

Globalization refers to increasing global connectivity, integration and interdependence in the economic, social, technological, cultural, political, and ecological spheres. Globalization is an umbrella term and is perhaps best understood as a unitary process inclusive of many sub-processes (such as enhanced economic interdependence, increased cultural influence, rapid advances of information technology, and novel governance and geopolitical challenges) that are increasingly binding people and the biosphere more tightly into one global system. There are several definitions and all usually mention the increasing connectivity of economies and ways of life across the world. The Encyclopedia Britannica says that globalization is the "process by which the experience of everyday life ... is becoming standardized around the world." While some scholars and observers of globalization stress convergence of patterns of production and consumption and a resulting homogenization of culture, others stress that globalization has the potential to take many diverse forms. <sup>[1]</sup>

### Trends

Globalization has various aspects which affect the world in several different ways such as:

- *Industrial* (alias *trans nationalization*) - emergence of worldwide production markets and broader access to a range of goods for consumers and companies
- *Financial* - emergence of worldwide financial markets and better access to external financing for corporate, national and subnational borrowers
- *Economic* - realization of a global common market, based on the freedom of exchange of goods and capital.
- *Political* - Political globalization is the creation of a world government which regulates the relationships among nations and guarantees the rights arising from social and economic globalization. <sup>[4]</sup>
- *Informational* - increase in information flows between geographically remote locations
- *Cultural* - growth of cross-cultural contacts; advent of new categories of consciousness and identities such as *Globalism* - which embodies cultural diffusion, the desire to consume and enjoy foreign products and ideas, adopt new technology and practices, and participate in a "world culture".
- *Ecological* - the advent of global environmental challenges that can not be solved without international cooperation, such as climate change, cross-boundary water and air pollution, over-fishing of the ocean, and the spread of invasive species.
- *Social* - the achievement of free circulation by people of all nations.
- Greater international cultural exchange
  - Spreading of multiculturalism, and better individual access to cultural diversity (e.g. through the export of Hollywood and Bollywood movies). However, the imported culture can easily supplant the local culture, causing reduction in diversity through hybridization or even assimilation. The most prominent form of this is Westernization, but Sinicization of cultures has taken place over most of Asia for many centuries.
  - Greater international travel and tourism
  - Greater immigration, including illegal immigration
  - Spread of local consumer products (e.g. food) to other countries (often adapted to their culture)
  - World-wide fads and pop culture such as Pokémon, Sudoku, Numa Numa, Origami, Idol series, YouTube, Facebook, and MySpace.
  - World-wide sporting events such as FIFA World Cup and the Olympic Games.
  - Formation or development of a set of universal values
- Technical/legal
  - Development of a global telecommunications infrastructure and greater transborder data flow, using such technologies as the Internet, communication satellites, submarine fiber optic cable, and wireless telephones
  - Increase in the number of standards applied globally, e.g. copyright laws, patents and world trade agreements.
  - The push by many advocates for an international criminal court and international justice movements.



Since World War II, barriers to international trade have been considerably lowered through international agreements - General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Particular initiatives carried out as a result of GATT and the World Trade Organisation (WTO), for which GATT is the foundation, have included:

- Promotion of free trade
  - Reduction or elimination of tariffs; construction of free trade zones with small or no tariffs
  - Reduced transportation costs, especially from development of containerization for ocean shipping
  - Reduction or elimination of capital controls
  - Reduction, elimination, or harmonization of subsidies for local businesses
- Intellectual property restrictions
  - Harmonization of intellectual property laws across the majority of nations, with more restrictions.
  - Supranational recognition of intellectual property restrictions (e.g. patents granted by China would be recognized in the United States)

Globalization can also be defined as the internationalization of everything related to different countries [Internationalization however, is a contrasted phenomenon to that of Globalization]

### Historical precedents

*Main article: History of globalization*

The term "globalization" was coined in the latter half of the twentieth century, and the term and its concepts did not permeate popular consciousness until the latter half of the 1980s. Various social scientists have tried to demonstrate continuity between contemporary trends of globalization and earlier periods. [5]

Globalization is a centuries long process, tracking the expansion of human population and the growth of civilization, that has accelerated dramatically in the past 50 years. Earlier forms of globalization existed during the Mongol Empire, when there was greater integration along the Silk Road. Global integration continued through the expansion of European trade, as in the 16th and 17th centuries, when the Portuguese and Spanish Empires reached to all corners of the world. The effects on European industries were notable, e.g. the Silver Mining in Schwaz, Austria was partly gold and sheep, as silver was available from the Spanish colonies for lower prices.

