

Oxana Karnaukhova  
Southern Federal University

### **Globalism, Localism and Postcolonial Discourse**

At first glance the problem of postcolonialism seems to be less central than in the 1960s. One of the reasons lies in its demonstrative theoretization. But since globalisation reveals imperialist potential, we should renew our understanding and knowledge of the topic. My proposition is that to speak about postcolonial theory as instrument and ideological tool is more fruitful than to emphasize its empty theoretization. Beginning as a discourse of resistance, postcolonial studies is now also seen as an attempt to express social and cultural transformations, as well as globalisation in terms of localisation. From Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978) to Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's *Empire* (2000), postcolonial studies anchored itself in the humanities, but greatly influenced the social sciences and beyond.

Since the 1990s, Russia has conceived of itself as one of the greatest postcolonial empires; the urgent attempts to change national self-consciousness and to form a new identity cause us to look into the essence of the processes. That is why it is extremely important to introduce approaches of coloniality and postcoloniality into the study of contemporary collisions of local and global, regional and world-wide. The term "postcolonial discourse" provokes us to ask the following questions: What is postcolonial? What is "post" in this notion? What are consequences of engagements between postcolonial theory and global transformations of identity, citizenship and ideology?

In thinking about the most important theoretical approaches to the problem of postcoloniality and its possible intersection with discussions of multiculturalism, we see a principal division between European and American research paradigms. This division is grounded in historical difference and is continually revealed in the processes and tensions of contemporary development. The European approach is based on the Enlightenment project as well as theorizing

about the imperial past and postimperial present. The formula of the Enlightenment proposed the linkage of nationality with government, that is the connection between nation and territory. That is why postcolonialism is presented as a form of (intendedly permanent) settlement which is in one sense the last way to describe the relation of the transnational corporations to their client terrains. A colony is not just the “other” of its metropolis but its peculiar other, part of it through antagonism. So the main interest lies in the field of binary oppositions – empire-colony, West-East (Oriental) as We-Other, and the colonial versus postcolonial environment of identity and citizenship transformations. Therefore, the topic of postcoloniality appears to be combined with multiculturalism as part of the European answer to global-local collisions (cf. Jurgen Habermas, Christian Joppke, David Morley, Steven Vertovec, and Stephen Castles).

From another side postcolonial studies appeared as a discourse of former colonial resistance to “Westernization/Europeanization” in the context of the modernization paradigm. So we can name E.Said, H. Bhabha, G.C. Spivak as founders - fathers of the new intellectual trend.

The American paradigm in studying the problem of multiculturalism was likewise prompted by historical conditions, namely, the translation and transcription of Enlightenment ideals onto the “pure sheet of paper” of the American political project. It means the transfer of scholarly attention to the essence of notions such as justice, rights, group representation, and solidarity. Indeed, multiculturalism is seen as a stage of state policy and as the logical result of democratic development.

A variety of methodological approaches can be found in this stream of investigation. The first impetus for further discussion was presented by Will Kymlicka, as well as John Berry, who celebrates cultural diversity as an indisputable value and a necessary element of domestic policy. Kymlicka suggested a model of such a policy and tried to apply it to different countries. Such an imperative is also characteristic of Charles Taylor and his book, *Multiculturalism and “The Politics of Recognition”* (1992), where he puts a multicultural imperative “to recognize the equal value of

different cultures” into the practical field of affirmative action<sup>1</sup>. Brian Barry<sup>2</sup> rightly observes that there is no unified multiculturalism in our globalizing world, but rather multiculturalisms. The implication is that we cannot translate multiculturalism as a universal model for all countries around the world.

Conceptions of cosmopolitanism and solidarity can be considered as attempts to move beyond multiculturalism. The typology of theoretical approaches suggested by Mark Brilliant appears promising. He divides all the paradigms into four main trends: “pure” multiculturalists (W. Kymlicka), civic nationalists (A. Schlesinger, D. Ravitch), cosmopolitans (D. Hollinger, A. Appiah, S. Scheffler), cultural conservatives (A. Bloom)<sup>3</sup>.

Nevertheless, the problem to be discussed and to be solved is as follows: how can multiculturalism be described? In a sense, multiculturalism can be explained in terms of ideology. In this case we can speak not only about an idealistic model but its application to policy in different historical, social and cultural situations (Eagleton, 2007).

