has increased in time with the development of technologies.

Dissolving boundaries in the process of communicating between cultures is a commonly noticed fact in globalization discourse. One of the reasons behind these "leaks" is the crisis of the concept of nation-state. As M. Shapiro says, “While a state is understood (within dominant narratives) as a territorial entity that historically expanded its political, legal, and administrative control by monopolizing violence and incorporating various subunits into a legal and administrative entity with definite boundaries, the primary understanding of the modern “nation” segment of the hyphenated term is that it embodies a coherent culture, united on the basis of shared descent or, at least, incorporating a 'people' with a historically stable coherence.”[13]

It should instead be accepted that coherence is exclusively a feature of idealized models. Its absence in the social world appears to result from the dynamics of globalization which is, in turn, to a large extent conditioned by the emergence of new technologies, social mobility and socio-political tensions.[14]

According to Robert Stam and Ella Habiba Shohat, „the media are absolutely central to any discussion of multiculturalism, transnationalism, and globalization. (…) By facilitating a mediated engagement with “distant” peoples, the media circulate across national boundaries and thus 'deterritorialize' the process of imagining communities. And while the media can destroy community and fashion solitude by turning spectators into atomized consumers or self-entertaining

[13] Michael J. Shapiro, op. cit., p. 121.
[14] On this issue cf., for instance, Jürgen Habermas' remarks in his „The European Nation-State: On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship”, *Public Culture* 10 (Winter 1998), p. 404, as quoted in Michael J. Shapiro, ibid. The concept of citizenship being positioned by two factors: territorial location legitimized politically and legally on the one hand, and cultural identity shared with others on the basis of ethnic unity on the other hand, seems interesting as it justifies a sort of social will that tends to maintain, or reactivate, the links between two regions once united, but occasionally separated in spite of the current “political context,” as in the case of East and West Germany by the fall of the Berlin Wall, North and South Korea, the Republic of China and Taiwan, etc. It should be added, however, that they contend with each other; as a result of continuous "negotiations" between them, the problem of priority and sovereignty remains open, and, consequently, a possible superiority of one becomes a transitive value.

monads, they can also fashion community and alternative affiliations."[15] Exchanges between different cultures mediated through the media being used in the process of globalization, including cross-cultural interactions, are hardly balanced. The lack of equilibrium or symmetry between those who, as senders, transfer their culture through the media, and those who, as the audience, are beneficiaries of this transfer, gives media researches an interpretative premise that allows them to describe these interactions in terms of a vertical model.

The superiority of one culture over another can be imagined as quantitative variables that can be expressed in figures (for instance, the number of films distributed to cinemas per year or shown on television in prime-time per week, or the number of those films or television shows in the charts of most popular films or television programs). Resilience and vitality of cultural patterns, stylistic or genre conventions, on the other hand, would constitute qualitative variables which, transferred to a new territory where they are genealogically "alien," are successfully internalized and domesticated.[16]

In recent multidisciplinary discussions on the media and globalization, Western criticism has devised a method of conceptualizing research problems that seems to be derivative of imperial rhetoric.[17] Even though it may not be imperial in its literal meaning, this rhetoric at least emphasizes the fact of the imposition of a new order onto a culture. A new division of the world into the First World and the Third World has taken place within a new global political project that has been formulated in the spirit of this rhetoric. Both concepts are a construct, or a projection of a model of the world, produced by Western civilization not only on the basis of the knowledge of oneself and of the Others but are also fostered by wishful thinking. The First World not only has appropriated the role of the hegemon as the most important actor on the stage but it also usurps the right to act as the paragon of progress, beauty and civilization. The strategy oriented on the

[15] Robert Stam and Ella Habbiba Shohat, „Film theory and spectatorship in the age of the „posts", in Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams, eds., *Reinventing Film Studies,* London: Arnold, 2000, p. 381.
[16] For instance in Poland after 1989, when communists had to cede power, and culture became the site of expansion of the Western media, the „poetics" of the Academy Awards' ceremony with the "nominated" and the "winner is" as its integral parts, has become the model convention at parallel Polish ceremonies, both in social practices, and on TV shows, reflecting a trademark of prestige and political "opening up to the world."

