

REVIEW ESSAY

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization, in Theory and Practice?

Todd J. Barry

Abstract: Globalization is resulting in complex decisions by businesses as to where and what to produce, while free trade is resulting in a greater menu of choices for consumers, often with the blending of products and goods from various cultures, called 'glocalization.' This paper reviews the theories and practices behind these current happenings, which are each economic, political-economic, institutional, and sociological, first by looking at the supply side of why certain countries produce the goods that they do, and then at the demand side, why consumers have particular, cultural tastes and preferences for goods. It also proffers theories to explain firm location and that of intra-industry trade. This occurs when countries trade similar products rather than differentiating, as economic theory would suggest. After reviewing the literature, through numerous examples of political-economy and culture, it argues somewhat normatively that differences in culture and goods are a strength to the world community, and that globalization in the end will not likely result in a singular global culture with a uniformity of exactly identical economic goods anytime in the near future.

Keywords: globalization, global culture, melting pot, product homogenization, glocalization

The Supply of Culturally Diverse Goods

The past few centuries have seen enormous changes through globalization, whether one considers that it began with: the roads of Rome, the travels of Marco Polo, the voyages of Columbus and da Gama, the European repeal of the Corn Laws, the invention of the steam engine, the gold standard and Victorian England, the World War II conference at Bretton Woods, or the Internet (Frieden 2006). In many respects, cultures, and thus products, are changing dramatically; writes economist Tyler Cowen, "On one thing the whole world seems to agree: Globalization is homogenizing cultures" (Cowen 2002). Hopper quotes Ulf Hannerz as coining a new phrase, the "global ecumene," or the possible development of a world culture with similar products (Hopper 2007). To the question if we will have a market based on technology, or of materialism and the

continued expansion of consumer goods, the answer is easily “yes.” The question if this market will be completely global is more difficult. Recently, scholars have turned to this cultural market aspect of globalization. As one author writes, “a scientific approach ... is only beginning to develop” (Cesari 2002).

In my first year of college, I was amazed to find my roommates all using similar soaps and toothpaste, even by students from different parts of the U.S and the world. How could this be, from such faraway places? Only later was I introduced to the concept of globalization, and that economist Milton Friedman would twirl around a pencil, showing that few people even knew that the graphite comes from Africa, the rubber from the Amazon River, and the wood from North America. It would be amazing to go back in time to the Enlightenment in colonial America, when the likes of such individuals as Benjamin Franklin could probably tell a visitor where each of the components of new gadgets came from, all over “the Orient.” Today, consumers are unaware of supply or simply do not care. Over time, countries have based the goods they produce, and consume, on economic comparative advantage, resources, institutions, culture, and political-economic systems. Culture in this context is defined as music, clothing, values, preferences, food, entertainment, and just about everything else.

Early man, point out anthropologists, known as Cro Magnons, carried around trinkets and small pieces of art, that they traded with each other, and that these cultural goods maintained a unity, that may have enabled them to out-survive Neanderthal man. The first economist and philosopher to write about culture, however, was the German Max Weber in the late 19th Century, but since then the general opinion, as professed by Francis Fukuyama (1999), is that culture has little effect upon economics. However, both the effect and the recognition are changing with globalization. The literature indicates that because of globalization, time and space no longer constrain culture or cultural products. Erez and Gati (2004) write that there are two levels of culture, a global one, and an individual one, which are perpetually influencing each other in both directions, such that culture is dynamic and completely changing. Abu-Febiri (2006) notes that globalization is causing true multiculturalism, but destroying cultural diversity, and that a holistic curriculum in schools is required.

Khondker (2006) writes that the movement of different cultures closer together has often produced conflict, whether economic, social, or political. This is similar to what political-scientist Samuel P. Huntington (1993) called the “clash of civilizations,” which America and the West are now experiencing with the mid-East, and possibly with Asia in the future. But while the United States imports numerous products from Asia, Asia is not as quick at adopting American products, aside from financial goods. Another author, Buzan (2010), argues that culture can change from civilizations expanding or conquering another, politically, socially, or economically, and that culture is not a problem for stability, but that political structure is. This reminds one of World Wars I and II,

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization

which saw the spread of American jazz music overseas. Doku and Asante (2011) echo Erez and Gati in writing that people today have a bi-cultural identity, of their home and globally, and that there is a “contamination” and loss of cultural identity from borrowing from other places.