Globalization became a business phenomena in the 17th century when the first Multinational was founded in The Netherlands. During the Dutch Golden Age the Dutch East India Company was established as a private owned company. Because of the high risks involved with the international trade, ownership was divided with Shares. The Dutch East India Company was the first company in the world to issue shares, an important driver for globalization.

Liberalization in the 19th century is often called "The First Era of Globalization", a period characterized by rapid growth in international trade and investment, between the European imperial powers, their colonies, and, later, the United States. The "First Era of Globalization" began to break down at the beginning with the first World War, and later collapsed during the gold standard crisis in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Lenin's Theory of Imperialism (1905) provided a seminal critique of this period as the being characterised by the exploitation of the third world by those in the first. This theme forms the basis of many recent critiques of globalisation.

Globalization in the era since World War II has been driven by advances in technology which have reduced the costs of trade, and trade negotiation rounds, originally under the auspices of GATT, which led to a series of agreements to remove restrictions on free trade. The Uruguay round (1984 to 1995) led to a treaty to create the World Trade Organization (WTO), to mediate trade disputes and set up a uniform platform of trading. Other bi- and trilateral trade agreements, including sections of Europe's Maastricht Treaty and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) have also been signed in pursuit of the goal of reducing tariffs and barriers to trade grand.



The world increasingly is confronted by problems that can not be solved by individual nation-states acting alone. Examples include cross-boundary air and water pollution, over-fishing of the oceans and other degradations of the natural environment, regulation of outer-space, global warming, international terrorist networks, global trade and finance, and so on. Solutions to these problems necessitate new forms of cooperation and the creation of new global institutions. Since the end of WWII, following the advent of the

UN and the Bretton Woods institutions, there has been an explosion in the reach and power of Multinational corporations and the rapid growth of global civil society.<sup>[6]</sup>

The Global Scenario Group, an environmental research and forecasting organization, views globalization as part of the shift to a Planetary Phase of Civilization, characterized by global social organizations, economies, and communications. The GSG maintains that the future character of this global society is uncertain and contested.

### Measuring globalization

Looking specifically at economic globalization, it can be measured in different ways. These centre around the four main economic flows that characterize globalization:

- 1- • Goods and services, e.g. exports plus imports as a proportion of national income or per capita of population
- 2- • Labor/people, e.g. net migration rates; inward or outward migration flows, weighted by population
- 3- • Capital, e.g. inward or outward direct investment as a proportion of national income or per head of population
- 4- • Technology, e.g. international research & development flows; proportion of populations (and rates of change thereof) using particular inventions (especially 'factor-neutral' technological advances such as the telephone, motorcar, broadband)

To what extent a nation-state or culture is globalized in a particular year has until most recently been measured employing simple proxies like flows of trade, migration, or foreign direct investment, as described above. A multivariate approach to measuring globalization is the recent index calculated by the Swiss Think tank KOF. The index measures the three main dimensions of globalization: economic, social, and political. In addition to three indices measuring these dimensions, an overall index of globalization and sub-indices referring to actual economic flows, economic restrictions, data on personal contact, data on information flows, and data on cultural proximity is calculated. Data are available on a yearly basis for 122 countries. According to the index, the world's most globalized country is Belgium, followed by Austria, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. The least globalized countries according to the KOF-index are Haiti, Myanmar the Central African Republic and Burundi.<sup>[7]</sup>

A.T. Kearney and Foreign Policy Magazine jointly publish another Globalization Index. According to this index, Singapore, Ireland, Switzerland, the U.S., the Netherlands, Canada and Denmark are the most globalized, while Egypt, Indonesia, India and Iran are the least.

