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ABSTRACT

In an increasingly globalised context, issues of identity and belonging have taken on particular resonance, yet understandings of how globalisation influences identity and belonging, especially with respect to the ‘local’ – women, ‘grass-roots’, marginalised peoples, and minorities – remain outside dominant globalisation discourses. This paper argues for the adoption of more robust frameworks to account for complex linkages and experiences (re)produced through globalisation, particularly in relation to interrogating identity and belonging. By examining a variety of phenomenon occurring at the ‘local’ level a complex picture of the influence of globalisation on identity and belonging emerges. This includes the means by which globalisation (re)constitutes various actors and enables analyses of the diverse articulations of gender, race, nationality, religion, sexuality and class within globalisation contexts that challenge dualistic categorisations of ‘global’-‘local’.

Within the paper ‘alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism and hybridisation literature are put forward as lenses through which to enter into a discussion on globalisation that investigates and exposes some of the specificities of the uneven effects of various globalisation processes that dualistic binaries tend to obscure. Four ‘categories’ of identity are developed in the paper to reveal the dynamic forces and contradictory trajectories of identity formation and belonging within contemporary globalisation.
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Introduction

An era of dramatic and often volatile change in the post-Cold War period has helped facilitate the emergence of new and diverse perspectives regarding the nature of globalisation processes and the ways in which these processes can best be understood. A multitude of perspectives on globalisation currently exist as theorists have sought to develop frameworks that comprehend, capture and account for the dynamics of ‘global’ events such as the rapid development of information technology and social media, global economic ‘booms’ and ‘busts’, mass migratory flows of people, the acceleration of environmental degradation, and the outbreak and spread of new pandemics. Attempting to come to a definitive characterisation of contemporary ‘global’ processes has proven difficult, however, as there exists no fixed points of contestation regarding globalisation’s origins and the state of the globalisation process: what is happening, how it should be managed and whether globalisation as a new phenomenon is even new at all. Many dominant globalisation frameworks do share certain commonalities in terms of their overarching premises, yet differ in the specificity of the theoretical arguments they espouse. Regardless of whether scholars view contemporary globalisation as an outcome of modernity, not yet fully realised, or simply as a continuation of modernisation (Nye Jr. and Keohane, 2004; Giddens, 2003), today, most globalisation theorists account for some degree of ‘global’ interconnectedness that spans across geographic and geopolitical distances.

In an increasingly globalised context, issues of identity and belonging have taken on particular resonance, yet understandings of how globalisation processes shape and influence conceptions of identity and belonging, especially with respect to the ‘local’ – women, the ‘grass-roots’, marginalised peoples, and minorities – remains outside of dominant globalisation discourses. Through an examination of a variety of phenomenon occurring at the ‘local’ level a more complex picture of the influence of globalisation processes on identity formation and belonging can be developed. This includes the means by which these forces (re)constitute the roles and responsibilities of various actors in ways that are often most harmful to women and minorities. This enables analysis of the diverse articulations of gender, race, nationality, religion, sexuality and class within specific globalisation contexts that challenge dualistic categorisations of ‘global’ and ‘local’.

In this paper I posit that contemporary globalisation is best viewed as neither an overwhelmingly ‘global’ nor a singularly linear and inevitable process. Instead I argue for the adoption of more robust frameworks in which to account for the complex linkages and experiences (re)produced through the forces of globalisation, particularly in relation to identity and notions of belonging. From this perspective it is asserted that globalisation is a process of complex interaction resulting in a multitude of inter- and intra-group exchanges and the hybridisation1 of the ‘global’ and ‘local’. This paper argues that the complex and often contradictory trajectories of 21st century globalisation are (re)constituting identities and modes of belonging in ways that create
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1 Hybridisation or hybridity as defined within the scope of this paper can be understood to refer to both the cultural effects of globalisation processes as well as the effects of the inter-mixing of cultural practices on identity.
new opportunities for belonging and empowerment through transnational\textsuperscript{2} intermixing, while simultaneously (re)producing processes of marginalisation and exclusion, often experienced overwhelmingly by women and marginalised peoples.

Drawing on ‘alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism, and hybridisation literature the paper enters into a discursive exploration of globalisation that permits us to begin to investigate and expose some of the specificities of the uneven effects of various globalisation processes that dualistic ‘global-local’ binaries tend to obscure. This shifts an analysis of identity and belonging away from what is occurring at the ‘global’ level to how certain identities and notions of belonging are being (re)constituted and (re)produced within ‘global-local’ interactions. It also enables an exploration of the factors influencing identity formation and belonging that lead to the (re)construction of boundaries that (re)position the ‘local’ in traditional and stereotypically ‘female’ roles. In the paper four ‘categories’ of identity are developed, (1) Hyper-Masculinisms and the (Re)Feminisation of the ‘Local;’ (2) Diasporas; (3) Nationalist Resurgences and Fundamentalisms and (4) Hybridities and Hybridisation\textsuperscript{3}, to reveal the dynamic forces and contradictory trajectories of identity formation and belonging within globalisation. These concepts reveal some powerful insights into how contemporary globalisation produces potentially empowering and transformative\textsuperscript{4} notions of identity and belonging as well as (re)crafts boundaries of difference, exclusion and marginality.