To study the effects of economic and cultural globalization and their affect upon products, one must turn to the theories of international trade which date back to David Ricardo in the mid-19th C. He showed that the law of comparative advantage holds that countries will specialize in those goods for which they have a cost advantage. Historically, this has depended in part on resources and geography. Economic theory was expanded by Heckscher and Ohlin, two early 20th Century Swedish economists who demonstrated that countries specialize in those goods for which they have the factors to produce, and in the early 1940s, by the American Paul Samuelson and the German economist Wolfgang Stolper who analyzed how this produces economic “winners” and “losers.”

International products also depend on economic institutions and systems that have taken years to develop, as stressed by institutional economics. Regional and national differences can thus be explained. Americans make better pharmaceuticals because their health care system charges so much that companies can afford the research costs. Canadians may make better snow shovels because consumers need them to survive cold, snowy winters, increasing demand. Japan makes better cameras because their culture may value filial piety and the need to record family activity. Germans may make better cars because their culture stresses engineering education. Italians may make better olive oil because most of the world’s olives grow in the Mediterranean, and the British, with their loquacious, chatty culture, make the best dry comedies. The question is if these cultural and institutional idiosyncrasies will diminish with the increased speed and communication of the globalized world.

As political-economists such as Rosser and Rosser (2004) point out, all nations’ economies can be classified differently into systems across many criteria, such as by: allocation, customs, forms of ownership, role of planning, types of incentives, income redistribution, social safety nets, and impact of ideology and politics. Whereas the “traditional economy” allocates wealth based on customs, such as India’s cast system, and results in many cultural products, perhaps seasonal, the “market economy” does so by supply and demand, as in the West. Finally, the “command economy” does so by choices made by powerful leaders, such as in ancient empires or modern dictatorships. Combinations exist, such as the planned-market economies, as in France and Japan. In Islamic nations, interest is forbidden, but allowed for some financial instruments, such as in Saudi Arabia, while China under Confucianism encourages a greater good for the society, and more saving (Rosser and Rosser 2004). Scandinavian countries have developed strong social safety nets, due to the historical importance of unions, and corporatism that links businesses with employees

Todd J. Barry

(Rosser and Rosser 2004). All of these factors affect the types of firms that develop and the products they offer.

According to Michael Storper (2009), the best resource, the combination of political and economic systems, unique to every country, is the “whip,” which determines the rules for competition which increase “incentives to firms in different places to become more efficient over time” (Storper 2009, 1). Other economic factors are also important, such as economies of scale, which give cost advantages to larger firms. The timing of entry is important such that early entrants are better able to satisfy demand, and sequencing, in which large firms or firms late to enter the market may be hurt by worse terms of trade already globally established. Storper writes that it “depends on the intricate socioeconomic processes at the local level and appropriate broader institutional enabling conditions...” (Storper 2009, 2). These conditions include institutions, of which Gregory and Stuart (2004) indicate five, such as: structure and organization of economic decision making, rules for the market, property rights, incentives for setting goals, and the role of government (Gregory and Stuart 2004). These institutions, whether in societies or large companies, take hold after long periods of time, and discourage risk-taking in new types of products, which are left to entrepreneurs.

Political-economies have affected business in Japan, for example, where several hundred years of peaceful rule under the Tokugawa shogunate led to improvements in business, infrastructure, and literacy (Rosser and Rosser 2004, 148). Asian companies have strong links to each other and to banks, collectively called keiretsus, which unfortunately are a hidden barrier to trade to outsiders (Rosser and Rosser 2004, 151). Japan also benefits from strong supply chains, and the kanban system, allowing for faster logistics and reduced unnecessary inventory. So, for years, Japan was able to make high quality products (Rosser and Rosser 2004, 156). In the case of Germany, one of today’s strongest economies, not only is the nation good at engineering roads and cars because of its education system, but also because of a corresponding apprenticeship program. Its business managers have more engineering degrees and experience than any other place in the world, dating since the founding of now Daimler-Chrysler in the 1880s (Rosser and Rosser 2004, 232, 235-236).

The products of the British people could, moreover, be due to the dreary weather. I visited London a few years back, and observed their way with words - the intricate nursery rhymes that parents read to children, mostly originating in England, with hidden meanings dating back to English history. Some point to their economic lack of entrepreneurship, excessive strikes, lack of technology usage, and not joining the euro. Economist Mancur Olson (1982) blames it on a lack of a historical, “general shakeup,” but this is questionable because of England’s Civil War and Glorious Revolution which established rights, and the wars following the colonial period (Rosser and Rosser 2004, 576-578).

