

Globalization

1. Two contradictory processes: globalization and localization: differentiation and homogenization. Cosmopolitans and locals.
2. Causes and Characteristics:
 - growing global perspectives, interdependence, and internationalization.
 - 'culture' is giving way to concern for identity.
 - deterritorialization: break down of bounded cultures
 - time-space compression: surge in speed and volume of global transmission of information and images which create a "nightmare for the contemporary cross-cultural studies. Kearney 1995, 557.
 - postmodernism reflects the global culture emerging.
3. Appadurai's 5 dimensions of global culture flow which move in non-isomorphic paths.
 - ethnoscaples: growing domination of English as the world language even in Japan, India and Africa if a person wants to be a part of the global dialogue.
 - technoscaples: telephones, radios, TV, email etc.

Appadurai

Kearney, M. 1995. The local and the global. the anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. Annual Review of Anthropology. 24:547-565.

Marshall, Gordon, ed. 1994. Globalization, globalization theory. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology. NY: Oxford Uni v. Press.

- finanscaples: globalization of captial flow with 24 hour stockmarket trading.
- mediascaples
- ideascaples

Gobal Worldview

1. Meta =

Wilson, Blackmur, Kazin and Trilling (see Gunn p. 25) modern humansim.

"That humanism is based on the notion that the sum of our potentialities as human beings can never be defined solely in relation to our actual circumstances - biological, psychological, economic, social, or historical - but in relation to our effort to encompass them. In saying "No" to all that limits or restricts, they have implicitly maintained, we say "Yes" to spiritual freedom that permits us to imagine otherwise. Hence the centrality in their humanism of the experience of art itself, whose moral function is for them identical with its imaginative function: to express the measure of our independence from those very systems of meaning we have created in culture - indeed, as culture - to define and enact ourselves.

Assuming, then, that human beings can, through imagination, transcend themselves, these critics have generally assumed that we live both within culture and, in Lionel Trilling's felicitous phrase, "beyond culture." Not that they have supposed that human beings actually exist outside of culture; only that they believe we human beings can, in a manner of speaking, achieve a standpoint independent of, or at least dissociated from, its official versions. Put more directly, they have maintained that some irreducible element within the self, however base or sublime, exists beyond the reach of cultural control." Gunn 1987, 25-26.'

Science and Morality

1.

The task of providing an ethical structure or value system for society has never been assigned to scientists and is quite outside any competence which their scientific training gives them. This is as true of social scientists as of natural scientists. Either a natural scientist or a social scientist may contribute greatly to this problem if he happens to be a great man as some scientists have been, as was William James, but the establishment of an amoral order is not part of the task of a scientist qua scientist. Strictly defined, it is not the function of the social sciences to determine public purposes or humanistic objectives, yet the work of social scientists can make great contributions to the commonweal. On the other hand there is always the possible danger that social science, by perfecting manipulative skills, can be turned to anti-social purposes in the hands of unscrupulous leaders. Obviously this is equally true of the natural sciences. One may hope that as methods of understanding and controlling human behavior are improved, these methods will be put to the best social use. Such a causal nexus, however, cannot be taken for granted. For example, the Germans during the war displayed a high degree of sophistication in the training and handling of troops from a psychological standpoint. As we know, they developed propaganda of extraordinary efficiency. Their knowledge of human behavior was, from our standpoint, turned to anti-social purposes. The improvement of methodology in the social sciences does not in itself mean an advance in social welfare. 1997. p. 4.

Herring, Pendleton. 1997. The social sciences in modern society. Items: Social Science Research Council. 51:1:2-6. March.