

The book cover features a central illustration of a person in silhouette, standing on a green, leafy hill and balancing a large, textured globe on their head. The globe is painted with green and blue, representing continents and oceans. The background is a warm, orange-yellow gradient with a large, stylized sun or moon at the top, outlined in a darker orange. The sun/moon has a decorative border of swirling patterns. The overall style is artistic and textured, resembling a watercolor or mixed-media print.

How Much
Globalization
Can We **Bear?**

RÜDIGER SAFRANSKI

How Much
Globalization
Can We Bear?

How Much Globalization Can We Bear?

Rüdiger Safranski

Translated by Patrick Camiller

polity

First published in German as *Wieviel Globalisierung verträgt der Mensch?* by Rüdiger Safranski © Carl Hanser Verlag München Wien 2003.

This translation and preface first published in 2005 © Polity Press

The right of Rüdiger Safranski to be identified as Author of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Polity Press
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN: 0-7456-3388-9
ISBN: 0-7456-3389-7 (pb)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in 10.5 on 12 pt Sabon
by Servis Filmsetting Ltd, Manchester
Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin,
Cornwall

For further information on Polity, visit our website: www.polity.co.uk

Contents

<i>Preface: Understanding Globalization – Between Sociology and Philosophy</i> Peter Wagner	vi
1 First Nature, Second Nature	1
2 Globalization	6
3 Globalism	9
4 Making Enemies	14
5 World Peace?	26
6 The Global and the Other Totality	35
7 The Individual and the Immune System	42
8 Jungle and Clearing	51
9 False Glows	57
10 Creating Space	63
<i>Notes</i>	70
<i>Index</i>	73

Preface: Understanding Globalization – Between Sociology and Philosophy

Globalization is certainly one of the most widely debated topics of our time. The issue arises wherever one looks, and one wonders whether anything new remains to be said. Rüdiger Safranski's account of the issue leads to the instant, if surprising, realization that the answer to this question is most definitely 'yes'.

'Individualization' has frequently been proposed in sociological debate, as the conceptual counterpart to 'globalization'. It has often seemed that, once these processes were fully developed, all that would be left would be individual human atoms dispersed on a globe without any political, economic or cultural structures. But regardless of whether that theory is based on any good and valid observation, nobody has drawn the conclusion that suddenly emerges as evident after reading Rüdiger Safranski's exploration of the issue: globalization, if it occurs, means a radical change in the human condition. It brings human beings into direct confrontation with the world in its totality – indeed, one might say that it returns to such a confrontation, after centuries of attempts to build institutions that mediate between human beings and the world. Almost unnoticed in the broader debate, the scenario of globalization entails a return – in new and radical guise – of the time-honoured question of the ways of being-in-the world of human beings.

Globalization means that we humans, as self-relating animals, must also learn to relate to the whole. But what is this

‘whole’, out of which we cannot step, but in relation to which we nevertheless need to gain some distance, in order to exercise our powers of reason, our claim to make things around us intelligible? This question is the point of departure for the short, but provocative intellectual journey on which Safranski takes his readers. The adventures on the journey are plenty, and rewarding, and the author is the only guide we need. It is useful, however, to pose two questions briefly at the outset: why is it that much of the better-known literature on globalization fails to address this possible novelty in the human condition? And: how does the account that follows relate to the broader debates?

Action, reflexivity and boundaries under conditions of globalization

When it emerged almost two decades ago, the topic of globalization was a disturbing one. It questioned established wisdom both in the intellectual sphere and in the realm of political action. Associated with the diagnosis of the decline of the nation-state and the dissolution of boundaries in all walks of social and political life, it even challenged the very idea of human agency, be it individual or collective. That is to say, action seemed to presuppose not only an actor who somehow stands out from the world upon which he or she acts, but also a rather solid structure for that world, so that any intervention in it would have somewhat predictable effects. A globalized world, however, appeared at best fragmented in a disorderly way and at worst in a permanent state of flux and out of reach. In turn, the inhabitants of that world, who were previously seen as easily identifiable members of a class, nation or gender, were now seen as ‘individuals’ in the radical sense that they could be certain neither of their ties to other human beings nor of their own self and identity.

Such a world is, however, uninhabitable. And that insight seems to be the main reason why this early, disturbing perspective on globalization has gradually given way to a more orderly intellectual landscape. Broadly and somewhat schematically, there are three major ways of diagnosing the global constellation that started to emerge after the end of the Cold

viii *Understanding Globalization*

War and, let us not forget, after colonialism (chapters 2 and 3 below address the global situation and the way in which it is usually interpreted). Most closely associated with the very meaning of the term 'globalization' are, first, the observers who hold that we are in the process of creating actual global structures for all major social practices – most importantly an effective world market for many products and a relatively homogeneous global (mass) culture. Significantly, this view is held in two versions, an affirmative and a critical one. The former is dominant among proponents of neoliberal deregulation projects; the latter points to an increasingly globalized resistance to such projects, most prominently voiced in the works of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri.

Second and similarly consistently, other diagnoses insist on the persistence of cultural particularity in the world, often even suggesting that globalization tendencies may provoke the hardening of such cultural forms. As used to be the case with theories of nationalism and the nation-state, such reasoning is most often accompanied by the idea that cultural communities should give themselves a political form. The rise of communitarianism in political theory pre-dated the globalization debates and indeed at its outset was related solely to national communities. From the early 1990s onwards, however, this theme was integrated into a new culturalist diagnosis of the time, finding its most widely debated contribution in Samuel Huntington's idea of a 'clash of civilizations'. While this concept has rightly been criticized as intellectually and politically conservative, more innovative uses of what may be broadly understood as cultural thinking have also emerged in the context of the globalization debate, the most interesting of these probably being Johann Arnason's renewal of civilizational analysis in his recent *Civilizations in Dispute*.

Despite the richness of reasoning in both these points of view, and particularly in the latter one, what is most characteristic of the current debate is that the basic theoretical positions adopted can be criticized relatively easily on conceptual grounds. It is, after all, not very difficult either to show that numerous social practices, even many economic ones, hardly globalize at all, or to raise doubts about the idea that social life naturally occurs within relatively closed and coherent cultural containers. As a consequence, a third position has