protection of one's own interests becomes evident in different ways, for instance by relegating the Third World onto a further level. Marginalization of the Third World is more effective when participants in globalization discourse, originating in most cases from the First World, "forget" about the Second World in their analyses. This exclusion in discourse is not accidental and almost certainly results from the accepted and secretly implemented strategy geared towards the preservation of the dominant position. Undoubtedly, it is farther from the First World to the Third World than to the Second one. The distancing of the two worlds aims at a covert attribution of values: advancing the First World and discrediting the Third World. On the level of language, such a manipulation is not semantically neutral, which only corroborates one truth: even though media empires function in a dispersed way in our world[18], it is difficult not to see that they establish power-related relations.

As has already been mentioned, critics use vertical structures to analyze such relations. The degree of dependence between the stronger and the weaker is contained in the space between submission on the one hand and hegemony, or even imperial authority, on the other.[19]

Post-colonial discourse operates within the same space. The application of the term "post-colonial" reactivates a defined tradition: it refers to the process of colonization and decolonization,

---

[17] See Yosefa Loshitzky, „Travelling culture/travelling television", *Screen* 37:4, Winter 1996, p. 323.

[18] Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan use the category of "dispersed hegemonies", see their *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1994, cit. after Robert Stam and Ella Habbiba Shohat, op. cit., p. 383.

[19] Subjugation and hegemony in the context of the domination of Hollywood cinema in the world were the subject of works by authors such as Pierre Berton, *Hollywood's Canada: the Americanization of Our National Image,* Toronto: McClelland and Steward, 1975; Andrew Higson and Richard Maltby, eds., *"Film Europe" and "Film America": Cinema, Commerce and Cultural Exchange 1920-1939,* Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1999; David W. Ellwood and Rob Kroes, eds., *Hollywood in Europe: experiences of a cultural hegemony,* Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1994; Ian Jarvie, *Hollywood's overseas campaign: the North Atlantic movie trade, 1920-1950,* Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992; M. Medhi Semati and Patty J. Sotirin, "Hollywood's Transnational Appeal: Hegemony and Democratic Potential?", *Journal of Popular Film and Television,* vol. 26, no 4 (Winter 1999), pp. 176-188; Kristin Thompson, *Exporting entertainment,* London: BFI, 1985; Miriam Bratu Hansen, "The mass production of the senses: classical cinema as vernacular modernism", in Christine Gledhill & Linda Williams, *Reinventing film studies,* London: Arnold, 2000, pp. 340-1; Darrell William Davis, "Reigniting Japanese Tradition with *Hana-Bi*", *Cinema Journal* 40, no 4 (Summer 2001), pp. 66-7. Cultural imperialism is discussed in, for instance, Victoria de Grazia, "Americanism for export", *Wedge*, 7-8 (Winter-Spring 1985), pp. pp. 74-81; also her "Mass Culture and sovereignty: the American challenge to European cinemas, 1920-1960", *Journal of Modern History,* 61,1 (March 1989), pp. 53-87; Joel Smith, *Understanding the Media: A Sociology of Mass Communication,* Cresshill: Hampton Press, 1996, pp. 274-90. The concept "imperial conquest" requires further elaboration. Historically, it refers to the times when the loss of cultural independence ensued the loss of political independence resulting from the seizure of the land by an "aggressor" who, in terms of space, was the country's closest or relatively close neighbor. In the era of

or, more precisely, to the mechanism that has functioned in history for centuries, signifying first subjugation of some by others[20], and then liberation from the restraints imposed. The term "post-colonial" is being used these days historically and metaphorically. In its historical sense, it refers to the period after World War II which Miyoshi has discussed lately[21] and which can be considered closed. Used metaphorically, it acquires a different meaning.

