

THE ISSUE OF IDENTITY IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

Ovidiu Florin TODERICI

Vasile Goldiș Western University of Arad

Faculty of Humanistic, Political, and Administrative Sciences

Tel: 004-0745201435 E-mail: todflorin@yahoo.com

Abstract

The paper assumes the approach of concepts of identity and alteration from the globalization view and its effects on the population. Starting from the analysis of these concepts the question that we can resume about is: which is the bond between democracy and globalization? The answer consists in the presentation about the problem of the ethnicity's globalization which cannot show globalization as whole but only as an economical vision. The countries which needed the most of the benefices of globalization were the ones who have been exploited by them. And so the measure in which our identity wouldn't be seen only from one point of view in a multiple global world but only as a responsible part of a whole political and economic system will be the moment in which our individual responsibility will expend over the habit in which it acts over the others.

Keywords: identity, society, economical vision, globalization, integration

INTRODUCTION

Identity is not a new concept, but its relation to ethics and responsibility for the subsequent effects of its actions is. Since John Locke, in the eighteenth century, the identity of a person is strictly related to its normative implications. This type of identity (Locke 1706) can be called "relational" due to the need for a vector quantity over time through which the actions and effects can be found in time. From this perspective, the identity is not based on the idea of substance, essence, but on a self-reflective consciousness. In this aspect, the possession over the body and the actions they make are those that make the connection between identity and moral responsibility. The perception of your own corporality and its handling does not guarantee the identity. Only consciousness is able to guarantee that. My identity has a place and a space and is due this place and space. Influenced by these, in my turn, I influence them too. This identity is a form of cautious rationality as far as I am concerned about the things I did before the present moment and about those I will do. But Locke ignored other forms of identity, such as the biological one, considering them to be based on the idea of substance. One of the criticisms that has been made to Locke's position is that identity presupposes consciousness, which automatically implies a set of pre-existing psychological components of identity. Continuing along this line, the identity appears as a construction work not based on the tabula rasa and it is transitive in time, but not

necessarily identical to itself (a person can identify with his instance he was a child, but not is the same individual).

Currently the identity is defined outside the criteria of practical actions that concern any individual or another consisting of psychological, biological or narrative analysis. We could say that the first two are concerned with the side "real" identity, while the latter, with the imaginary and the symbolic. From this analysis, I propose to analyse Globalization as:

"The word globalization is on everyone's lips; a bauble quickly became a fad slogan, magical incantation, something able to open doors to all present and future mysteries. For some people, globalization is something we must achieve if we want to be happy; according to others, our unhappiness resides precisely in globalization." (Bauman 2005, 5.)

DISCUSSIONS

Despite the image that globalization has in the collective imagination, it is less a process of global homogenization in terms of economy and technology and more of a global process of production and distribution systems of the capitalist system. Globalization also means bringing to a common denominator in terms of legislation (especially labour law), in order to support this motion to extend the production systems towards the periphery of the capitalist economy, often unidentifiable with its own system of government of countries that invest in them. Democracy is not the common denominator of globalization, but a package of benefits of an ideological type that comes together with the foreign capital investment. For now, we can speak about a relatively complete globalization only in Western countries. In the rest of the world, globalization has only an economic sense and, sometimes, a legislative one. What is clear is that one of the first events that occurred with the advent of globalization is the division of the world into economic blocs: the European Union, the Southern Cone of Latin America, and Asian Bloc. And from here, a number of issues related to immigration and employment law, human rights and the cultural dimension of globalization. Globalization, like any other system, is a process of centralization and creation of periphery between the main centers of financial and technological power and the rest of the world, thus leading to new forms of segregation and inequality, as well as to new forms of exploitation in employment, both in the third world countries and the financial centers of the world itself, a phenomenon marked by rapid industrialization and focusing on services. This turn which defines the postindustrial era has had long lasting effects on the lives of communities involved in these processes directly or indirectly. The economic factors have imposed mass movements that have destabilized the traditional perception of the labor. The population movement has grown and together with it there appeared tensions of identity, both among migrant groups/individuals and in the communities that were subjected to the movements of the labor. New policies to manage these movements arose due to this, and also an impressive revival of the racist, nationalist and patriarchal movements. The other is again the stranger, the unknown.