**Re-visiting ‘global’isation: exploring the intersections between ‘alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism and hybridity**

While many theorists agree that globalisation is a multidimensional process, most dominant (or mainstream) theories continue to be bounded by their common exclusion of issues and events occurring at the ‘local’ level, which in many instances results in specific neglect of gendered issues and the nexus between globalisation processes, modes of belonging and identity. For the most part, conventional accounts of globalisation are presented as ‘gender neutral’, even as some theorists allow for a consideration of the experience of certain women in their ‘global’

\textsuperscript{2} Transnationalism implies a condition in which despite geographic distance and territorial boundaries, certain relationships and linkages have been formed that span across the globe, thus connecting the ‘global’ and the ‘local’. These relationships and linkages can be political, economic, educational, cultural, ethnic, religious, and/or social and formal or informal in nature.

\textsuperscript{3} In supporting the notion that categorical boundaries inhibit the development of more comprehensive accounts of globalisation, it is important to recognise that the identities conceptualised in this paper are not intended to function as essentialist and static categories to which all individuals must fit. Instead they are meant to be used as both conceptual and discursive tools providing one structural framework in which to organise and make evident some of the complexities, paradoxes and contradictions surrounding identity formation and belonging as well as highlight new locations of centrality and marginality that are constituted by the processes of globalisation.

\textsuperscript{4} Empowerment and transformation in this context are not conceptualised as Westernised notions of giving, or teaching how to be empowered and transformed to those who are disempowered. Rather these concepts are defined more closely along the lines of Alternative Dispute Resolution literature that views them as ‘the restoration to individuals of a sense of their own value and strength and their own capacity to handle life’s problems’. They do not include ‘power balancing’ in order to ‘protect’ weaker parties, nor do they involve ‘controlling or influencing’ outcomes so as to produce ‘an empowered’ to ‘transformative’ outcome but rather focus on building capacity for people to determine their own empowerment (See: Bush and Folger, 1994).
analyses. Likewise, those theorists that do attempt to question what is exclusively ‘global’ about globalisation through the notion of ‘glocalisation,’ the interaction and mutual reinforcement of the ‘local’ and the ‘global,’ often overlook how ‘global’ processes tend to ‘overwhelm the local’ (Ritzer, 2004: xiii).

Such omissions fail to develop a comprehensive picture of the scope of globalisation through their emphasis on the disjuncture of the ‘global’ and ‘local’ as opposed to focusing on their interlinkages. Moreover, there is a tendency to think about ‘global’ economic, political and social systems as inevitably ‘globalising’ and evolving, a view that sees globalisation as a singular entity or process that must be ‘managed’ and ‘controlled’ (Held and McGrew, 2003: 1-4). The transnational writings of ‘alternative’ globalisation’ (i.e., Saskia Sassen 1998; Arjun Appadurai 1996), transnational feminist (i.e., Chandra Mohanty 2003; Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan 1994) and hybridity (i.e., Stuart Hall 1991; Gayatri Spivak 2007; and Jan Nederveen Pieterse 2001) scholars have called for more nuanced accounts of what it means for gender, culture, race, ethnicity and class to be located within spheres of globalisation. They argue that each of these factors impacts identity formation not merely in a geographic or biological sense, but within contested sites of activity that are (re)produced and defined through ‘global-local’, or transnational interactions and ‘public-private’ exchanges. These discourses both critique and expose the shortcomings of abstract, ‘gender-neutral’ and ‘macro’-level theories for their expulsion of many women’s and minority issues to the ‘periphery’ of ‘global’ analyses.

Each of these theories is fundamentally associated with the emergence of postcolonial discourse, building more equitable power relationships and social relations and critiques of cultural imperialism, connecting them to transnational theorizing on the role of human rights within globalisation. Johanna Brenner (2003:31), for example, posits that in part the attainment of ‘global’ justice against economic, social and political injustices and inequalities can be achieved through women’s participation in ‘global’ justice movements as members of grassroots organisations and leaders of feminist and rights networks. This also necessitates a focus on challenges facing the realisation of rights, the intersection of rights-based issues such as political citizenship and control of women over their bodies within settings of conflict, exclusion and migration, the appropriateness of current mechanisms to achieve rights and the interrelationship of the totality of these issues to other areas of globalisation.