My proposition lies in considering the dynamics of globalisation simultaneously with localisation, meant in terms of Gramsci’s notions of “resistance” and “dominance”. Moreover, localisation is an essential feature of global processes and modernisation, as was demonstrated in several seminal works (for example, De Boeck, Filip; Robertson, Roland; Ferguson, James)<sup>4</sup>. Putting aside the economic specificity of this process, we discover a special operational discourse of *cultural imperialism* (the term used by David Morley), in which colonial-postcolonial relations

---

<sup>1</sup> Charles Taylor. *Multiculturalism and “The Politics of Recognition”*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1992. pp. 64-65

<sup>2</sup> Brian Barry. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Polity Press, Cambridge, 2001

<sup>3</sup> Mark Brilliant. “Intellectual Affirmative Action”: How Multiculturalism became Mandatory and Mainstream in Higher Education // *The 1980s: Gilded Age or Golden Age*. Oxford University Press, 2008 (forthcoming)

<sup>4</sup> De Boeck, Filip, 1996, *Postcolonialism, Power and Identity: Local and Global Perspectives from Zaire* // Richard Werbner and Terence Ranger (eds.), *Postcolonial Identities in Africa*. London: Zed Books Ltd.; Robertson, Roland, 1990, *Mapping the Global Condition: Globalization as the Central Concept* // Mike Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity* (a Theory, Culture & Society Special Issue). London: Sage Publications; Ferguson, James, 2006, *Decomposing Modernity: History and Hierarchy after Development* // *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*/ Ed. Ania Loomba ets. Duke Un. Press

spread out. In this perspective, social change in non-Western cultures today is still seen as repetitions of nation-state formation in nineteenth century Europe, where Europe is the norm and the archetype (see, for example, Berman , Marshall, 1982)<sup>5</sup>. Although we can assume that not all contemporary ethnic groups are the products of the colonial period, the precipitation of ethnic identities becomes incomprehensible if it is divorced from colonial rule.

The hypothesis of the research is as follows: it will be fruitful to consider state, social and cultural transformations through a postcolonial perspective, which can be elaborated in three areas – identity, citizenship and ideology. As representatives of postcolonial studies show, narratives of cultural particularity not only fail in their own terms to make sense of social collectivity and territorial belonging, they also return to haunt in the form of resistance to a national identity.

Since the main characteristic of postcolonial development is ambivalence and binarity, the first aspect of local-global interrelations – identity – is evident in the hybridization of “self”. In the image of identity that this narrative (borderhood) invokes, the specificity of the “border” becomes the general image of difference. The “border” thus becomes a metaphor and, as a metaphor, it loses its particular national socio-political relevance and turns into a universal cultural symbol that hides the acts of nation that construct it (such as immigration policy, economic and cultural policies towards Other). Such originary hybridities are central to the West's identifications, and these hybridities work against some of the most entrenched and violent attempts to separate one racial, cultural, or national character from another. As Waldron explains the hybridization of identity, it was an effect of the articulation of an “unexpected transformation” in the very structure of selfhood, which can be identified as cosmopolitanism<sup>6</sup>.

D. A. Hollinger marks out three main approaches to treat cultural diversity as well as cultural identity transformations: universalism, cosmopolitanism, pluralism. At first glance, the

---

<sup>5</sup> Berman , Marshall, 1982. *All That is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. London: Sage Publications

<sup>6</sup> Waldron, Jeremy, 1993. *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers 1981–91*

notion of cosmopolitanism seems to be a synonym for a universalistic position. But as D. A. Hollinger points out in Cosmopolitanism and Solidarity: Studies in Ethnoracial, Religious, and Professional Affiliation in the United States (University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), universalism is trying to find a common ground and cosmopolitanism is engaging human diversity. What is most important for our investigation is that “cosmopolitanism urges each individual and collective unit to absorb as much varied experience as it can while retaining its capacity to achieve self-definition and to advance its own aims effectively”<sup>7</sup>. Pluralism accepts diversity and emphasizes the boundaries between groups in the sense of their needs, demands and cultural settings. It means that very often this approach is used as synonymous to the ideology of multiculturalism. In this case the pluralist position does not go beyond the frames of previous pan-European system of values. As pluralism is oriented to the existing cultures of groups, cosmopolitanism answers to the liberal ideals of the predominance of individualhood. That is why we can consider cosmopolitanism as an attempt to cross to the world-wide position.

Cosmopolitans prefer to deal with the notion of solidarity as the most representative for the construction of group units. As soon as cosmopolitanism is connected with the solidarity construction we can assume that in common sense cosmopolitanism itself is a result of citizenship erosion. A precise analysis shows that citizenship can be considered as social relationship through instruments and tools of developers and the to-be-developed, and it is still constituted by the developers’ knowledge and categories<sup>8</sup>. M. Hobart, as well as G. Spivak, is critical when it comes to trust in systematic, rational and scientific knowledge as universal and the only and sole version of knowledge. As this kind of one-sided knowledge increases so does the possibility of ignorance, if local agents are presented as mere objects to be changed. E. Balibar and J. Waldron acquaint us

---

<sup>7</sup> Hollinger, D. A. Preface in: *Cosmopolitanism and Solidarity. Studies in Ethnoracial, Religious, and Professional Affiliation in the United States*. The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

<sup>8</sup> Hobart, Mark, 1993, Introduction: *The Growth of Ignorance?* // Mark Hobart (ed.), *An Anthropological Critique of Development: The Growth of Ignorance*. London: Routledge

with a hybridized form of knowledge – transnational social relations – that serves as a reason for the transformation of citizenship. As J. Habermas argues, the idea of the nation has hardened people's sense of affinity by providing them with a symbolism that confirms their shared heritage: “Constructed through the medium of modern law the modern territorial state thus depends on the development of a national consciousness to provide it with the cultural substrate for a civil solidarity. With this solidarity, the bonds that had formed between members of a concrete community now change into a new, more abstract form”. Faced with the disempowering consequences of globalisation, Western democratic states develop regulatory procedures that allow them to preserve their integrity. Departing from notions of national cohesion, democratic cultures can restructure themselves around notions of participatory and inclusive citizenship: democracies guarantee a sort of emergency backup system for maintaining the integrity of a functionally differentiated society<sup>9</sup>.