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization

According to Irwin M. Stelzer (2007, 1) "Great Britain is in a great time zone to do business, and uses the language of business, English, with similar terminology to that of Wall Street. It also has an attractive, lenient regulatory system, low taxes, and 'an appealing quality of life,' such that some want it to replace New York as a financial center." Despite these attractions, stock market efficiency is slower, and it has a worse deposit insurance system, eccentric mayors, a poor exchange rate, expensive taxes, and more crime. The British culture though is seen as best at assimilating culture from Muslim immigrants (Pauly 2004).

It is interesting to consider the cultural differences between Europe, Asia, and Latin America, but the contributions different factors play are unclear, although one could try running a linear regression. The types of capitalism practiced in parts of the world also differ, which affect firm size and types of products. While the American system is essentially *laissez faire* and is referred to as the Anglo-Saxon model of capitalism, the European model involves more state regulation and legal codes, and the Asian model is based on high capital formation directed by the state (Gregory and Stuart 2004). Interestingly, communist writer German economist Karl Marx never called for the isolation of an economy from trade. Nevertheless, Joseph Stalin's original model called for autarky, which lasted longer than other features of the Soviet economy, because the Russians were afraid that trade would "undermine the effectiveness of central planning" (Rosser and Rosser 2004, 276-277).

While some look towards the small companies in other countries as a reason for differentiated products, it is commonly estimated that some 70% of all U.S. businesses are small, mom-and-pop shops. However, U.S. businesses are taxed too high, since small firms are often taxed at individual taxation rates, and for larger firms there is essentially a high, flat tax. Some economists have speculated that with the global slowdown there will be a race to reduce rates, or to relocate. Japan's tax rates were at 39.5%, but they recently reduced taxes by 5% (Barrasso 2012). The U.S. rate is also triple that of Ireland, and 10 points higher than Austria, Denmark, or China, forcing many U.S. subsidiaries overseas (Kocieniewski 2011). Since 2000, 30 developed countries have cut their business tax rates (Barrasso 2012, 1). In the U.S, the revered Burger King headquarters recently departed to Canada.

The decision making of multinational companies as to where to locate and supply products are complex, and involve ownership of assets, particularly: whether to share intellectual property assets, whether or not to license technology to foreign firms, and whether to use advantages of countries in raw materials or cheaper labor. Finally, there is question of where consumers are located so as to lessen transportation costs. Internationally, five of the twenty largest world multinational firms are located in France or Germany, four are in the United States, also the largest four, and three are in Great Britain. Multinationals operating in the home country, but seeking to do business in a

Todd J. Barry

host country, may find many unaccustomed regulations. National defense, telecommunications, and transportation tend to be the most regulated industries (Sawyer and Sprinkle 2009).

Raleigh Barlowe (1993) provides additional suggestions for national specialization, which some scholars call “location theory,” which dates back to the 19th Century. He attempts to explain why new industries develop in certain locations. Worker training, skills, education, and motivation vary considerably across countries, and one of the largest implications is that of transportation costs, with the producer trying to minimize them as much as possible. However, national pride may cause citizens of one country to support the production of traditional products, like the “Buy American” campaign. (Barlowe 1993) Places like Silicon Valley developed as a location for technically minded individuals to form networks with each other, writes Fukuyama (Fukuyama 1999). Location theory also examines why, after taking-off, additional expansion of the sector is limited to the original location and its surrounding areas. Sectors begin to form in places because the unit costs are lower, which Harrison et al. (1996) call static agglomeration. They define dynamic agglomeration as not costs but technological learning across places (Harrison et al. 1996).

Returning to Storper, he continues by arguing against Ricardian economics, writing instead that, “differentiated socioeconomic forms of organization and practice are key to creation” (Storper 2009, 4). Anthropologists have long debated if variations in economic organizations are simply an indication of different resource endowments and factor costs, which led to various power structures and incentives. Or, are people in different places not the same in terms of rationality, goal seeking, learning, and cognition? While mainstream economists favor the first, contemporary institutional economics go beyond. They hold that different initial conditions create scarcities and dilemmas amongst consumers and producers, resulting in unique institutional rules. A third view holds that institutions will obviously be dissimilar, but that practice and history will result in different types of capitalism, firms, and production systems (Storper 2009). Storper adds that what is missing from the arguments is what the layperson calls ‘culture,’ and that this is why the Japanese have a knack for quality control, the Italians such a passion for design. Storper’s argument is that “we still have [difficulty] deciphering such differences,” and that “this is the ‘dark matter’ of regional economies,” (Storper 2009), meaning it is currently unexplained.