The tripartite framework of ‘alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism and hybridity also calls for greater attention to be placed on the interrelationship between the ‘global-local’ through analysis of the ‘flexibilisation’ (Acker, 2004) or mobility of labour within globalisation. This mobility is evident in various producer-consumer supply chains that connect the work of peoples in diverse parts of the world. It demonstrates that gender and power relations, mediated by conflict, ethnicity and class are integrated in complex and multifaceted ways into chains or networks of ‘global’ production that (re)constitute the roles and responsibilities of ‘local’ actors within ‘global’ capitalist processes. Deborah Barndt’s (1999) exploration of the agro-export food chains produced by NAFTA (North American Free-Trade Agreement) provides an understanding of how supply chains link various locales of production, preparation and
consumption around the globe. Barndt (1999:63) writes that ‘McDonaldisation,’ initiated in the North and spreading to the South, and ‘maquilisation,’ initiated in the South and now appearing in the North, are interrelated processes in the new global economy’. This clearly connects the ‘global’ economic forces of consumption to ‘local’ economies of production that, while exploiting the ‘local’, also creates dependencies on the ‘local’ on the part of ‘global’ consumers through their reliance on the ‘local’ for provision of goods and services.

‘Alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism and hybridity discourses further provide critique of mainstream accounts of globalisation on the basis that they tend to obscure the historical and social contexts of colonialism and imperialism upon which current ‘global’ migratory flows are playing out that have privileged coloniser over colonised, ‘First World/North’ over ‘Third World/South’. For example, these theorists posit that inequalities follow racial, gender and class-based lines, enabling women (primarily from the ‘First World/North’) who have gained access to the formal economy to buy the domestic services of other women in order to meet both their ‘productive’ responsibilities in the formal sector and ‘reproductive’ responsibilities in the informal sector. Heidi Gottfried (2004:12) writes that ‘theorizing on the intersections of gender, class, race and nation is unavoidable when studying nannies, maids and home-health care workers who toil invisibly in the intimate sphere of someone else’s household’. Ultimately, the three bodies of literature utilised throughout this paper emphasise through their particularised discourses the gendered nature of ‘global’ relationships and the linkages between sites of ‘globality’ and sites of ‘locality.’ The remainder of this paper utilises these theories to interrogate four specific identity-related phenomenon that problematise ‘global’, ‘macro’-level understandings of globalisation processes and, instead, provide more robust accounts of identity and belonging that root ‘global’ complexities in specifically transnational and hybrid historical, social, economic, political and cultural experiences.

Trans/national identities and modes of belonging

Hyper-masculinisms and the (re)feminisation of the local

In the context of contemporary globalisation processes the emergence and subsequent dominance of particular forms of economic (hyper)capitalism (re)produces conceptions of identity and masculinity along dualistic ‘global-local’ binaries that both reinforces and challenges stereotypical representations of ‘feminine-masculine.’ The transnational restructuring of both the labour market and capitalist modes of production has, however, resulted in the transnationalisation of people and corporations, impacting the kinds of work that men and women do as well as who is recognised as a legitimate ‘global’ economic subject. Feminist scholars have long argued that the perpetuation of ‘global-local,’ ‘public-private’ and ‘feminine-masculine’ binaries creates boundaries that maintain hierarchical masculine power structures and enables economic exploitation (Acker, 2004). Similarly, alternative globalisation theorists, such as Saskia Sassen (1998), assert that the reconfiguration of economic spaces associated with globalisation, including the increasing prevalence of female-headed households and growing numbers of women in the labour force, has different impacts on women and men and
on ‘male’ and ‘female’ forms of power and empowerment. This reconfiguration of the ‘global-local’ and ‘male’ and ‘female’ conceptual boundaries within the ‘global’ economy is one aspect of the power dynamics that both characterises and makes possible the continued dominance of gendered ‘global’ capitalist practices and identities.

These gendered capitalist practices have been (re)configured and (re)produced through organisations, social interactions and stereotyped images and myths that are closely aligned with neo-liberal accounts of globalisation and belonging promoted predominantly by neo-liberal men from the ‘First World/North.’ The personified image of the ‘global business man’ is the principal actor charged with supporting and spreading ‘global’ capitalism’s mantra of freer markets, de-regulation, consumer consumption and ‘global’ competition across the globe. The characteristics embodied by this ‘global business man’ are made evident through the ethos of a ‘global’ business masculinity that is ‘marked by increasing egocentrism, very conditional loyalties (even to the corporation), and a declining sense of responsibility for others (except for the purposes of image making) … a hegemonic hyper-masculinity that is aggressive, ruthless, competitive, and adversarial’ (Acker, 2004: 29).

In part this (re)masculinisation of the ‘global’ is the product of the historical evolutionary processes of colonial conquest and imperialism, beginning with the expansion of European powers during colonialism. During colonialism and now in ‘global’ economic and political policy-making ‘the agents of globalisation, leaders and troops, have been men, but not just any men. They have been particular men whose locations within gendered social relations and practices can be captured by the concept of masculinity’ (Acker, 2004: 28). These hegemonic masculinities cast male colonisers and now ‘global’ actors as more manly, productive and successful, thus, emasculating the colonised, ‘local’ actor, at the same time as legitimating violence, aggressive behaviour, and individual gain in the interests of globalisation. Therefore, in the context of contemporary globalisation the (hyper)masculine practices of certain men, distinguished through the image of the ‘global business man,’ define and shape what is considered ‘masculine’ and ‘global’ in the transnational economy.