First of all, it functions outside a specific time-framework. In other words, post-colonial discourse, while operating the term figuratively, dispossesses, or even deprives the category of its spatial and historical specificity. Ella Shohat had earlier pointed out "its ahistorical and universalizing deployments" in such cases.[22] Interestingly, she observed that the formulation of the post-colonial beyond spatial and temporal specificity "collapses very different national-racial formulations…as equally post-colonial."[23] Therefore, if all cases described by the term are treated as "post-colonial" because they took place during a "post-colonial epoch," then they may just as well be considered "neo-colonial," that is, temporal specificity cannot be ascribed to them. Secondly, to operate it is to expose pleasures that are shared by those who benefit from them by participating in post-colonial discourse. The source of these pleasures is a covert, implicit satisfaction which stems from the belief that the time has come to consider opportunities not really for a re-vindication but for a new model of relationships with the former "aggressor." Such critical reflection frequently seems to be guided by post-Marxist ideology which makes use of Marx's

---

globalization, imperial conquests in the area of culture are made without spatial contact, "from a distance," which, from the point of view of the "invader," makes his actions psychologically more "friendly."

[20] Frantz Fanon describes colonial dependence in terms of submission of control over economy, culture, demographic patterns and consumption habits to the metropolitan center, see *The Wretched of the Earth,* trans. C. Farrington, Harmnondsworth: Penguin, 1967.

[21] Masao Miyoshi, op. cit., p. 729. Discourse on colonialism first originated in the area of literary theory and criticism. Miyoshi rightly considers as fundamental the authors such as, for instance: Aimé Césaire, *Discours sur le colonialisme*, Paris: Présence Africaine, 1955; Cyril Lionel Robert James, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint Louverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, New York: Vintage Books, 1963; *A History of Negro Revolt,* New York: Drum and Spear Press, 1969; *Beyond a Boundary*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1993; Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth,* preface by Jean-Paul Sartre, trans. Constance Farrington, op. cit; *A Dying Colonialism,* trans. Haakon Chevalier, New York: Grove Press, 1965; *Black Skin, White Masks,* trans. Charles Lam Markmann, London: Pluto, 1986; George Lamming, *In the Castle of My Skin,* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991; *The Pleasure of Exile,* London: Allison and Busby, 1984

[22] See her "Notes on the "Post-Colonial", *Social Text*, no 31/32, 1992, p. 99

[23] Ibid. p. 102.

category of "historic justice" according to which history will sooner or later take side with the nations that are exploited and oppressed both by fate and "capitalist aggressors."[24]

Operative requirements demand that the category of the author should be discussed at this point. When French structuralism represented by Roland Barthes proclaimed the death of the author and commanded criticism to focus exclusively on the text, severed from the person who brought it into the world,[25] nothing indicated that the author would somehow be resurrected and reenter critics' minds. It appears, however, that in the considerations presented here, the category of the author will be useful.

Let us use the argument that the analysis of post-colonial discourse demonstrates that it was initiated and has been consistently practiced by critics from former colonies in Asia, Africa and Latin America, or from the territories whose national status is uncertain and unstable. To formulate such a supposition is not to accept researchers' biographical experiences and/or national and cultural identities as fundamental powers that form their critical approaches. A note of affiliation with psychologism[26] that can be noticed here is not tantamount to giving this methodological doctrine the exclusive right. What is important is the treatment of the author as one of the elements that shape the critical perspective and the choice of the critical procedures. In other words: the complex of dependencies cannot be reduced to a single code.

---

[24] See Karl Marx, "The Future Results of the British Rule in India", *New York Daily Tribune*, Aug 8, 1853, in Russian as "Vuduszcze rezultati britanskogo vladiczestva v Indii", in K. Marx, F. Engels, *Soczinenia*, t. 9, Moskva 1957; Friderik Engels, *On the National and Colonial Questions: Selected Writings*, Aijaz Ahmad, ed., New Delhi: Left World, 2001; Vladimir I. Lenin, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination", in *Collected Works,* Progress Publishers: Moscow, 1964, vol. 20, pp. 393-454; "The Question of Nationalities or "Autonomisation"", in ibid., vol. 36; Josef W. Stalin, "Marxism and the National Question", in *Works,* Foreign Languages Publishing House: Moscow, 1954, vol. 2, pp. 300-81.

[25] See Roland Barthes, "La Morte de l'auteur", *Manteia* 1968, in Eng as "The Death of the Author", in *Image, Music, Text,* ed. and trans. Stephan Heath, New York: Hill and Wang, 1977, pp. 142-8; Sean Burke, *The Death and Return of the Author. Criticism and Subjectivity in Barthes, Foucault and Derrida,* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993; M. Couturieur, *La Figure de l'auteur*, Paris 1995; P. Lamarque, "The Death of the Author: An Analytical Autopsy", *British Journal of Aesthetics* 1990 no 4.