Let us be clear: globalization is linked to identity by several factors related both to the cultural spectrum of itself and to the system of government that supports this spectrum. Democracy, as a political and cultural system, at least in the West, is one of the major factors for the analysis of identity, from a perspective that combines human rights and labour law with the foreign policy of countries where democracy is already linked to the tradition and cultural heritage. Only the West one can notice that someone's identity is politically and economically defined (by formulas like: neoliberal, left, ultraconservative, etc.) by the system of government. When we discuss about otherness and identity in the era of globalization we must take into account this feature, the identity is politically legitimized. Thus, individual identity can be separated from the social and political, but does not contain the whole concept of identity, being limited to a mere image of itself.

But what is the connection between democracy and globalization? To what extent the crisis of democracy can be motivated through the economic mechanisms of globalization and not by an asymmetry in the very mechanism of democratic legitimacy and popular sovereignty? For a democracy to bear its own operating mechanism, it needs a political community, the popular sovereignty that is self-governing. But they would require such a capability of self-government before the appearance of democratic institutions to support such mechanisms, which however is not the case. Initially we could say that such legitimacy can come from the concept of nation, a pre-political concept that has occupied this gap of identification. But the mechanisms of globalization tend to reopen this gap by a tendency toward cosmopolitanism and the distancing of the concept of nation-state. In this case, power asymmetries of globalization cannot find resolution through democracy, for it has no alternative in this situation. However, even globalization can, in a sense, to fill this gap by homogenizing transcultural concepts that will enable a new identity: multiculturalism, tolerance, cooperation, partnership, union. The connection between our nation and its political system, which seemed unnecessary before, now appears unfounded, because democracy has enlightened its nature through an approach that involves a defined territory and sovereign power - the people. Globalization attacks the foundation of territoriality of-territorializing and re-inventing new spaces that need to be filled sovereign. Democracy, that is popular-national sovereignty, seems to reach its formal limits, although the political momentum remains this time, however, exercised by institutions of globalization. These economic and geographical relocation movements subdue the status of community to tensions that did not exist before. The city itself supports these movements that are not always approved by its inhabitants. Thus we have to deal with a limitation of sovereignty of the city inhabitants in terms of economic decisions. A gap thus arises between what is economically necessary and what people think it is their need. Practice policy is more necessary than ever, being the only one able to reconcile the different interests between them and permanent variables. It would be wrong to imagine globalization as global economic stratification between the developed countries and the third world. The stratification occurs at the local level because cities are

directly influenced by the stratification, in which occurred the same movements of boundary between the residential areas and suburbs (favelas in Brazil, banlieue in France, ghettos in the US).

What I want to say is that the problem of otherness is too metaphysical for what is necessary at the moment. The identity is an issue which is required before any thought of otherness, even if the latter is the first, in the logical sense. Asserting their identity prevails before the recognition of the other. The appreciation of the person next to you have to be gained and, if possible to give you something in return. Symbolic nature of otherness is buried in the amount messages with symbolic semiotic sense that capture most of our attention; vibration of 40 Hz ¹ (Nørretranders, T., 2010, III) appears on television rather than in a meeting with an unknown person. A reflection of this is seen in terms of the idea of freedom, for the current middle class would rather give up some freedoms hardly acquired by those before them, to keep the material well.