This image of the ‘global business man’ also plays a part in upholding stereotypically gendered images of women, while simultaneously reinforcing dualistic ‘global-local’ binaries that views the ‘global’ ‘First World/North’ as ‘developed’ and the ‘local’ ‘Third World/South’ as ‘underdeveloped.’ The association of the ‘global’ with the ‘First World/North’ effectively denies the existence of ‘Third World/South’ business environments in what are conventionally thought of as ‘local’ spaces, therefore, maintaining ‘global-developed’ and ‘local-underdeveloped’ binaries. Furthermore, the construction of the feminised image of the ‘local labourer’ seen as passive, cheap to employ, and capable of only rural or repetitive work has imbued the ‘local’ and ‘Third World/South’ with stereotypically ‘feminine’ qualities. This has had a particularly negative impact on the place of ‘Third World/South’ women, devaluing their contribution to the ‘global’ economy and has led to a ‘feminisation’ of labour in which predominantly women, but also minority ‘Third World/South’ men and children, are forced into low paying, insecure, and often dangerous forms of employment (Peterson, 2003: 61-63).
The image of the feminised ‘local labourer’ is complicated, however, by the phenomenon of the ‘localisation of the global’ (Sassen, 1998) whereby the ‘global’ and the ‘local’ are linked through the presence of migratory and immigrant labour in conventionally ‘global’ spaces. Regarding the emergence of such phenomenon in urban spaces, today many ‘global’ cities are absorbed by a demographic evolution, where many residents and workers are migrants and women, often originating from the ‘Third World/South’. On the one hand, this class of labour does alter gender hierarchies and roles through the prevalence of women migrant labourers as the sole income earners within many households. On the other, however, it also constitutes a largely invisible and powerless class of worker often subject to human rights and labour violations in order to earn wages. Rhacel Parrenas (2005:6) concludes that, despite the fact that ‘transnational families open the door for the reconstitution of gender by rupturing the structural constraints that encourage ‘normative gender behavior’ [...] the various ways that migrants and their kin adapt to their reconstituted households enforce gender boundaries’.

The (hyper)masculine subject of the ‘global business man’ is also at the epicenter of a ‘global mass culture’ (Hall, 1991), perpetuating the spread of a (hyper)consumerist society as an extension of the (re)masculinised ‘global village’ (McLuhan, 1964) in order to further ‘global’ capitalism. This ‘global mass culture’ has a number of characteristics. First, it is centered in the ‘First World/North’, maintaining class hierarchies that privilege the ‘First World/North’ over the ‘Third World/South’, ‘global’ actor over ‘local’. It also furthers positive imagery of a consumerist society in which the latest technologies, goods and services are promoted as necessary for success and fulfillment within the ‘global village’. Robert Holton (2000:142) posits that this vision of ‘consumer capitalism’ has been ‘built upon a standardised brand image, mass advertising …. The creation of the global consumer has been based not merely on the utilitarian convenience of global products but also on the sale of dreams of affluence, personal success, and erotic gratification evoked through advertising’. Thus, the (hyper)masculine ‘global’ subject is partly (re)produced through ‘global-local’ binaries that set the image of the ‘global business man’ against the feminised ‘local labourer.’ It is also framed, however, by the ‘global business man’s’ central role in perpetuating a particular form of ‘global mass culture’ as a form of belonging that (re)masculinises the ‘global’ economy. Ultimately then, within the ‘global’ capital economy gendered hierarchies and boundaries between the ‘global’ and ‘local’ are shifting and being (re)constituted as traditionally ‘local’ actors move into ‘global’, urban spaces and take up work in the ‘global’ economy. However, the ‘ideal’ identity promoted for success is aggressive, ruthless and individualistic, thereby, (re)feminizing and imbuing the ‘local’ with stereotypically feminine characteristics such as passivity, cooperation and compliance.

Diasporas

Diasporas challenge ‘global-local’ dualisms and notions of territorial boundedness by creating a sense of transnational belonging for dispersed ‘like’ others separated geographically from their perceived home(land)s due to ‘global’ migratory flows produced by factors such as conflict, political oppression, the economy and environmental degradation. James Clifford (1997:255) writes that ‘the significance of diaspora identity lies in its force as a symbolic declaration of liberation from the abject position of ‘ethnic minority’ in an ‘oppressive national hegemony’."
Diasporas, therefore, produce a sense of commonality and community, of being a ‘people’ with historical and cultural linkages outside of the locality of the host nation. Similarly, Appadurai (1996:4) posits that from the ‘rapid flow of mass-mediated images, scripts and sensations … moving images meet deterritorialised viewers. These create diaspora public spaces, phenomena that confound theories that depend on the continued salience of the nation-state as the key arbiter of important social changes’.