[26] According to Robert Stamm and Ella Habiba Shohat, psychologism inscribed in the post-colonial discourse is cognitively questionable as it makes the reduction of „large-scale political struggles to intra-psychic tensions" possible, see their "Film theory and spectatorship in the age of the "posts", in Christine Gledhill and Linda Williams, eds., *Reinventing film studies,* London: Arnold, 2000, p. 393. To see how illusory this methodological perspective is it is enough to recall the case of the German novelist Karl May, the author of the *Winnetou* trilogy, adapted for screen on a number of occasions. Karl May probably worked on the main outline of his novels dealing the Indians in the Wild West when in prison. By this, he somewhat undermined the efforts of a critic who accepts an already defined position from which he will seek parallels between the author's life and the fictitious life of his works. See Hermann Wohlgschaft, *Grosse Karl May Biographie. Leben und Werk*, Paderborn: Igel Verlag Wissenschaft, 1994, pp. 98 and 144.

One more argument calls for the inclusion of the subject in the act of enunciation into the critical approach. Participants in post-colonial discourse which overlaps with the discussion on the media and globalization seem to obey, apart from the one mentioned above, another perplexing rule. They construct their texts "dealing" with first the problem of colonization and secondly of decolonization in such a way that their stories are equally stories about the object and the subject. The effect is achieved in two ways: (1) either when authors cannot maintain a sufficient distance from the phenomenon they describe, that is when the "I" of the enunciation and the "I" of what is enounced overlap, (2) or when they "supplement" their professional writings as researchers by autobiographical texts or fragments as "private persons" who initiate dialogue with the former.

Frantz Fanon, for instance, born in a French colony and educated in France, wrote his *The Wretched of the Earth* as if he were an immediate witness of the described events or even participated in them. He even emphasized his superior position as the subject of the act of enunciation in relation to the fact of recounting the event through the change of the language form, which validated the "story" of decolonization itself in the eyes of the reader (audience). In other words, this technique allowed the events, as presented by the subject in the text, asserting the right of the formerly colonized countries to self-determination, to acquire the status of "objective" historical facts the credibility of which could not be disputed.[27]

The category of the author makes itself felt in the second case too. The image constructed in interviews or autobiographical works by such participants in post-colonial debates as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak or Edward Said makes the public opinion believe that they became involved in post-colonial discourse not only because of their "personal" research interests but also because their lives were connected with the colonial tradition (the case of Jacques Derrida, incidentally, is also similar[28]). Producing these types of texts, or rather, contributing to their production, they enhance

[27] See Chester J. Fontenot, *Frantz Fanon. Language as the God gone astray in the flesh*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1979.

[28] Apparently, what is of significance is that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak was born and raised in West Bengal, India, once „The Jewel in the Crown." See her comments upon herself in *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues,* Sarah Harasym, ed., London: Routledge, 1990; also Donna Landry and Gerald MacLean, eds., *The Spivak Reader*, New York and London: Routledge, 1996. Edward Said was born in what is now the occupied territories and

the credibility of their practices: subjects in power over their post-colonial texts are, in the readers' perception, "enfleshed." Those texts seem to be legitimized and protected by the person of the author who stands "behind them" and affirms their identity through the story of his/her life.

Some media and globalization critics clearly refer to the experience of post-colonial discourse. For instance, the vertical model of the world which is the result of the tension between the colonizer and the colonized seems to be of great use in describing the role of hegemon of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe after WW II[29] or presenting the cinema as an instrument of mass communication, capable of implementing new social patterns and awakening national awareness in the audiences in African countries.[30] This model seems to be suitable to formulate a thesis that one of the reasons for the low social and economic level of underdeveloped countries is the communication domination of the superpowers to which they are subjugated.[31]

A certain general conclusion may be drawn at this point. Today, the concept of the media and globalization, discussed in this paper, is a derivative of the model of the world, accepted earlier by scholars, the development of which is prompted by tensions between "the stronger" and "the weaker." The emergence of the approach as such comes as an effect of the syndrome of the master and the servant, or the conqueror and the conquered, or the colonizer and the colonized. It may probably be assumed that those critics would perceive the historical process as an implementation

