

# CULTURAL DETERRITORIALISATION: COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY, PROVENANCE AND PLACE

ALEKSANDRA BIDA

RYERSON UNIVERSITY AND YORK UNIVERSITY, CANADA

Abstract: The deterritorialisation, or uprooting from time and place, of culture through communication technologies can be explored through John Tomlinson's idea of globalisation as "complex connectivity". This paper aims to cover various areas of research to highlight the ways in which cultural deterritorialisation continually permeates cultural experience. The analysis is grounded in an understanding of globalisation as both a homogenising and differentiating force. Three aspects of communication's "complex connectivity" are looked at in greater detail: control, speed/ease, and the idea of a global village. These are discussed in terms of ownership and market concentration, and notions of "direct connectivity" and "indirect connectivity". Adapted from Tomlinson's "complex connectivity", "direct connectivity" focuses on interpersonal relations and deterritorialisation on individual scales through personal global contact, while "indirect connectivity" enlarges the scale with a focus on mass cultural production and global consumption. Finally, a discussion of possible kinds of reterritorialisation will consider the impact of these aspects of communication's "complex connectivity" on cultural flows. Rather than concepts such as transterritoriality which are not rooted and remain deterritorialised, reterritorialisation is explored as a means of balancing global trends in the cultural and communications sectors of global and local villages alike.

Key words: communication, "complex connectivity", culture, deterritorialisation, global village, globalisation

## INTRODUCTION

The deterritorialisation, or uprooting from place and people, of culture through communication technologies and practices can be explored through John Tomlinson's (1999) idea of globalisation as "complex connectivity". Rather than examining political implications, such as the possibilities of (anti)national resurgence, the focus here will remain on cultural agency and information flows. The analysis is grounded in an understanding of globalisation as both a homogenising and differentiating force, and means of transferring or exporting culture are also integral to the topic. Anthony Giddens' (1991) notion of post-traditional culture is in line with the proliferation of communication technology and access to global information through the changing experience of time and space around the globe. This change situates the experience of deterritorialisation in relation to culture.

An understanding of deterritorialisation connects to various immediate implications for everyday life and potential types of global assimilation. Studies of several countries and regions will be focused on, in addition to the impact of major corporations in communications, and the perception of American cultural imperialism. I concentrate on three aspects of communication's "complex connectivity": control, speed/ease, and the idea of a global village. Control will be discussed in terms of ownership and market concentration. Speed and ease will frame the notion of "direct connectivity" through changes in interpersonal communication via the internet and mobile telephony. Thirdly, the global village will be looked at in terms of "indirect connectivity" or the scope of modern international mass communication, with specific factors including the prevalence of television and film flows as well as the virtual scope of this electronic global village. Finally, a discussion of reterritorialisation will assess the possibility of new rooting in the "complex connectivity" of globalisation.

## HOMOGENISATION AND DIFFERENTIATION

As international connectivity, from cultural flows to economic ties, continues to grow in complexity and scale, a perception of globalisation as an intricate and integral force of contemporary culture is needed in order to examine the deterritorialising process. One facet of this is economic globalisation which Subhabrata Banerjee and Stephen Linstead (2001) highlight by arguing that globalisation is in fact consumerism and a form of neo-colonialism. For them, boundaries dissolve in the global village and people consume global brands while corporations compete in the global marketplace. Globalisation becomes the "knowledge producing (and appropriating) process in which the social, cultural and political combine at particular geographic locations and times" (p. 690). Local knowledge and global knowledge can influence, impede, or reinforce each other. While localisation, seen as a kind of resistance, cannot thwart the dominance of the global, it can incorporate itself through glocalisation or the intermingling of the local and global. Banerjee and Linstead point out that "[t]here is not one global mass culture, but rather transnational processes produce the globalisation of culture where a multitude of cultural flows, not always consistent with dominant nation-state ideologies emerge" (p. 696). A dismissal of "one global mass culture" is imperative in avoiding a

superficial understanding of globalised cultural flows.