Storper provides several examples to highlight his points. First, he discusses the differences between owning a restaurant in the U.S. versus France. The supply chains for ingredients are different, much harder to obtain fresh, low cost products in the U.S. than in France, which affects the supply curve. Second, there are lower barriers to entry into the restaurant market in the U.S., and third, U.S. restaurants are pushed by urban locations and profit-making to become larger. Fourth, there is a difference of culture in the kitchen, with the U.S. having

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization

a more pronounced hierarchy. Finally, there are differences in innovation, with most new ideas coming from the creativity of the less-stressed France, Italy, and Spain. These reasons together give France an epicurean competitive advantage (Storper 2009).

Storper proffers additional examples, such as the differences between Hollywood and Bollywood, between Milan and New York fashion, and Danish versus French or American food processing. The first two probably depend on taste and preferences, the last probably on historical food laws. In another example, he suggests that the apparel industry ranges from geographically divided chains of mass production to local, specialized firms, the former trying to copy the latter. In the car industry, products are more comparable than in fashion, but Detroit manufacturers, even with today's technology spill-over effects, have less innovation than Tokyo or Germany. Each use marketing information, and frame business problems, differently (Storper 2009). Finally, "winner-take-all" systems such as Silicon Valley or Hollywood create products distinct with "locally constructed techniques that are rooted in the local system as a whole" (Storper 2009, 10).

Intra-industry trade, the trade between countries of similar products, is increasingly dramatically worldwide, defying traditional theory that countries should specialize in producing certain goods. The best explanations offered are that certain countries have developed, over time, specific tastes and preferences which open the door for niche markets of slightly differentiated products. Other explanations are that of "brands," that is, the use of prestigious names on products by marketers to make it appear as if the products are more unique than they seem, first written about by economists Joan Robinson and John Kenneth Galbraith.

Marketing can be used to convince consumers to buy goods because the country of the business has a reputation for it; consider bottled water companies in France. Mass marketing has been used in the U.S. since the 1950s to "generate" demand; simply image the drawings of soup cans by artist Andy Warhol. A third explanation is that of "product life cycles," that new products are altered by countries as they move from being the hottest fads, to the standard products in the industry, to the "has-beens," while theories by Paul Krugman suggest that economies of scale may result in firms producing at lower cost and charging less. "Overlapping demand" theory suggests that countries will trade similar products if consumers are similar across countries (Sawyer and Sprinkle 2009). Mishra (2014) calls this "hyper commodification" of products. A final idea I offer is that of risk, that diversification reduces cyclicity or shocks disturbing supply. Some nations, because of their political-economic system, may choose to block trade, while others follow an open policy, all which have an effect upon businesses. In short, culture affects supply and trade, because it affects whether or not products supplied meet consumers' demand. Under Say's Law, supply comes first, but this is a "chicken-versus-the-egg" type question. In advanced

Todd J. Barry

economies, consumers have the option of rejecting products that do not conform to their tastes, and they can therefore save their money instead for future spending.

The Demand of Culturally Diverse Goods and the Future

It is hard to say what will happen with globalization and product homogenization in the future, but one could envision the world as an unending salad bar, made of numerous components. In economics, demand depends on many factors, such as income, relationships to other goods, shocks to the economy, and tastes and preferences, while quantity demanded depends mostly on price. Taste and preferences can never fully be explained, whether they depend on nature or nurture, except that economists assume consumers are rational. However, one would think it depends strongly on culture. We can look to the U.S. as an example, starting in the early 1800s, when some authors see the beginning of globalization due to the convergence of commodity good prices from improvements in rail and steam. America, because of immigration, was becoming what has been known as the “melting pot.” In recent years, many scholars have instead called America a “garden salad.” Individual, national, and ethnic differences still remain and are somewhat pronounced, in pockets of differences, which include products.