The development of ‘diaspora consciousness’ (Vertovec, 1999): the process of deliberate identifying in and around ‘difference’ and of creating spaces for the strategic formation of minority group identity is one means by which dispersed ‘like’ people(s) gain power and a sense of belonging. Regarding ‘diaspora consciousness’, Steven Vertovec (1999:450) writes that ‘it is a common consciousness or bundle of experiences which bind many people into the social forms or networks … the awareness of multi-locality stimulates the desire to connect oneself to others, both ‘here’ and ‘there’ who share the same ‘routes’ and ‘roots’’. The recent surge of diaspora communities appearing at an increasing rate both within post-colonial localities as well as within the borders of Western hegemonies has called attention to notion of a ‘Chinese-diaspora’ in Canada, a ‘Mexican-diaspora’ in the US and a ‘Indian-diaspora in Britain,’ bringing with it a degree of legitimisation, recognition and belonging.

Indeed, as Ien Ang (2003:141) notes, ‘claiming one’s difference and turning it into symbolic capital has become a powerful and attractive strategy among those who have been marginalised or excluded from the structures of white or Western hegemony’. Diaspora communities can be located in the context of globalisation as constituting new geographies of centrality and marginality that takes place within a complex process of renegotiating the contours of displaced peoples lives and selves through their displacement and encounters with their host ‘Others’. Diaspora communities, however, while encouraging some aspects of diaspora identity construction are not always inherently anti-essentialist and/or subversive toward the exclusivist boundaries of race, nation and ethnicity. Nor do they necessarily challenge stereotypical and exploitative practices against women as women in the diaspora are often the victims of abuse, sexual exploitation and violence.

It is here that diaspora identification as a conceptual tool of belonging and resistance against ‘global-local’ binaries and the territorial boundedness of the nation-state becomes limited, for diasporas can only truly be recognised in relation to a degree of acknowledgement of the legitimacy of borders. Ang (2003:142), for example, argues that ‘diaspora formation transgress the boundaries of the nation-state on behalf of a globally dispersed ‘people’ … but paradoxically this transgression can only be achieved by drawing a boundary around the diaspora’. Essentially this boundary is formed by the very claiming of ‘difference’ that effectively defines categories of belonging within the diaspora along ‘us-them,’ ‘self-other’ binaries, thus, making diaspora communities as exclusionary as they are inclusive. Therefore, in an attempt to deconstruct and transgress boundaries, diaspora identification may actually re-affirm the validity of binaries and the territorial boundedness of the nation state.
An exploration of the reliance of most diaspora discourses on the concept of ethnicity as a site of belonging helps to contextualise and make visible the ways in which diaspora identity formation (re)constructs and (re)constitutes boundaries within contemporary globalisation processes. Ethnicity can be defined as the ‘the idea of naturalised group identity’ (Appadurai, 1996: 13). This notion of ‘naturalised group identity’ is at the heart of diaspora identity formation as the diaspora relies on the mobilisation of specific differences in ethnicity and culture between groups to articulate the particular diaspora identity. Ultimately, even though diasporas do not rely on the territoriality of the nation-state, they are, nonetheless, bounded by the diaspora’s finite membership. To elaborate on this ‘particularist vision’ Ang (2003:145) writes that ‘unlike the nationalism of the nation-state, which premises itself on a national community which is territorially bound, diaspora nationalism produces an imagined community that is deterritorialised, but that is symbolically bounded’. In many ways then, the discourse around diaspora identification can authenticate borders, create belonging through symbolic boundedness and reinforce notions of the exclusivity of ethnic and cultural sameness.

Moreover, diaspora communities can also act as sites of reproduction for traditional cultural and nationalist expressions in foreign landscapes, often reifying particularly inflexible gender roles that place women in stereotypically feminine positions. In her work Uma Narayan (1997) explores the relationship between Indian food and Indian identity with broader implications for the significance of gender in preserving cultural and national identities in Indian diasporas in Britain. She emphasises the responsibility of Indian women ‘to safeguard the ‘cultural distinctiveness’ of their communities by refraining from dating, from marriages that are self-arranged, and, most stringently of all, from same-sex relationships’ (Narayan, 1997: 177).

The responsibility to preserve traditional cultural traits can be particularly difficult to navigate for women in diasporas who are ‘often confronted with a dual struggle, against the patriarchal and heterosexist constructions of ‘our culture and values’ by their communities, and against the often racist attitudes and agendas of the state’ (Narayan, 1997: 177). Likewise, culturally specific and gendered practices within foreign geographic localities can be taken up by migratory populations with mixed results, including the production of a form of cultural hybridity. This can also produce pressure on women in diaspora communities from the host population to adopt their cultural practices and norms as well as cause alienation if they fail to comply. To some extent this is indicative of the role played by unequal power relations both in and outside diasporas that sees belonging and identity used as tools to maintain the traditional gender and cultural roles of diaspora women. In one sense the diaspora communities caused by migratory flows of people and produced by the forces of globalisation do, ultimately, challenge ‘global-local’ binaries and notions of territorial homogeneity and boundedness. In its reliance on ‘difference’ as a conceptual tool of belonging and resistance, however, diaspora communities can authenticate the legitimacy of territorial borders and reinforce traditional gendered norms in an attempt to maintain this ‘difference.’
Nationalist resurgences and the rise of fundamentalisms

Another related identity category to emerge from the forces of globalisation has been the resurgence of nationalisms, characterised by new forms of territorial boundedness, and a rise of fundamentalisms. At the same time as globalisation exhibits an outward moving trajectory that brings dispersed units or groupings into greater likeness it also displays a dynamic of diffusion. R.W. Cox (1996:27) suggests that far from the disappearance of the nation-state, the outward expansion of the homogenizing vision of a 'global village' is producing, 'a resurgent affirmation of identities' seen through an inward turn toward specific nationalistic and cultural traditions. Therefore, as the forces of 'global' capital have flexed their 'muscle' reaching across oceans and nations 'more ethnic groups than ever seem to be reasserting their identities and yearning to create their own state - Palestinians and Kurds, Basques and Catalans, Scots and Welsh, Tibetans and Kashmiris, Corsicans and Quebecois' (Guillen, 2001: 240).