You cannot draw a definitive conclusion. The paradox of human life is that every action has its negative side. In business, this is called "externalities". What globalization has questioned is how we relate to, by economic models and different forms of investment to the lives of others. After all, we influence each other from great distances and without knowing the one whose life will change from our actions, from buying a laptop assembled in the Philippines, in an area free of charge and in which the exploitation is everywhere, up to a million dollar investment in a disadvantaged area. Due to globalization, the link which binds us to most people in the world is now consumption. And this model expands in terms of human relationships. Do not be fatalistic. We live in the only time in history when at any time, we can, inquire about the fate of others and be able to change some of these. This is the condition under which today history is made:

"Globalization means that we all depend on each other. Distances do not matter much now. Whatever happens somewhere may have global consequences. With the resources, technical tools and knowledge that we have, our actions span great distances of space and time. However local our intentions can be, we err if we ignore global factors since they can decide the success or failure of our actions. What we do (or not do) can influence the living (or dead) of people in the places that we will not ever visit and some generations that we will not ever know (Bauman 2001).

Raising the issue of globalization ethics cannot target globalization as a whole, but only as an economic vision. The countries that were most in need of the benefits of globalization are run from it. You cannot turn back the process. Only two positions are possible: to be for globalization or be against it, because, currently, we cannot speak of a global culture and certainly not about a global legal and political system, so that our position can see it only as an ongoing process, with some effects. Meanwhile, dependency networks created are not designed according to their sustainability, but according to their immediate effect. This

¹ this attention is indicated by this vibration of neurons

"immediacy" thinking actions, made possible by the advent of electricity, the telegraph and the telephone, prevents us from losing too much time, and instrumentalize how to relate to things that henceforth must self-support the inutility. Let it be handy. No wonder that the other has lost metaphysics value while he won the potential action over his own world. Perhaps we should question this double movement itself which we have noticed before: the movement toward things is accompanied by a movement from people. It is not a necessary logical connection but it accompanies a certain vision of the world where consumption and possession of goods are the definition of happiness and the freedom is one of acquisition and investment. An unregulated market by the state is the ideal of the American neoliberalism and it is seen as the ultimate freedom, although often this is not democratic freedom (Klein, 2009).

What new systems will appear in the distant future of globalization? Can we talk about systems, as long as what we consider to be the norm, relatively closed society that had their own cultural and political models are no longer seen as viable and are replaced by multicultural models that challenge the national cultural models? What is the place of the individual in this model of representation of globalization? What kind of identity is at the emergence of new cultural, political and social systems, and has this ability to adapt to new situations of instability? Systems were seen before as a whole able to provide a certain cultural unity, which in its turn ensures a safe climate for the members of that system. The whole is replaced by an asymmetry of its parts, which are formed independently of the other parts, as there is no longer a direct correlation between culture, economy and politics. Each of them advances separately, thus incubating an imaginary fragmentation that will represent the individual and individual training. Contemporary technology supports this eclecticism that defines individualism, this creating its own grand récits in the absence of those institutionalized.

Do not fall into the trap of believing that social forces are the only ones that shape the way our world looks. As Anthony Giddens (Giddens 1984) states that a macro or micro level analysis is insufficient, as long as these two are separated from each other. The social structure is reproduced by repeating actions, social modelled by human agents. This is the process called "structuring" and envisages a combination of Marxist or Weberian prejudices the other is always defined by his actions and reporting to the general social climate. His identity cannot be discussed in a general sense, or just individually, without taking into account both factors and his participation in it, from the perspective of a global state. I say "global state" because globalization, though now it seems a process to us, is more than a state of affairs that cannot be reversed on ways it was achieved. It is the background, "background process", which supports the possibility of many other economic, cultural and social processes. Certainly, it may look different in time, but its existence based on economic operating systems will remain practically unchanged. For the same reason, we can speculate that the return to the old ways of doing things and thinking about world is no longer possible. It is no longer possible to return to practice any religion some as it was hundreds of years ago. It is no

longer possible to see the world as infinite and flat, it is no longer possible to believe in a sovereign as divinely sent, it is not possible to think economy through outdated concepts such as barter(although there is a modern version of its barter) or "local" economy. In other words globalization is one of those moments in history that cannot be go back. This is largely due to the concept of "structure" used previously. Globalism is always reiterated by every act of our consumption. For it there is no need to accept or consensus, but just the act of buying. The latter act, almost mechanical, has effects of the most extensive in time and space, and the lowest content that is aware of responsibility. We all know or have heard of people from the farthest corners of the world, exploited by factories and warehouses that assemble Nike, IBM, Adidas etc. Similarly, the operating policies of the company Nestlé water tables in arid areas of Africa. But we drink Nestea.