### Measuring Attitudes to Globalization

Measurement of attitudes toward globalization were sought after in a 2003 worldwide globalization study. The study focused on teenagers' perceptions towards globalization and globalism, because soon they will be the adults living out the results of today's policy. The study examined the thesis of: Teenagers are natural globalists & Teenagers are afraid of globalization. The sample for this study included two hundred teenagers between the ages of 14 and 18, from New York, Lebanon, Azerbaijan, and the Philippines. The locations were urban. There was a survey administered with input from Gene Ellis, a professor (Wirtschaftswissenschaft Seminar) at the Eberhard Karls University of Tuebingen, and

global consulting principal, economist, and former World Bank employee Andrew Mack. Topics of globalization and globalism were grouped into sub-categories. Globalization categories included immigration, trade, and diplomatic relations. Globalism included consumption, personal freedoms, technology, and culture. The results of the research suggested that both American teenagers and international teenagers are natural globalists and are largely in favor of globalization. Teenagers in New York had higher levels of support for globalization than globalism. International teens were more globalists. Importantly, all teens were very positive towards technology, cultural exchange, trade, consumption of international goods, and immigration. The study suggested that the future of international technology,



trade, and culture will depend on bringing the concepts of globalization and globalism together. More so, the Internet seems to be one of the most important tools in linking teenagers globally and this suggests that this sort of communication should be developed around the world at a faster rate. Finally, it was suggested that the future of culture and trade will depend on the rate of technological progress.

#### Pro-globalization (globalism)

Globalization advocates such as Jeffrey Sachs point to the above average drop in poverty rates in countries, such as China, where globalization has taken a strong foothold, compared to areas unaffected by globalization, such as Sub-Saharan Africa, where poverty rates have remained stagnant.

Supporters of free trade point out that economic theories of comparative advantage suggest that free trade leads to a more efficient allocation of resources, with all countries involved in the trade benefiting. In general, this leads to lower prices, more employment, higher output and a higher standard of living for those in developing countries. <sup>[8] [9]</sup>

One of the ironies of the recent success of India and China is the fear that...success in these two countries comes at the expense of the United States. These fears are fundamentally wrong and, even worse, dangerous. They are wrong because the world is not a zero-sum struggle... but rather is a positive-sum opportunity in which improving technologies and skills can raise living standards around the world.

—Jeffrey D. Sachs, The End of Poverty, 2005

Libertarians and other proponents of laissez-faire capitalism say that higher degrees of political and economic freedom in the form of democracy and capitalism in the developed world are ends in themselves and also produce higher levels of material wealth. They see globalization as the beneficial spread of liberty and capitalism. Liberals see it as a tool for relieving poverty and providing the poor with a foothold in the global economy. <sup>[10]</sup>

Supporters of democratic globalization are sometimes called pro-globalists. They believe that the first phase of globalization, which was market-oriented, should be followed by a phase of building global political institutions representing the will of world citizens. The difference from other globalists is that they do not define in advance any ideology to orient this will, but would leave it to the free choice of those citizens via a democratic process <sup>[citation needed]</sup>.

Supporters of globalization argue that the anti-globalization movement uses anecdotal evidence to support their protectionist view, whereas worldwide statistics strongly support globalization:

- The percentage of people in developing countries living below US \$1 (adjusted for inflation and purchasing power) per day has halved in only twenty years, <sup>[11]</sup> with the greatest improvements occurring in economies rapidly reducing barriers to trade and investment; yet, some critics argue that more detailed variables measuring poverty should be studied instead. <sup>[11]</sup>
- The percentage of people living on less than \$2 a day has decreased greatly in areas effected by globalization, whereas poverty rates in other areas have remained largely stagnant. In East-Asia, including China, the percentage has decreased by 50.1% compared to a 2.2% increase in Sub-Saharan Africa. <sup>[12]</sup>
- Life expectancy has almost tripled in the developing world since World War II and is starting to close the gap between itself and the developed world where the improvement has been smaller. Infant mortality has decreased in every developing region of the world. <sup>[12]</sup>
- Income inequality for the world as a whole is diminishing <sup>[13]</sup>
- Democracy has increased dramatically from there being almost no nations with universal suffrage in 1900 to 62.5% of all nations having it in 2000. <sup>[14]</sup>

- Feminism has made great advances in areas such as Bangladesh through economically liberating and empowering women with jobs. <sup>[10]</sup>
- The proportion of the world's population living in countries where per-capita food supplies are less than 2,200 calories (9,200 kilojoules) per day decreased from 56% in the mid-1960s to below 10% by the 1990s. <sup>[11]</sup>
- Between 1950 and 1999, global literacy increased from 52% to 81% of the world. Women made up much of the gap: female literacy as a percentage of male literacy has increased from 59% in 1970 to 80% in 2000. <sup>[12]</sup>
- The percentage of children in the labor force has fallen from 24% in 1960 to 10% in 2000. <sup>[13]</sup>
- There are similar increasing trends toward electric power, cars, radios, and telephones per capita, as well as a growing proportion of the population with access to clean water. <sup>[14]</sup>