---

raised in Cairo; he wrote upon himself: "I was…a Palestinian going to school in Egypt, with an English first name, an American passport and no certain identity at all," see his "Between Worlds," *London Review of Books*, vol. 20, no 9 (7 May 1998); Jacques Derrida's comments upon himself in Jacques Derrida and Derek Attridge, "This Strange Institution Called Literature: Interview with Jacques Derrida", *Acts of Literature/Jacques Derrida*, Derek Attridge, ed., trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby, New York: Routledge, 1992, pp. 33-75; also Jacques Derrida, and Geoffrey Bennington, *Jacques Derrida*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

[29] Aniko Imre has lately written: "…Eastern Europe's frontier position in Europe has made it into a type of a colony for the West (as well as for the East, most recently Russia)." See her „White man, white mask: *Mephisto* meets *Venus*", *Screen* 40:4 (Winter 1999), p. 406. A similar perspective was adapted by Tadeusz Lubelski in his analysis of the Polish cinema after 1945, see his *Strategie autorskie w polskim filmie fabularnym lat 1945-1961 [Authorial strategies in the Polish narrative film between 1945-1961],* Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 1992. From the methodological point of view, Thomson's book is based on a similar premise, see Ewa M. Thompson, *Imperial Knowledge. Russian Literature and Colonialism,* Greenwood Press: Westport, Connecticut, London, 2000.

[30] See three articles in the *Women, Race, Gender, Nation* special issue of *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, vol. 17, no 4: Dorit Naaman, "Woman/Nation: A Postcolonial Look at Female Subjectivity", pp. 333-42; Sandra Gayle Carter, "Farida Benlyazid's Moroccan Women", pp. 343-69; June M. Gill, "The Films of Euzhan Palcy: A Voice for Black History", pp. 371-81.

[31] See Muhammad Ayish, "International communication in the 1980s: implications for the Third World", *International Affairs*, vol. 68 no 3 (1992), p. 487, cit. after Yosefa Loshitzky, "Travelling culture/travelling television", *Screen,* 37:4 (Winter 1996), p. 327.

of the pattern based on the rule of dialectics. In other words, according to them, the world's political and social evolution is generated by power as those "at the bottom" endeavor to replace the ones "at the top." Resentments originating from a sense of wrong and discrimination must or may have contributed to the acceptance of such an assumption.[32] The experienced wrongs which history has confirmed and which have become permanently recorded in collective memory forming, as one of the factors, national and cultural identities, arouse the desire for retaliation. The desire to revenge and "get even" often found additional justification in ideologies derived from human rights and/or historic justice, used to reinforce their claims.

I believe it is a **hard vertical (**or **radical)** concept of studying globalization related to the media today.

Research activities of some critics participating now in the discourse on the media and globalization who come from Africa, Asia and South America or perceive communication problems from this perspective or, having emigrated to and assimilated in the countries in the First World, consider them from a new perspective which also combines the experiences and harms suffered by their "earlier" culture (this culture may, but does not have to be, their "mother" culture), may be placed within this theoretical structure.

Homi K. Bhabha's case calls for a separate analysis. This scholar, born in Bombay, India, and then westernized, has for many years been one of the most acclaimed representatives of post-colonial discourse. His discussions on the inability to integrate national identity and cultural identity in some situations, as well as on the ambivalence of the category of the "nation"[33], are recommended literature on both sides of the Atlantic. His theory is an interesting area in which several powers clash. As an advocate of post-structuralism of Jacques Lacan, Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, Bhabha refuses to accept the practice of constructing binary oppositions, popular in Western thought, and, by adhering to deconstruction of Derrida, he has long attempted to

[32] See Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, op. cit.; Margaret Canovan, *Nationhood and Political Theory,* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, 1996.

displace their hierarchical structure. Thus, a strong tendency to make difference relative, to seek a "Third Space," to negotiate between what is opposite and what is drastically different, appears in his writings. However, a persistent and consistent application of this approach to all cases may jeopardize his position and invalidate his participation in the post-colonial discourse on the side of "anti-colonialists," or else it may make it dubious and vague. It would easily provide an argument for supporters of radical leftist political groups. They could even accuse Bhabha of having betrayed native ideals when he moved from the Third World to the First one and of having rejected the values that had earlier defined his national and cultural identities. Therefore, it may be possible that political correctness has generated a need to accentuate his anti-colonial beliefs even on the level of language. Destroying, as it were, Queen's English, i.e. violating it by play on words or appropriating it in his own way and employing it to serve a new cause or idea[34], he questioned symbolic values of the "aggressor's world."