The Activism that comes to the surface in this work does nothing but illustrate the difficulty of discussion about existence and identity regarded as philosophical terms in the era of globalization. Certainly, we could appeal to Martin Buber and the relationship Myself-Yourself, to Lévinas and the responsibility for the other self, but analysing both of them, we always refer to a reinforced individuality in itself at the time when the life opposes to the other. Their Self, the subject, (although Lévinas revokes this concept) is confronted with the resemblance of the other, and at the same time, with the incomprehensible difference that separates them. In a way, we can say that this inexplicable of the other and, in fact, of every human being, leaves room for the inability of judging the other's actions and acting accordingly. Somewhere on the way, it is not only the language that limits you in understanding the other (tool and incantation), but also the metaphysical distance.

Karl Jaspers (Bauman 2001) speaks about two types of "guilt" that a person can feel: there is the "moral guilt", which is felt by an individual as a consequence of his/her actions and also a "metaphysical guilt", which does not relate to the consequences of our actions, but to those which require a common empathy process of each person, such as someone's death or someone's injury, things which cannot be controlled by us. Such a responsibility is required by Lévinas and, eventually, by our humanism itself. But is it still possible during globalization? I wonder if it is still possible and if it is still applicable, not because of the alteration of the concept, but because of our incapacity to react in due time. This delay is not a deliberate one, but it is sustained by our daily routine, our everyday life, that defines us. In this way, the very act of acquisition becomes a part of our daily identity along with the consequences of this act, in the same way, although we are not completely aware of them.

If technology has eliminated much of the temporal co-ordinates of the identity, globalization does the same thing when talking about space. Time and space are not compressed, but the types of actions are multiplied (regarding the others, set in the form of political activities, but also as a form of coexistence), of works and things we have to perform daily, as well as their causes (Toderici 2014). In Hanna Arendt's vision, "*vita activa*" takes over any other type of living. Work

creates vital needs and inserts them in the course of life, that is to say artificial forms of existence (things), what make us superficial and create a "World" for us. From this perspective we should understand the reference to the other, as a passage through a world of objects, created by us, for ourselves, but which we are stranded to. In order to live we need to adapt, and from this point of view, any form of adaptation is a coextensive part of our existence, and not only an effect caused by different relations of power to which we are put through. In this chaos of objects, the other one might not appear as a great event or phenomenon. Such a reaction to the other's existence resides on the Cartesian line of introspection:

" ... Although the truth cannot be known and something given and revealed, man can at least be familiar with what he himself does. This has indeed become the most common and the most widely accepted attitude of the modern age, and this belief, rather than doubt on which it is based, it is the one who pushed generations after generations for more than three hundred years at a more and more accelerated pace of discovery and development. ... What people now have in common is no longer the world, but the structure of their mind, which, technically speaking, they cannot have it in common, the capacity of being rationalist incidentally the same for everyone." (Arendt 2007)

In other words, the metaphysical value of the other consists in its power to forge its own truths (Toderici 2014). The only capacity that makes us different from other animals is the awareness and rationalisation of the consequences². This is also true for the relationship with each other. As long as the structure of our minds is only similar but not identical, a question always arises: what kind methods are used for the identification of each as *distinct individualities* by others? The answer seems obvious: the language and cultural systems. For this reason, if we refer to identity, factors such as ethnicity and nationality are evoked most often. Through the process of globalization, which is also a mechanism for clearing the visibility of such differences, a various mix gets to reveal the common character of rationality, of a mind similarly structured. World recognition as a human creation gives a positive aspect to it and also to the mind who created it. The further we advance in the process of knowing this and our mind, the farther away seems any answer and any question regarding our purpose here. But, at the same time, we can always manufacture it ourselves. *Lifestyle* is the name given to our journey for the research of the self, in which capitalism plays an important role due to extra-social value represented by products.