At least, emphasis on cosmopolitanism and hybridization in the sphere of social and individual “hood” is supported by a common European ideology of multiculturalism, destroying time-space boundaries of locality. But the most important source of the intercultural communications in Europe, as well as multicultural tendencies, is European expansion of the world. That is the reason why we trace the development of European multiculturalism from colonial and postcolonial history.

The types of multicultural societies can be articulated as follows:

- Those countries which came into existence before the epoch of modernity (Russia, Habsburg monarchy);
- New colonial empires (France, Belgium);
- “White” colonies (Canada, USA);
- “Oriental” colonial and postcolonial societies (multicultural against their will).

---

<sup>9</sup> Habermas J. The postnational constellation : political essays / Jurgen Habermas ; translated, edited, and with an introduction by Max Pensky. 2001

Our preliminary analysis shows that what many researchers mean when they use the term “multiculturalism”, is actually, as Kymlicka writes, “polyethnicity”, making a distinction between national minorities and ethnic groups (Will Kymlicka, 2000, pp. 1-44). Such polyethnicity of the Old World is often presented in scholarly literature as a legacy of empire, as a contemporary construction of multicultural (ethno-cultural) policy, that is, a postcolonial development (Joppke C., 2004; Barry B., 2001; Bennett D., 1998).

The first step of the postnational multicultural global community toward multiculturalism, which includes Western Europe, requires a “politics of recognition” because the identity of each individual citizen is woven together with collective identities, and must be stabilized in a network of mutual recognition. In order for a multicultural society to function and survive, then, it has to develop an inclusive political system that is based upon mutuality and consensus. Multiculturalism is thus possible when the state recognizes and welcomes different ethnicities into its fold and permits other cultures to influence its development. But it also appears that, in this account, subaltern groups or resistance movements have almost no bearing on the emergence of multicultural states. Other ethnicities merely provoke a separation of national culture from the state: once this separation has been achieved, all that remains for minorities is to sit on the margins of political life. From this alternative perspective, what other communities bring to multiculturalism is the realization that cultural difference cannot be smoothly incorporated into the state's evolving constitution. The multiculturalism that emerges and becomes established can only be a profoundly uncertain one, and this anxiety demands a different understanding of both national identity and national difference.

Therefore, the key binary categories in postcolonial theorisation, like hegemony and resistance, or the state versus civil society, must be complemented with aspects of localised strategies of adaptation, accommodation and collaboration.

*References:*

- Brian Barry. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Polity Press, Cambridge, 2001
- David Bennet. *Multicultural States. Rethinking Difference and Identity*. London: Routledge, 1998
- John W. Berry. *Sociopsychological Costs and Benefits of Multiculturalism*. Economic Council of Canada, 1991
- Mark Brilliant. *“Intellectual Affirmative Action”: How Multiculturalism became Mandatory and Mainstream in Higher Education // The 1980s: Gilded Age or Golden Age*. Oxford University Press, 2008 (forthcoming)
- Can liberal pluralism be exported?* / Ed. W. Kymlicka, M. Opalski, Oxford U. Press, 2001
- Terry Eagleton. *Ideology. An Introduction*. Verso. 2007
- Antonio Gramsci. *Prison Notebooks*. Columbia University Press, 1996
- Jurgen Habermas. *The postnational constellation : political essays / Jurgen Habermas ; translated, edited, and with an introduction by Max Pensky*. 2001
- David Hollinger. *Postethnic America. Beyond Multiculturalism*. Basic Books, 2000
- David Hollinger. *Cosmopolitanism and Solidarity. Studies in Ethnoracial, Religious, and Professional Affiliation in the United States*. Un. of Wisconsin Press, 2006
- Christian Joppke. *Ethnic Diversity and the State // The British Journal of Sociology*. 2004, Volume 55, Issue 3
- Will Kymlicka. *Citizenship in the Culturally Diverse Societies: Issues, Contexts, Concepts/ Citizenship in Diverse Societies/ ed. by Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Postcolonial Studies and Beyond/ Ed. Ania Loomba ets. Duke Un. Press*. 2006



*Postcolonial Wales*/ed. by Jane Aaron and Chris Williams. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2005

Charles Taylor. *Multiculturalism and "The Politics of Recognition"*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.1992

Steven Vertovec. *Multi-multiculturalisms// Multicultural policies and the state: a comparison of two European societies*/ed. by Marco Martiniello. Utrecht University, the Netherlands, 1998