One of the principal aims of culturally based nationalism in the context of contemporary globalisation is to strengthen and regenerate a people's cultural identity and sense of belonging when it is thought to be threatened by asserting the uniqueness and/or greatness of one's culture. It can be argued that this form of nationalism 'is concerned with the distinctiveness of the cultural community as the essence of a nation' (Castells, 1997: 31). Similarly, Hall (1991:177) writes that the processes of globalisation do 'not mean that the nation-state is bowing off the stage of history', but rather that the state may enter into 'an even deeper trough of defensive exclusivity'. This 'defensive exclusivity' often arises out of a sense of social, political or economic alienation, marginalisation and/or exclusion that can express itself in the form of fundamentalisms, self-determination or secessionist movements, terrorism or violence. It is at this point that 'local ethnicities become as dangerous as national ones' often leading to a 'rediscovery of identity that constitutes a form of fundamentalism' (Hall, 1991: 184). The motivating rationale behind the formation of nationalist and fundamentalist movements can, therefore, also be linked to exclusionary and unequal power relations. This is because 'even in those cases where territory seems to be a fundamental issue, such as in Palestine, it could be argued that debates about land and territory are in fact functional spin-offs of arguments that are substantially about power, justice, and self-determination' (Appadurai, 1996: 21).

This rise in nationalist and fundamentalist forces has particularly damaging effects on those most marginalised within societies and most especially women as they become the sites where efforts to gain political power and exert social control play out. Leaders seek to control gender-based identities and roles, both masculine and feminine, as a means of preserving cultural, religious and moral traditions that they believe to be threatened by the forces of globalisation (Kerr, 2004: 20-21). Nationalist extremisms and fundamentalist movements often also represent a re-claiming of masculinisms and masculine identity by minority men who have been emasculated by 'global' economic and migratory forces that results in their 'detrerritorialisation' and subjugation to the identity category of feminised 'local labourer.' This can effectively be

---

5 The term fundamentalism is taken to refer to a strong adherence to a set of beliefs, often in the face of criticism or unpopularity, and often contains extreme or conservative political and religious connotations.
seen in the example of mostaz’af as a concept of revolutionary mobilisation in Iran. Minoo Moallem (2003:228) observes that, ‘in the case of men the word has the power of mobilizing men who have been emasculated in the process of colonisation and modernisation’ and provides them with spaces of belonging set against their ‘global’ exclusion. In the post-revolutionary period, however, women have been ‘suppressed and rendered abject in the name of revolution’, thereby excluding them from belonging to either the revolution or from globalisation processes (Moallem, 2003: 228).

Banu Subramaniam’s (2003) work on religious nationalism in India also helps to explicate how actions undertaken in the name of nationalism and belonging have justified the (re)positioning of women in traditional and inflexible gendered roles. Subramaniam (2003:163) writes that, ‘at first glance, religious nationalists seem to have a critique of the harsh impact of colonialism. … they present the glorious aura of a grand civilisation forgotten by its own people. … However, on closer examination, it appears that religious nationalists embrace some of the more regressive elements of both science and religion’. Extreme nationalisms and fundamentalisms, thus, falsely represent themselves as a return to the culture and tradition of a glorified and romanticised past that is often selectively re-invoked for political, cultural, social, ethnic, national and/or economic gain.

In India, for example, women play both a symbolic and ideological role in this (re)interpretation and (re)production of culture and tradition through the image of women as ‘sacred’ and the symbol of ‘motherland’. Through this ‘recasting, women are at once mythologised and empowered, yet subjugated and disciplined. … there is renewed Hindu masculinity, a rhetoric of symbolic female power that in reality perpetuates the redomestication of women’ (Subramaniam, 2003: 164). This calls attention to how historicised events, such as colonialism and imperialism, have intersected with culture and tradition to produce a symbolic ‘glorious’ past of belonging that is sought to be reproduced within a contemporary context of globalisation. Ultimately, even though nationalist and fundamentalist forces act as powerful counter-weights to ‘global’ capitalism’s homogenizing vision of the ‘global village,’ they often retreat into exclusivist and narrowly-bounded positions that can result in as destructive outcomes as that of the ‘global village’.