But the symbolic extra value is a form of *Diffusion*. The value of the result depends on the possibility to present itself. The perception and the concept form

² The approach is based on the idea of talking about the perfectly rational agent that is exclusively motivated by personal interests. Moreover, the theory of rational choice goes through the meaning of rational agent: an isolated individual behaving ; Which already has priorities perfectly in order and enjoys complete information and perfect internal computer that will allow him to accomplish the most profitable choice, according to his desires. He is prone to act instrumentally-rational because his choices are bound to maximise the utilities expected.

the possibility of the phenomenon ensuring the criteria of opportunities. But a phenomenon which itself appears to be an event, like in the case of the result, claims a formal condition of saturation, which does not require an observer, neither his perceptions nor his concepts, but just frame, in which the request makes the event valid. The result itself is a "saturated phenomenon"³ (Marion 2007). The open possibilities at such a scale are not one of un-lived emotions but of immediate satisfaction or the independent usage regardless the conditions that made it possible- the ignorance of external factors. Caught in this whirlpool, the individual becomes its subject and a phenomenal object itself, which would have an important role when designing the possibilities, thus reducing it to a perception and not to something certain. *The appropriateness*, something what in Husserl phenomenology would confirm the truth a phenomenon, in the case of a system based on application of requests and offers of phenomena (the result is reduced to a phenomenon by the fact that it is, first, a possibility), *the appropriateness* is not a "ultimate emotion" of perception, but a distraction toward its appearance.

Firstly, because the perspective where it forms the possibility is one detached from that of the Self, whose horizon of expectations still remains one of the un-lived experiences, and not of inexperienced products.

Secondly, this appearance provided by the system of guarantee of a result as an event, the publicity, disturbs the necessary connection for that something to become *Obvious* – That is suitable for a set of insights – between intention and intuition, meaning and content. But the insight is only by reference to a perspective, to a form of delineation. In the case of an overall perspective, however, the experience certifies itself even before its concepts and surpassing perception. This means that it is independent of the subjectivity of the Self (user, in this case) and it is entailing its own existence, certified, recently to the majority of the results, towards what perception uses less (choosing an experience from the personal experience), and even that one being a purely formal experience, lacking emotions: the Science. This variety of results, lacking perception and experience, it is an effusive one and also decreased as most of the daily interactions take place under these aspects. The individual but also the identity are the subject matters of the open tensions which appear with reception of the event as such, despite their deficiency. And if horizon of perceptions lacks emotions, there has to be a change towards the indigenous intuition of the Self: its own body as an emotion and a source of constant emotions.

The compliance of its own identity, its option to be shaped, has its own reflection upon the embodiment, from now on the land of metonymy and semiotics. As Giddens says it, the body has been "reflective assembled", as a matter for the improvement and not as "something given". Jean-Francois Lyotard speaks in the famous "post-modern condition" about the social connection that:

³ The term "saturated phenomenon" appears at the Marion J.L. Although Marion uses this term of analyzing within the religious field, I felt that actually the formal criteria which he discusses, can be applied to any phenomenon.

"...as the problem, it is a game of words, the question game which sets a an instant position for the one who asks the question, for the one who is asked and for the one which the question is about; this issue already forms the social connection." (Lyotard 2003)

By now, the other is seen as a rational performer, able to respond and to act in the behaviourist diagram of the type of stimulus-response. This alteration of the perception of the other means nothing else but the assumption of the model of information theory, in which input and output are the basic premises of information. In this progress of the information, which involves a transmitter and a receiver, both are part of the same rational system. But to reduce linguistic constituent only for the transmission of information would be superficial. The statements are of several types, each with different functions, supported by the language non-verbal communication, a sign of communication. The embodiment plays an important role in this communication system because it has the ability to deflect the process stimulus-response from its essential operation system. Between the Stimulus and the Response lies the Body/Message.