Thus, writings of Bhabha, albeit loosely connected with functioning of the media in the global aspect, also implement a hierarchical model, although in a less visible and therefore more covert and subtle way.

Relatively recently, Yosefa Loshitzky has made an interesting attempt to apply some developments in the so-called nomadic criticism and travel theory to television and mass communication.[35] Travel theory is founded on the experiences of the Others involved through life or a voluntary decision into a new cultural space described as the asylum in the political discourse.

---

[33] See Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture,* London and New York: Routledge & Keegan Paul, 1994, especially his Introduction; Homi K. Bhabha, ed., *Nation and Narration,* London: Routledge, 1990, especially his "Introduction: narrating the nation."

[34] See his essay „DissemiNation: Time, Narrative and the Margins of the Modern Nation", in *The Location of Culture*, op. cit. For the strategy of degradation of the category of imperial culture by representatives of cultural traditions other than imperial see Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures,* London: Routledge, 1989.

[35] See Edward Said, „Travelling theory", in *The World, the Text, and the Critic,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983, pp. 226-47; Edward Said, "Movements and migrations", in *Culture and Imperialism*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993, pp. 326-36; James Clifford, "Traveling cultures", in Larry Grossberg, Carry Nelson, and Paula Treicher, eds., *Cultural Studies*, New York: Routledge, 1992, pp. 96-116; Janet Wolff, "On the road again: metaphors of travel in cultural criticism", *Cultural Studies*, vol. 7, no 2 (1993), pp. 224-39, all quoted in Yosefa Loshitzky, op. cit. Also of use are Mary H. Helms, *Ulysses' Sail: An Ethnographic Odyssey of Power, Knowledge, and Geographical Distance,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988; Chris Rojek, *Decentring Leisure: Rethinking Leisure Theory (Theory, Culture and Society)*, London: Sage Publications, 1995; James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation,* Cambridge,

As a result of migration, newcomers "from somewhere else" face the problem of adjustment in a new environment. As the functioning of television is contained in generating "imagined communities,"[36] then indeed, in keeping with Clifford's conception, it may be a way of free traveling.

Loshitzky, however, aptly notices that "the notion of travel... seems to disguise the power relations involved in it, rather than to clarify culture as a site of intersection and displacement."[37] Further on, she states, "Viewing television as travel deconstructs the two major assumptions inherent in the questions posed by globalization studies. First, it questions the positioning and agency of centre and margins and therefore makes obsolete the question of cultural hegemony. Second, it challenges the essentialist notion regarding 'cultural purity' and the 'fragility' of indigenous cultures by viewing cultural encounters not according to the paradigm of a weaker static culture invaded by foreign forces, but as shifting and everchanging relationships between cultures."[38]

Thus, the concept of television as travel provides a new perspective on globalization studies. It leads it into a space free from wars, aggression and exploitation since no forces interested in appropriating new territories operate in it. Approached from this point of view, television, or more precisely, global television, appears to be the generator of traveling culture. The concept is seemingly power-free as it removes the relationship between the stronger and the weaker from sight. Thus, it appears to be different and even seems horizontal because traveling in most cases entails a passage behind the line of horizon or even border crossing.

Well, it is too good to be true. I am afraid it is only an illusion that this is actually the case. In the cultural tradition of the West from the mid-19th century, i.e. from the beginnings of photography, throughout almost the entire 20th century, the production of images has triggered off

---

MA: Harvard University Press, 1997; Susan L. Roberson, ed., *Defining Travel. Divers Visions,* University Press of Mississippi, 2002

[36] See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso, 1983.