**Hybridity and hybridisation**

The concepts of hybridity and hybridisation provide important, though contested, sites for rethinking notions of identity and belonging, in the context of contemporary globalisation and transnational migration. The term hybridity can be traced to 19th-century discourses of ‘scientific racism’ and its use as a metaphor for the ‘negative consequences of racial encounters’ (Papastergiadis, 1997: 258). Reconfiguring and reclaiming these earlier concepts of hybridity and hybridisation, contemporary transnational scholars, recognise hybridity as a useful analytical tool for foregrounding complex inter-mixing and for thinking about the processes of colonial encounter and transnational exchange. An exploration of hybridisation is also able to draw out the processes by which colonial, nationalistic and ‘global’ categories of identity have...
been challenged and unsettled by marginalised subjects in a manner that attempts to resist
dualistic ‘global-local,’ ‘First World/North-Third World/South’ binaries.

Ang (2003:141) argues for the ‘importance of hybridity in a world in which we no longer have the
secure capacity to draw the line between us and them, the different and the same, here and there’. Similarly, the importance of hybridity and ‘third space’ cultural politics lies in the ability of these discourses to enable new formulations of identity that do not rely on ‘global-local’ and ‘us-them’ binaries. Jan Pieterse (2002:220) argues that hybridity ‘problematises boundaries’, ‘transcending binary categories’ and goes ‘beyond dualism, binary thinking’ to a place of ‘in-betweenness’ (238). The concept of ‘in-betweenness’ can also be brought up in relation to ‘our encounters at the border – where self and other, the local and the global […] meet,’ but is problematical through a recognition of the potential for ‘miscommunication and intercultural conflict’ that these encounters engender (Ang, 2003: 149).

In the context of globalisation, hybridity can act as a dynamic lens for reflecting on histories of migration and drawing attention to the linkages that connect people(s) to multiple places across territorial boundaries that disrupts singular notions of belonging. This conceptualisation of identity provides people(s) with the possibility to construct new modes of belonging and reconfigure the self in new localities. The language of hybridity, therefore, ‘becomes a means for critique and resistance to the monological language of authority. The hybrid text always undoes the priorities and disrupts the singular order by which the dominant code categorises the other’ (Papastergiadis, 1997: 267). Hybridity, is thus a concept that problematises boundaries and disrupts homogenizing and essentialist notions of identity. It does not, however, erase borders and notions of boundedness completely, as paradoxically, and in a similar vein to the formation of identity in the diaspora, hybrid discourses can (re)produce boundaries around the identity of the hybrid subject as it seeks to frustrate and deconstruct them.

This raises important questions about the political implications of a variety of applications of hybridity and the ability of people(s) to form (new) identities through border-crossing and inter-mixing. Pieterse (2002:237) provocatively writes that ‘what we must come to terms with is the circumstance that nowadays we are all ‘Moroccan girls doing Thai boxing in Amsterdam,’ that is we are all mixing cultural elements and traces across places and identities’. It is important, however, to think about some of the implications of Pieterse’s (2002:237) suggestion that ‘this has become the ordinary experience’, in light of what it fails to consider about the specific contexts in which this ‘mixing’ of ‘cultural elements’ takes place. By presenting hybridity as a singular category of analysis, one can obscure and overlook the historical and social contexts of colonialism and imperialism upon which current global migratory flows and exchanges are playing out. This can also neglect the question of whether all instances of hybridisation necessarily trouble boundaries and the underlying power relations that distinguish between specific acts of border-crossing. In fact some instances of hybridity can privilege the ‘global,’ ‘First World/North’ over the ‘local,’ ‘Third World/South’ and imbue ‘Third World/South’ women with ‘exotic’ and ‘alluring’ qualities.
Arlie Hochschild and Rhacel Parrenas reveal exploitative patterns of hybridity in their analyses of women’s migration and the disruptive affects of the increasing mobility of women on conventional gender roles and household norms. Hochschild (2003:17-20:) uses the term ‘care drain’ to refer to the accelerated movement of ‘Third World/South’ women care workers to the ‘First World/North’ that contributes to the growing ‘feminisation of migration’ and the establishment of ‘transcontinental’ networks. Regarding this ‘extraction’ of care she continues that ‘the notion of extracting resources from the Third World in order to enrich the First World is hardly new. … Today, as love and care become the ‘new gold,’ the female part of the story has grown in prominence’ (Hochschild, 2003: 26).

Parrenas (2003) also acknowledges the dual nature of hybrid identities in her study on children and transnational families in the Philippines. She writes that ‘the dominant gender ideology, after all, holds that a woman’s rightful place is in the home, and the households of migrant workers present a challenge to this view. In response, government officials and journalists denounce migrating mothers, claiming that they have caused the Filipino family to deteriorate, children to be abandoned, and a crisis of care to take root’ (Parrenas, 2003: 40). The impact of globalisation forces that results in the formation of hybrid identities, therefore, can have a dual negative affect on migrating women. On the one hand these women are vilified in their countries of origin, accused of abandoning their familial responsibilities, while on the other they are subject to exploitative low-paying jobs within the societies to which they migrate.