A study of U.S. history reminds one of the independent tenement sections that arose in the 19th C. in cities like New York, Chicago, and elsewhere. After arriving at Ellis Island, immigrants would organize such that some neighborhoods would be Italian, others Irish, some German, with the similar religious groups tending to interact, reside nearby, marry within themselves, and combine ideas to form new products. Consider the recent Disney movie, “The Hundred-Foot Journey” about the blending of cultural goods. The same activity is now taking place in numerous countries and across the world, resulting in changed tastes and preferences. On the other hand, fragments of culture continue to last for years - in fact, America has acquired a philosophical background from the Greeks, religions from the mid-East, science and math from China and 7th C. Islam, and languages from Europe. The Greeks prided themselves on the ability to “synthesize” or amalgamate culture (Cohen 2002).

Hari Prasad Bhattarai quotes sociologist Van den Berge as providing a definition of such garden salads as, “societies wherein several distinct social and/or cultural groups coexist ... and share a common economic system that makes them interdependent, yet maintain a greater or lesser degree of autonomy and a set of discrete institutional structures in other spheres of social life” (Bhattarai 2004). According to Bhattarai, this is one way out of four ways in which a society can deal with culture, and this can be applied to goods as well: amalgamation, in which various cultures are transfixed into an entirely new culture, assimilation, in which minority segments adopt the culture of the majority, segregation, the complete separation and discrimination of cultures,

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization

and pluralism, the garden salad, also referred to by some writers as a “rainbow” of different colors, or a “fruit salad.” Consumers can choose their culture and demand products just like at a salad bar. In classical economics, inputs are considered fixed, and it is only in more modern economics that assumptions are relaxed to allow for changes in tastes and preferences (Salvatore 1996).

Products are being affected by globalization in various ways. Just as globalization affects income inequalities both within and in-between countries (Williamson 2002), so too does globalization affect cultural change. Within countries, it is leading to a larger number of products available, and thus cultural diversity. But in-between nations, cultural diversity is lessening. What is the net effect? Cowen (2002) writes that niche markets demanding specific tastes and preferences, or vegetables in the salad, are emerging globally, evidenced by the newly found popular demand for “Indonesian gamelan music to African cinema” and “Haitian naïve painting to Tuvan throat singing” (Cowen 2002). Culture is simultaneously being either “dumbed down” into pop, Hollywood culture, or lifted up, by “yuppies” and youth who tend towards the international.

Sociologist Peter L. Berger (1997) identifies four main types of global market cultures: the Davos culture, one of business people which is named after a resort in Switzerland, followed by the Faculty Club International that consists mostly of academics. Third is the widely popular culture of McWorld, followed by the Evangelical Protestant Movement, which is growing in Latin America and the far East, and is the most “aggressive” in spreading its views (Bergen 1997). Still, writes Cowen (2002), music today is “healthier and more diverse” than it has ever been, as some countries like Egypt and Brazil are producing more than 70% of their own music. Films are being produced around the globe, and the Netherlands, with under 10 million people, is writing the world’s best fiction novels (Cowen 2002).

Psychology theory shows that consumer demand decisions are made not always rationally, but with imperfect information and with local points of reference, or “anchors,” a process called “situationalism” (Storper 2009, 7). Also of importance are comparison and emulation, and how “actors” process information. Storper calls all of this “context,” defined as “the division of labor and the networks in which the actor finds herself or himself, ... , hence her or his ‘input’ structure of cues and reference points” (Storper 2009, 8). According to Mishra (2014), consumption depends on “bandwagon” and “snob” effects, termed “conspicuous consumption” by 1920’s economist Thorstein Veblen (Mishra 2014).

The majority of the world’s products are western, since the West grew faster and earlier from trading and political relationships, technology, resources, and freer markets (Storper 2009). The changes to culture will have, as in all globalization, winners and losers. The largest winner, says economist Niall Ferguson, will be what he calls “chimerica,” a United States-Chinese linkage. This is not to forget India, with its English language services. Already we see this with

Todd J. Barry

the “Americanization” or “McDonaldization” of the world, with America marketing its style of products abroad, while accepting the entrance of novel foreign products. Consequently, to help preserve foreign cultures, the U.S. must be careful not to become a cultural imperialist, causing cultural loss. America and Europe have had a negative history of colonization, dating back to the Romans’ attempt to civilize the “barbarians,” the Middle-Age Crusades, and 19th C. Christian missionaries. Now, as the world’s leader, the U.S. must be respectful and not repeat past mistakes. The first question is whether we should as a global society try to stop cultural loss (Steger 2009, 48)?