Area	Demographic	1981	1984	1987	1990	1993	1996	1999	2002	Percentage Change 1981-2002
East Asia and Pacific	Less than \$1 a day	57.7%	38.9%	28.0%	29.6%	24.9%	16.6%	15.7%	11.1%	-80.76%
	Less than \$2 a day	84.8%	76.6%	67.7%	69.9%	64.8%	53.3%	50.3%	40.7%	-52.00%
Latin America	Less than \$1 a day	9.7%	11.8%	10.9%	11.3%	11.3%	10.7%	10.5%	8.9%	-8.25%
	Less than \$2 a day	29.6%	30.4%	27.8%	28.4%	29.5%	24.1%	25.1%	23.4%	-29.94%
Sub-Saharan Africa	Less than \$1 a day	41.6%	46.3%	46.8%	44.6%	44.0%	45.6%	45.7%	44.0%	+5.77%
	Less than \$2 a day	73.3%	76.1%	76.1%	75.0%	74.6%	75.1%	76.1%	74.9%	+2.18%

SOURCE: World Bank, Poverty Estimates, 2002 <sup>[15]</sup>

Some pro-capitalists <sup>[citation needed]</sup> are also critical of the World Bank and the IMF, arguing that they are corrupt bureaucracies controlled and financed by states, not corporations. Many loans have been given to dictators who never carried out promised reforms, instead leaving the common people to pay the debts later. They thus see too little capitalism, not too much. They <sup>[citation needed]</sup> also note that some of the resistance to globalization comes from special interest groups with conflicting interests, like Western world unions. José Bové, one of the leaders of the movement, also represents French farmers, who are protected from competition from the developing world by high tariffs and receive very large subsidies from the European Union. Others, such as Senator Douglas Roche, O.C., simply view globalization as inevitable and advocate creating institutions such as a directly-elected United Nations Parliamentary Assembly to exercise oversight over unelected international bodies. Supporters of globalization are highly critical of some current policies. In particular, the very high subsidies to and protective tariffs for agriculture in the developed world. For example, almost half of the budget of the European Union goes to agricultural subsidies, mainly to large farms and agricultural businesses, which form a powerful lobby. <sup>[16]</sup> Japan gave 47 billion dollars in 2005 in subsidies to its agricultural sector, <sup>[20]</sup> nearly four times the amount it gave in total foreign aid. <sup>[21]</sup> The US gives 3.9 billion dollars each year in subsidies to its cotton sector, including 25,000 growers, three times more in subsidies than the entire USAID budget for Africa's 500 million people. <sup>[22]</sup> This drains the taxed money and increases the prices for the consumers in developed world; decreases competition and efficiency; prevents exports by more competitive agricultural and other sectors in the developed world due to retaliatory trade barriers; and undermines the very type of industry in which the developing countries do have comparative advantages. <sup>[23]</sup>

Anti-globalization



## Main article: Anti-globalization

Critics of the economic aspects of globalization contend that it is not an inexorable process which flows naturally from the economic needs of everyone, as its proponents typically argue. <sup>[citation needed]</sup> The critics typically emphasize that globalization is a process that is mediated according to corporate interests, and typically raise the possibility of alternative global institutions and policies, which they believe address the moral claims of poor and working classes throughout the globe, as well as environmental concerns in a more equitable way. <sup>[24]</sup> The movement is very broad, including church groups, national liberation factions,

left-wing parties, environmentalists, peasant unionists, anti-racism groups, protectionists, anarchists, those in support of relocalization and others. Some are reformist, (arguing for a more humane form of capitalism) while others are more revolutionary (arguing for what they believe is a more humane system than capitalism) and others are reactionary, believing globalization destroys national industry and jobs.

In terms of the controversial global migration issue, disputes revolve around both its causes, whether and to what extent it is voluntary or involuntary, necessary or unnecessary; and its effects, whether beneficial, or socially and environmentally costly. Proponents tend to see migration simply as a process whereby white and blue collar workers may go from one country to another to provide their services, while critics tend to emphasize negative causes such as economic, political, and environmental insecurity, and cite as one notable effect, the link between migration and the enormous growth of urban slums in developing countries.