Paradoxically, however, the act of earning a livelihood can become a site of empowerment and for re-crafting meanings of the self, community and belonging, particularly in relation to challenging dominant gendered stereotypes. It is often at this place of the ‘local,’ at the ‘margins’ of globalisation, where hybridity can be used most effectively as a tool of resistance to challenge the dominant, hegemonic relations of power that (re)produce ‘global-local’ ‘masculine-feminine’, ‘public-private’ binaries in the context of globalisation. In certain contexts hybridisation ‘destabilises established cultural power relations between white and black, coloniser and colonised, centre and periphery, the ‘West’ and the ‘rest,’ not through a mere inversion of these hierarchical dualisms, but by throwing into question these very binaries through a process of boundary-blurring transculturation’ (Ang, 2003: 150). Transnational theorizing on hybridity can, thus, aid in (re)thinking through a variety of struggles organised across multiple axes of ‘difference’. This is because, despite its tensions, hybridity does open up possibilities for developing transformative notions of belonging and resisting ‘global-local’ binaries. In order for hybridity to be an effective and empowering means of fostering belonging, however, one must resist presenting hybridisation as a singular category of analysis that neglects the influence of power relations and the legacy of colonialism, imperialism and conflict on the construction and mobilisation of the hybrid identity, particularly in considering the complexities of cross-border flows of goods, people and ideas. Hybrid discourses must, therefore, continually be brought back to the notion that identities are perpetually in flux, evolving and being (re)constituted and (re)produced through the multiple interrelationships and linkages formed through various encounters with the forces of globalisation.
Conclusion

Sassen (1998) writes that ‘there are analytic moments when two systems of representation intersect. Such analytic moments are easily experienced as spaces of silence, of absence. One challenge is to see what happens in those spaces, what operations (analytic, of power, of meaning) take place there’. One of the principal objectives of this paper has been to ‘open up’ these spaces where systems and categorisations of representation, identity and belonging intersect in the context of contemporary globalisation, enabling a more robust analysis of the complexities surrounding identity and belonging within globalisation processes. Drawing on ‘alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism, and hybridity literature a multifaceted discursive framework has been delineated in which to conceptualise the complex nuances of transnational encounters, identity formations and notions of belonging within globalisation.

Taken together, these bodies of literature permit us to interrogate the intricate linkages and interdependencies (re)produced through particular accounts of globalisation. This discursive framework has further been intended to expose some of the specificities of the uneven and unequal effects of various ‘global’ processes that dualistic ‘global-local’ binaries tend to obscure. These discourses focus on gendered power relationships, highlighting the connections that exist between the diverse subject areas and relationships brought about through globalisation and rooting these in particular social, economic, political and cultural experiences and histories. These discourses critique the shortcomings of abstract, ‘gender-neutral’ globalisation theories for their expulsion of gendered and minority issues to the ‘periphery’ of ‘global’ analyses.

In this paper I have argued that 21st century globalisation is best viewed not as an inevitably globalizing phenomenon but rather as a complex process of transnationalisation and hybridisation. This analysis has focused on the impact and influence of factors that results in the (re)construction of boundaries that, while creating new opportunities for belonging, empowerment and well-being that challenge dualistic ‘global-local,’ ‘masculine-feminine’ binaries, simultaneously produce processes of exclusion, oppression and marginalisation. A transnational account of globalisation is, thus, one means of drawing out the dynamic and complex relationships between globalisation processes, identity formation and belonging and calling attention to the reciprocal inter-linkages between the ‘global’ and ‘local.’ Furthermore, while making evident some of the complexities and paradoxes surrounding identity as an analytical construct, this paper has highlighted several locations of centrality and marginality that are constituted by the processes of globalisation that reveal the dynamic forces and contradictory trajectories of identity formation and belonging within contemporary globalisation.

In order to avoid (re)producing the dualistic binaries that this paper endeavored to critique, globalisation was first revisited by calling attention to the intersections within ‘alternative’ globalisation, transnational feminism and hybridity literature that call for the linking of the ‘global’ and the ‘local’ through transnational- and hybrid-isation. This provided a framework in which to contextualise and call attention to the multiplicity of viewpoints that exist within any discourse that suggests the inherent inadequacy of adopting dualistic frameworks in analytical investigations as well as presented one means of recasting notions of identity and belonging
within complex and contradictory ‘global’ flows and processes. A close examination of four ‘categories’ of transnational identity, Hyper-Masculinisms and the (Re)Feminisation of the ‘Local;’ Diasporas; Nationalist Resurgences and Fundamentalisms and Hybridities and Hybridisation, was then undertaken that revealed the multifaceted and paradoxical trajectories of different identities and modes of belonging being (re)produced within globalisation processes. Inevitably, debate over the meaning, significance and very existence of globalisation will continue for the foreseeable future. However, the continuing rise in ‘alternative’ theories that seek to provide more robust analyses in which to account for the forces of globalisation provides hope that dualistic, narrow explanations of globalisation will continue to be challenged by multidimensional and interdisciplinary research that refuses to be constrained by existing categories and boundaries that emphasise separation and difference over (inter)linkages and intersections.
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