My answer here, which might come as a surprise to some, is “yes” to a large extent. Product and cultural separateness, or diversity, creates many benefits, a veritable diversification of strengths, and a better society. Contrary to the common wisdom saying in China that “the nail that stands out gets hammered in,” one needs to look only at the experience of the Pilgrims to see that from America’s inception, the diversity of cultures has its benefits. In their second winter or the 17th Century, the Pilgrims used help from Native Americans in farming corn, and this exchange of culture allowed them to survive. But, if we choose to prevent the globalization of cultural goods, we should do so in a way that does not impede globalization’s strengths, and thus refine it, not end it. Borders have traditionally protected culture and goods, but since this is changing, we need to look at ways to increase pluralism, to understand cultural diversity. To stop the harms of cultural globalization some look to France. Write Gordon and Meunier (2001), it is a nation of people, since the 1930s Popular Front, which turned to its government frequently, earning it the sobriquet the “dirigiste state” (Gordon and Meunier 2001, 15-18).

France, a largely socialist country, spends over three billion government dollars per year trying to preserve its cultural products, from food, to film, to language, through government agencies that enlist over 12,000 employees (Cowen 2002), fearing globalization will erode sovereignty. In 1959, Charles de Gaulle created the Ministry of Culture, and cultural centers called the Maisons de la Culture. In 1967, Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber wrote, “The American Challenge,” a staple for the French people. Since the G-8 trade rounds of the early 1990s, France has sought protection for its cultural goods, and then domestically, in 1996, passed the “Toubon Law,” requiring that 40% of all radio broadcasts be in French. Food ranks next in importance, and the country has fought the European Union strongly to obtain barriers to genetically modified beef (Gordon and Meunier 2001). Still, the terrorist attacks of January 2015 on the *Charlie Hebdo* cartoon newspaper highlights the need to better integrate those of the Muslim faith into Europe, while in the United States, the Islamic population is much smaller.

Language, which is associated with stature, class, and influence, has been regulated by the French going back to 1635 and the establishment of the French Academy. The 1975 Bas-Lauriol law required all advertising to be in French, and

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization

in 1998, resulted in 8,000 linguistic inspections, 658 warnings, 255 cases, and 124 completed prosecutions (Gordon and Meunier 2001). In other nations, Canada's government requires its radio stations to dedicate a certain portion of the music to naturally born artists such as Celine Dion. Meanwhile, South Korea, Spain and Brazil have requirements regarding content for their film industries, which Spain and France also do so for their television industry. India at a certain time prohibited the sale of Coke (Cowen 2002). But, countries must still respect cultural diversity. In the United States, "hip" language introduced over the last several generations, along with technology which favors shorter messages, is diluting the quality of speech and writing. And, America's culture has become dangerous through production of violent video games, which cannot be regulated due to free speech and commerce laws, the Supreme Court ruled. This is one of the reasons why the U.S. has so much gun violence, and has led to a so-called detached young men crisis, veritably an epidemic, which the U.S. is now culturally exporting to the world. The United States culture places less control on violence and a greater emphasis on minimizing sexuality graphically, as compared with European states.

Other nations are using various means to pause economic globalization, the rapid spread of goods and ideas to all ends of the world. Writes van Elteren (2003), "Although political and cultural elites in some countries have imposed regulations and subsidies to protect local cultural content, the major thrust is clearly in the opposite direction," a direction of openness (van Elteren 2003, 175). Developing countries suffer from low wages and poor working conditions, which Western activists protest. So, they will have to turn towards citizens, or non-governmental organizations. Since the Seattle riots in 1999, dozens of world agencies have formed to deal with development issues, including cultural ones. Talks at the Kyoto Protocol in 1997, the 2002 Johannesburg World Summit, and the 2007 UN Bali Climate Summit, tried to address environmental issues, which affect quality and work conditions. In 2001, the World Social Forum was formed; as of 2008, there exist 150 civil society organizations associated with it, among them: trade unions, think tanks, agricultural groups, indigenous peoples' assemblies, financial watch-dog groups, religious groups, and human rights organizations (Steger 2009, 46, 125-30).