According to " The Challenge of Slums," a 2003 UN-Habitat report, "the cyclical nature of capitalism, increased demand for skilled versus unskilled labour, and the negative effects of globalization — in particular, global economic booms and busts that ratchet up inequality and distribute new wealth unevenly — contribute to the enormous growth of slums." <sup>[25]</sup> Various aspects of globalization are seen as harmful by public-interest activists as well as strong state nationalists. This movement has no unified name. "Anti-globalization" is the media's preferred term; it can lead to some confusion, as activists typically oppose certain aspects or forms of globalization, not globalization *per se*. Activists themselves, for example Noam Chomsky, have said that this name is meaningless as the aim of the movement is to globalize justice. <sup>[26]</sup>

Indeed, the global justice movement is a common name. Many activists also unite under the slogan "another world is possible", which has given rise to names such as altermondialisme in French. There are a wide variety of types of "anti-globalization". In general, critics claim that the results of globalization have not been what was predicted when the attempt to increase free trade began, and that many institutions involved in the system of globalization have not taken the interests of poorer nations, the working class, and the natural environment into account. Their solution is to raise the prices consumers must pay via protectionism. <sup>[27]</sup> Economic arguments by fair trade theorists claim that unrestricted free trade benefits those with more financial leverage (i.e. the rich) at the expense of the poor. <sup>[28]</sup>

Some opponents of globalization see the phenomenon as the promotion of corporatist interests. <sup>[29]</sup> They also claim that the increasing autonomy and strength of corporate entities shapes the political policy of countries. <sup>[citation needed]</sup> Some anti-globalization groups argue that globalization is necessarily imperialistic, is one of the driving reasons behind the Iraq war and is forcing savings to flow into the United States rather than developing nations; it can therefore be said that "globalization" is another term for a form of Americanization, as it is believed by some observers that the United States could be one of the few countries (if not the only one) to truly profit from globalization. <sup>[citation needed]</sup> Some argue that globalization imposes credit-based economics, resulting in unsustainable growth of debt and debt crises. <sup>[citation needed]</sup> The

financial crises in Southeast Asia that began in 1997 in the relatively small, debt-ridden economy of Thailand but quickly spread to the economies of South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Hong Kong, the Philippines and eventually were felt all around the world <sup>[29]</sup>, demonstrated the new risks and volatility in rapidly changing globalized markets <sup>[citation needed]</sup>. The IMF's subsequent 'bailout' money came with conditions of political change (i.e. government spending limits) attached and came to be viewed by critics as undermining national sovereignty in neo-colonialist fashion. <sup>[citation needed]</sup> Anti-Globalization activists pointed to the meltdowns as proof of the high human cost of the indiscriminate global economy. <sup>[citation needed]</sup> Many global institutions that have a strong international influence are not democratically ruled, nor are their leaders democratically elected. Therefore they are considered by some as supranational undemocratic powers. <sup>[30][31][32][33]</sup> The main opposition is to unfettered globalization (neoliberalism; laissez-faire capitalism), guided by governments and what are claimed to be quasi-governments (such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank) that are supposedly not held responsible to the populations that they govern and instead respond mostly to the interests of corporations. Many conferences between trade and finance ministers of the core globalizing nations have been met with large, and occasionally violent, protests from opponents of " corporate globalism." Some anti-globalization activists and



supporters object to the fact that the current "globalization" encompasses money and corporations, but not people and unions. This can be seen in the strict immigration controls in nearly all countries, and the lack of labour rights in many countries in the developing world. Another more conservative camp opposed to globalization is state-centric nationalists who fear globalization is displacing the role of nations in global politics and point to NGOs as encroaching upon the power of individual nations. Some advocates of this warrant for anti-globalization are Pat Buchanan and Jean-Marie Le Pen and Ned Pencil. Many have decried the lack of unity and direction in the movement, but some, such as Noam Chomsky, have claimed that this lack of centralization may in fact be a strength.

'Globalization' has become a buzzword. It has also become a key idea for business theory and practice, and entered academic debates. But how might we define globalization? We explore Jan Aart Scholte's discussion of five, key, broad definitions of globalization that are in common usage.

### **Globalization - some definitions**

Jan Aart Scholte (2000: 15-17) has argued that at least five broad definitions of 'globalization' can be found in the literature.