[37] Yosefa Loshitzky, op. cit., p. 329.

[38] Ibid., p. 330.

debates in which the examination of various types of images has been limited to defining the degree of their referentiality and illusoriness. This approach to analysis-making has gotten into a blind alley lately as the production process increasingly employs special effects which have succeeded in turning the image into a construct and synthesis. Feminist film theory, as well as cultural and semiotic studies, have contributed to the revision of traditional views on the overall nature of the image-operating media. They have made it possible to "denaturalize" them, which, consequently, exposed their semiotic and ideological "deference." Television in this context, watched only with one eye and seen only as a travelling culture (the other eye should be closed because it may accidentally recognize a colonial form in it[39]), can never be gender-, ethnicity-, or, consequently, culture-free.[40] Those are travels of a cannibal who with his gaze devours cultural worlds of those who sit in front of the television.[41]

It also seems it is not free from violence either, although violence was not supposed to enter this area. As may be suspected, the element of power was to be disregarded in the interpretation of the world proffered by travel theory. In other words, it hoped to devise a better world in which the slogan of the French Revolution: liberty, equality and fraternity, put into practice, would guarantee its order. It is not the first time that life did not go beyond hopes.

To date, travel theory, at least not to my knowledge, has not become social practice, that is, its procedures are not employed in studies on the mass media and globalization on a more widespread scale. It is, however, successfully used in cultural studies within which globalization discourse operates. I believe that psychoanalytical categories could be used to explain its application and usage. It is indeed puzzling that declarations that travel theory is power-free are actually not true. In fact, this approach operates horizontally only seemingly. It rather proves that a critic who adopts it works, as it were, in disguise: this "balaclava" is to serve as a mask, thus

[39] Loshitzky herself mentions such a possibility, see p. 324

[40] Although a number of publications on this issue exist, first of all I have in mind Jean-Louis Baudry, „Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematic Apparatus," in Philip Rosen, ed., *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology,* New York: Columbia University Press, 1986.

[41] The so-called „cannibal tours" were discussed by Dean MacCannell, *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers,* London: Routledge, 1992.

making playing a game possible. The game is played by researches in two areas. Firstly, loudly denouncing power as a method used to describe functioning of the media which have conquered the world, they apparently make it more "peaceful" or "friendly," i.e. more easily acceptable and justifiable to those conquered or invaded or dominated. Secondly, belonging to the First World, which basically rules over the global media, they omit the fact that the media use power, and thus deploy imperial sovereignty of their world's culture in the spirit of deconstruction. Furthermore, if they happen to be heirs or inheritors of the colonial tradition, by opting for a more friendly model of the world, they seem to support it in the name of deconstruction of history. They seem to want to *rewrite* the history in which the record of their predecessors if infamous.

Therefore, it seems that proponents of this concept, by practicing this type of research activities, want to liberate themselves from the role of the master now and/or in the past, the role sometimes passed on through tradition, as evidenced in history. This intentional exclusion of the power factor from the analysis of the way in which the media operate is also an attempt to reconstruct social memory, undertaken in conjunction with the psychoanalytical concept of repression and regression.[42] The purpose of such a defense mechanism is not only to free from the burden of "being stronger" but also to suppress less commendable elements from collective memory which contributes to national and/or cultural identity. Therefore, I consider this approach to be **soft vertical**, or a **less radical,** concept of studying globalization than the first one.

Having said that, I wonder which mechanism influenced the reasoning of the narrator of this essay. There always must be something behind the scenes in studies on globalization which has captured the world. The curiosity to define and explore what the element behind the scenes is triggers off thinking. And thinking always comes in handy.

[42] See C. Brenner, „The nature and development of the concept of repression in Freud's writings", *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* (Yale University Press) 1957 no 12, pp. 19-46; A. Frank & H. Muslin, "The development of Freud's concept of primal repression", *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 1967 no 22, pp. 55-76; Sigmund Freud, "Repression" (1915), *Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud,* J. Strachey, ed., Hogarth Press & the Institute of Psycho-Analysis: London, vol. 20, pp. 77-178; Sigmund Freud, "New introductory lectures on psychoanalysis", ibid., 1933, vol. 22, pp. 5-157.