Increasing awareness of racism and ethnocentrism and a need for greater multicultural understanding will be required to address global culture. However, the garden salad world will be able to maintain its differences in products. Even Hopper denies that there will be a future global culture in the full sense of the word. Cowen quotes Englishman John Grey calling it a product of the utopian Enlightenment, a dream of "a single worldwide civilization in which the varied traditions and cultures of the past were superseded by a new, universal community founded in reason" (Cowen 2012). Today, we want a world that is not bland and uniform, but flourishing in its uniqueness. Mid-1800s economist

Todd J. Barry

John Stuart Mill briefly mused about the importance of diversity, writing about improving our “arts or practices” and “points of character” (Carden 2008).

Contrary to many opinions, this one does not see a complete homogenization of culture or products, and instead portend a garden salad of diverse, cultural goods. One can talk to visitors to South Korea or Vietnam, who encounter high-rise offices businesses and restaurants like McDonald’s, instead of rice paddies, to see that global culture changes. “Glocalization” may be products’ future. Volkman quotes Larsson (2001) as saying: “In the Philippines you can order a McSpaghetti, in Thailand a pork burger with chili and basil, in India a Maharaja MacMutton burger, in Japan a teriyaki burger, in Norway a salmon burger, in Uruguay an (sic) egg burger” (Volkman 2014, 6). However, culture by its definition is constantly changing, that is its nature; it has been throughout history. And, it does not appear that a complete world culture “for all,” is developing. Jocelyne Cesari (2002) supports this idea of a garden salad, writing what the world is witnessing is “neither a complete disaggregation of existing social systems nor a complete integration of social systems into a single form, homogeneous and coherent” (Cesari 2002).

In conclusion, why Germans make better beer, Mexicans better silver jewelry, Iraq better rugs, or China better textiles depends not only on comparative advantages, but on historical, economic, cultural, and political systems, consisting of many kinds of institutions, that affect businesses. This is not to stereotype, but to offer prime examples. It would be more surprising if countries around the world produced exactly the same products with the same quality, timelessly. In fact, it seems almost rational that they should be different, but, with globalization, products are becoming similar, but not to the extent that one can label them identical under a global culture. While the Chinese leader Mao Tse-Tung may have been correct that we should let a thousands flowers bloom, we need also to respect past cultures, such as in entertainment like film and literature, or lose a sense of cohesive national identity.

According to Mishra (2014), the future of globalization may have either positive or negative results, both laid out by Benjamin R. Barber, and warned about by Kirkpatrick Sale in 1995 and R. Cronk in 1996 as undermining traditional values and causing corporate-determined product selection. But, globalization will depend on governments, international organizations, and masses of citizens. Volkman writes, “‘market forces’ cannot determine or compete with culture, since culture entirely determines the relevant market values” (Volkman, 4).

The neo-liberalism of the 1990s and 2000s, which emphasized free trade at all costs, has been replaced by a Post-Washington Consensus that centers around social issues, such as environmental impact upon the quality of goods. Writes Cowen, “It’s impossible to deny that globalization will bring the demise of some precious and irreplaceable small cultures, and for that reason we should hope [it] does not enjoy total triumph” (Cowen 2002), which it will not. He refers

Will Economic Globalization Result in Cultural Product Homogenization

back to Austrian Joseph Schumpeter's "creative destruction" theory of new technology replacing old ones, but says we "hope for the creativity without the destruction" (Cowen 2002). Globalization is a product of people, and therefore it and its effects are not inevitable. Hopefully, nations will be able to work independently and together to preserve cultural nuances, which they will be able to, so that the globalized world will consist of a peace-abiding society, which uses cultural awareness to reduce clashes of ethnic intolerance, and with pockets of individualism, just like a garden salad.

References:

- Adu-Febiri, Francis. 2006. "The Destiny of Cultural Diversity in a Globalized World." *Review of Human Factor Studies*. (June). Vol. 12 Issue 1.
- Barlowe, Raleigh. 1993. "On a level playing field." *Land Economics*. (May).
- Barrasso, Senator John. 2012, "No Joke- Obama's corporate rates are highest in the world." (March 30). FoxNews.com.
- Berger, Peter L. 1997, "Four faces of global culture." *The National Interest*. Fall.
- Bhattarai, Hari Prasad. 2004. "Cultural diversity and pluralism in Nepal; emerging issues and the search for a new paradigm." *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*. (July).
- Boston, William. 2010. "German Economy Bounces Back." *Institutional Investor*. (October).
- Buzan, Barry. 2000. "Culture and international society." *International Affairs*, (January). Vol. 86 Issue 1.
- Carden, Art. 2008. "Does Globalization Destroy Culture?" *Daily Sun News*. June 8.
- Cesari, Jocelyne. 2002. "Global multiculturalism: the challenge of heterogeneity." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*. (Jan.-March).
- Cowen, Tyler. 2002, "The fact of culture. (Two Faces of Globalization)." (Autumn). *The Wilson Quarterly*.
- "Chimerica." [En.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chimerica](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chimerica). (Retrieved Summer 2011).
- Doku, Paul Narh and Kwaku Oppong Asante. 2011. "Identity: Globalization, culture and psychological function." *International Journal of Human Sciences*. (July-December). Vol. 8 Issue 2.
- Erez, Miriam and Efrat Gati. 2004, "A Dynamic, Multi-Level Model of Culture: From the Micro Level of the Individual to the Macro Level of a Global Culture." *Applied Psychology: An International Review*. (October). Vol. 53 Issue 4.
- Frieden, Jeffrey A. 2006. *Global Capitalism: Its Fall and Rise in the Twentieth Century*. Jeffrey Frieden; USA.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1999. *The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstruction of Social Order*. New York, NY; Simon and Schuster.
- Gordon, Philip H. and Sophie Meunier. 2001 *The French Challenge: Adapting to Globalization*. Brookings Institution Press; Washington, D.C..

Todd J. Barry

- Goode, Eric. 2007. "Globalization: The Destroyer of Cultures or the Catalyst of Cultural Change?" *Countries And Cultures*. (December 27).
- Gregory, Paul R. and Robert C. Stuart. 2004. *Comparing Economic Systems in the Twenty-First Century*. Mason, Ohio: South-Western, Cengage Learning.
- Harrison, Bennett, Maryellen R. Kelley and Jon Gant. 1996. "Innovative firm behavior and local milieu: exploring the intersection of agglomeration, firm effects, and technological change." *Economic Geography*. (July).
- Hopper, Paul. 2007. *Understanding Cultural Globalization*. Polity Press; Cambridge, UK.
- Huntington, Samuel P. Summer 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs*.
- Khondker, Habibul Hague. 2006. "Cultural Conflicts, Fundamentalisms, and Globalization." *Globalizations*. (December). Vol. 3 Issue 4.
- Kocieniewski, David. 2011. "US Business Has High Tax Rates but Pay Less." *Business Day Economy*. May 2.
- Mishra, Girish. "Globalization and Culture." (Retrieved November 8, 2014) from www.stateofnatureorg/?p=6292.
- Olson, Mancur. 1982. *The Rise and Decline of Nations- Economic Growth, Stagflation, and Social Rigidities*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pauly, Robert J., Jr. 2004. *Islam in Europe: Integration or Marginalization?* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Rosser, J. Barkeley, Jr., and Marina V. Rosser. 2004. *Comparative Economics in a Transforming World Economy-2nd edition*. Massachusetts: MIT.
- Salvatore, Dominick. 1996. *Schaum's Outlines: International Economics- 4th ed*. New York, NY; McGraw-Hill.
- Sawyer, W. Charles and Richard L. Sprinkle. 2009. *International Economics- 3rd Edition*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey; Pearson.
- Steger, Manfred B. 2009. *Globalisms: The Great Ideological Struggle of the Twenty-First Century*. Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.; New York.
- Stelzer, Irwin M. 2007. "They're Going Downtown; London won't replace New York as the world's financial center any time soon." *The Weekly Standard*. October 15.
- Storper, Michael. 2009. "Roepke Lecture in Economic Geography regional context and global trade." *Economic Geography*. (January).
- van Elteren, Mel. 2003. "U.S. Cultural Imperialism Today: Only a Chimera?" *SAIS Review*. (Summer- Fall) vol. XXIII no. 2.
- Volkman, Richard. "Dynamic Traditions: Why globalization does not mean homogenization." (Retrieved November 8, 2014). <http://www.ccsr.cse.dmu.ac.uk/conferences/ethicomp/ethicomp2005/abstracts/34.html>
- Williamson, Jeffrey G. 2002. "Winners and Losers Over Two Centuries of Globalization." National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA. (September).