Coming from Descartes, this philosophy does not only reflect upon a better use of reason and a sensitive insight toward our needs and the others, but also a new set of values that are defined by reference to a mathematical consistency, a sum of consequences, "for short, a zero degree or a meagre unique quality; Evidence is carried out here in an appropriate manner to ensure that it has nothing but a blank and deprived perception.

"... We should in fact to ask ourselves on the privilege so often granted by logical knowledge and mathematical theories: They are raised to the level of all the other models, although they are distinguished mainly by their shortage of intuition, through their poor quality, even through absence of their matter." (Marion 2007).

CONCLUSION

This fondness for each other's philosophy as a non-phenomenon, a philosophy reinforced by present-day theories of psychology and evolutionism, is likely to be exposed to some factors which have to do with the world of matter: When will we be able to speak of a legitimate market of human organs? Why was the human organ sale forbidden, considering the fact that they can only be donated? "Slavery is an example of this motivation, exploitation, or, the gender differences, as well. Homo Economicus is nothing less than an ideal of neo-liberalism. The man is not only set to maximize his own interests and resources. This means that, however, there is hope for us to break the consumption flow and think about the other's existence, be it through ecological or ethical concepts. The other turned into something more and bigger than the one sitting next to us. The Globalization brought him to a global scale, each action has put a mark on him, while affecting us, too. *Our times make us responsible for this task to reflect upon the world while we reflect upon ourselves.*

As a result, I have tried to highlight the connection that today allows us to consider the terms as globalisation, joint identity, as a whole, even if it lacks unity,

but it surely is leading. When our identity will no longer be considered as a single point in a global world, but as a responsible part of an entire political system, economical and as an ecological unit, that will also be the moment when the individual responsibility will expand on the environment in which they operate and upon the others.

What occurs: „The rise of society has caused the decline of both public domain and the private field. But the disappearance of the public world, so decisive in the shape of the human being as a lonesome and so dangerous for the shaping of the people's mentality away from the world of modern ideological grounds, began with the loss, much more real, that part of the world which man kept in private mode." (Arendt, Hannah, 2007) is the Archimedean position outside of Earth, a separation from the world, in which the society and the mass misuse the private property toward the idea of nation and state, where the world is seen through the eyes of some discoveries which regarded the universe, through Galileo, and which have reached the capacity of measuring the planet and the solar system, abstract, but by applying these measurements to ground level. The value of a phenomenon is neither supported by turning it into a mathematical symbol, nor by the exchange value, but by the possibility of establishing a value of usage as to take into account people's needs and their opportunities. We can say that the market is located at that Archimedean observation point, demanding changes and adjustments to ground level on the basis of the measurements of profit and cost-effectively. But is far from those who live on Earth, where half of inhabitants are poor, but not invisible.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ARENDT, Hannah, *Human condition*, Editura Idea, Cluj-Napoca, 2007.
2. BAUMAN, Zygmunt, *The Ethical Challenge of Globalization. New perspective quarterly*, Volume 18, #4, Fall 2001. Accessible online at http://www.digitalnpq.org/archive/2001_fall/ethical.html. Accessed 26/11/2014.
3. BAUMAN, Zygmunt, *Globalisation and its social effects*, Editura Antet, București, 2005.
4. GIDDENS, A., *The constitution of Society: Outline of the theory of structuration*, University of California Press, 1984. Accesible online at www.brynmawr.edu/Acads/GSSW/schram/Giddens.pdf.
5. KLEIN, Naomi, *Shock Doctrine. Birth of disaster capitalism*, Editura Vellant, București, 2009.
6. LOCKE, John, *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding*, Printed for Awnsham and John Churchill, London, 1706. Accessible online at <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10615>. Accessed: 26/11/2014.
7. LYOTARD J.-F., *Postmodern Condition*, Editura Idea, Cluj-Napoca, 2003.
8. MARION, J.-L., *Visible and revelation*, Editura Deisis, Sibiu, 2007.
9. NORRETRANDERS, Tor, *User illusion*, Editura Publica, București, 2010.
10. TODERICI, Ovidiu Florin, *Political implementation of equal opportunities in region V West-Case studies*, Arad, 2014.