**Globalization as internationalization.** Here globalization is viewed 'as simply another adjective to describe cross-border relations between countries'. It describes the growth in international exchange and interdependence. With growing flows of trade and capital investment there is the possibility of moving beyond an inter-national economy, (where 'the principle entities are national economies') to a 'stronger' version - the globalized economy in which, 'distinct national economies are subsumed and rearticulated into the system by international processes and transactions' (Hirst and Peters 1996: 8 and 10).

**Globalization as liberalization.** In this broad set of definitions, 'globalization' refers to 'a process of removing government-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an "open", "borderless" world economy' (Scholte 2000: 16). Those who have argued with some success for the abolition of regulatory trade barriers and capital controls have sometimes clothed this in the mantle of 'globalization'.

**Globalization as universalization.** In this use, 'global' is used in the sense of being 'worldwide' and 'globalization' is 'the process of spreading various objects and experiences to people at all corners of the earth'. A classic example of this would be the spread of computing, television etc.

**Globalization as westernization or modernization** (especially in an 'Americanized' form). Here 'globalization' is understood as a dynamic, 'whereby the social structures of modernity (capitalism, rationalism, industrialism, bureaucratism, etc.) are spread the world over, normally destroying pre-existent cultures and local self-determination in the process.

**Globalization as deterritorialization** (or as the spread of supraterritoriality). Here 'globalization' entails a 'reconfiguration of geography, so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distances and territorial borders. Anthony Giddens' has thus defined globalization as 'the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa' (Giddens 1990: 64). David Held *et al* (1999: 16) define globalization as

a ' process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions - assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact - generating transcontinental or inter-regional flows and networks of activity'.

Of these five approaches/definitions it is only the last, according to Scholte, that offers the possibility of a clear and specific definition of globalization. The notion of supraterritoriality (or trans-world or trans-border relations), he argues, provides a way into appreciating what is global about globalization. His argument runs something like the following:

1. There is no need to replace the 'internationalization' by 'globalization' where it refers to a growth in interaction and interdependence between people in different countries. This process of internationalization has been going for centuries - and it adds nothing theoretically to describe it as globalization.
2. To describe the process of breaking down regulatory and other barriers to trade as globalization is similarly flawed. 'The liberal discourse of "free" trade is quite adequate to convey these ideas' (Scholte 2000: 45).
3. The notion of globalization as universalization also fails to provide new insight. The move towards universalization is a long-running one - and so little or nothing is added by substituting the notion of globalization.
4. The understanding of globalization as westernization has developed particularly in the context of neocolonialism and post-colonial imperialism. It is, again, difficult to see what advance the notion of globalization provides as against the discourse of colonialism, imperialism and 'modernization'. As Scholte (*ibid.* : 45) convincingly argues, 'we do not need a new vocabulary of globalization to remake old analysis'.
5. Important new insight can, however, be gained from approaching globalization as the growth of 'supraterritorial' or transworld relations between people. It allows for us to explore deep-seated changes in the way that we understand and experience social space.

The proliferation and spread of supraterritorial... connections brings an end to what could be called 'territorialism', that is a situation where social geography is entirely territorial. Although... territory still matters very much in our globalizing world, it no longer constitutes the whole of our geography. (Scholte 2000: 46)

The first four approaches are all compatible with territorialism, the fifth is not. Within a territorial orientation 'place' is identified primarily with regard to territorial location. However, we have witnessed a fundamental change. There has been a massive growth in social connections that are unhooked in significant ways from territory.

This argument, or rather the focus on supraterritoriality, is not without its critics. For example, Martin Shaw (2001) has argued that Scholte's focus falls into the trap of confusing a shift in the *content* of social relations for changes in their spatial *form*, 'a question of sociology for one of geography'. He suggests that Scholte's argument:

... misses the maximum sense of the global: the recognition of human commonality on a worldwide scale, in the double sense that the world framework is increasingly constitutive of society, and of emergent common values. It is not that supraterritorial spaces are growing more important, but that both territorial and supraterritorial spaces - more fundamentally national-international as well as supranational-transnational *relations* - are *both* globalized in this double sense.

In other words, the current scale, scope and speed of change in the spheres that Scholte labels as universalization and internationalization is such that it is possible to talk of our being in a qualitatively different situation. This shift, has a profound effect on the way we experience place (and vice versa).