Referring to Arjun Appadurai's (1996) understanding of globalisation through "ethnoscapes", "technoscapes", "finanscapes", "mediascapes", and "ideoscapes", the significance of communication technology emerges through its integral role as a part of each of these: increasing global mobility, technology, capital, information flows, and disseminating (counter)ideologies, respectively. While these can be seen as improvements in one light, they also have entrenched colonising effects. Crucially, for Banerjee and Linstead globalisation both homogenises and differentiates: "global consumer culture is a homogenising trend while simultaneously acknowledging and exploiting distinct market niches based on cultural difference" (p. 698). They stress that much of the world is embracing the American means of expressing identity through consumption and that this serves to further deterritorialise culture through globalisation's homogenisation and differentiation. Big brands are supranational and yet cultural signification is commercially used to fashion products which can appeal to many or varied tastes. While this seemingly contradictory process can be presented in an idealistic light, the authors conclude that while the "globalised" bear the costs, it is the "globalisers" controlling the process who reap the benefits. This assessment has implications in terms of the sources and effects of cultural deterritorialisation, and these implications will be further discussed in later sections.

## **DETERRITORIALISATION, TIME AND SPACE**

Tomlinson's (1999) understanding of globalisation as "complex connectivity" provides a flexible framework for the global communications expanse. In highlighting the deterritorialisation of cultures as well as the sense of proximity that globalisation has created, Tomlinson incorporates homogenisation as well as differentiation into this concept. For Tomlinson deterritorialisation "weakens the ties of culture to place" through its "penetration of local worlds" and "dislodging of everyday meanings" (p. 29). He mentions the related terms of delocalisation and dis-placement in a discussion of how this complex and ambiguous phenomenon, one that is uneven and sometimes contradictory, has been embraced and at times reversed. Deterritorialisation includes the effects of untethering cultural notions and artefacts from locality as well as opening them to individuals and groups of any culture.

Having "provided an alternative vision of the subject that contrasted with the dominant understanding of subjectivity as contained within the territorial confines set up by centralised powers" (Jacquemet, 2005, p. 262), deterritorialisation emerges culturally or sociologically as an effect of our greatly altered experience of space and time. This suggests an alternate possibility in infiltrating or reframing previously established physical, cultural, or ideological confines, yet it does not have to suggest a breakdown of the old understandings. For Marco Jacquemet (2005) "the most important social implication of deterritorialisation is not the dissolution of identities, cultures, or nation-states in a global environment ... but the interplay between global and local processes, and the reconstitution of local social positioning within global cultural flows" (p. 263).

This evaluation reiterates Tomlinson's "complex connectivity" in its stress on interplay and global flows.

As means of interpersonal and mass communication have altered, deterritorialisation needs to be placed in the context of contemporary experiences of time and space. Giddens' (1991) highlighting of the seminal change in experiencing space and time also extends to self-identity and post-traditional culture in a way that frames global communications. The post-traditional culture of amalgamated influences becomes an important feature of cultural communication flows and their effects. Tomlinson (1999) agrees with the diminishing prominence of place in everyday life and describes "places that are changing around us and gradually, subtly, losing their power to define the terms of our existence" (p. 29). Time is additionally complicated by the speed with which we virtually and physically traverse time zones.

For Giddens (1991) the "post-traditional order of modernity" has a "backdrop of new forms of mediated experience" (p. 5) and this mediated experience has been a factor in organising social relations since the advent of writing. The mass printing of newspapers has played a "major role in completing the separation of space from time" (p. 25) through a shift in the scope of information. Formerly, remote stories simply didn't have the same immediacy and this has only been magnified with electronic media. Giddens is quick to point out the similarities between printed and electronic media, and how they reorganise time and space through a "collage effect" of the various events dominating over their respective locations, hence "the intrusion of distant events into everyday consciousness" (p. 27). This domination of events over their locations and the repeated infiltrations of international events into localised lives change the way culture is able to flow. Place becomes another detail in an onslaught of international happenings which are then grouped thematically rather than geographically. Geography loses its rigidity as the "collage" alters formerly regimented divisions.

Other effects of deterritorialisation that Giddens mentions include "reality inversion" (p. 27) and a "multifarious number of milieux" (p. 84). Reality inversion transforms the real thing into something which seems less concrete because of previous encounters with it through mediation. Subsequently, rare experiences seem to be encountered regularly, and death is a poignant example of this. A kind of desensitisation to events at both ends of the spectrum, from natural disasters to medical miracles, this inversion blurs ties of people to a specific time and place. Additionally, because modern media destroy old boundaries by creating seemingly "direct" audiences who are not really there, a pluralism of choice – Giddens' "milieux" – is enacted on a greater scale and with more consistent force. Through mass media these milieux can be incredibly diverse, and Tomlinson (1999) agrees that choice contributes to deterritorialisation as people "come to include distant events and processes more routinely in their perceptions of what is significant for their own personal lives" (p. 115). He complicates this general point by noting that "mediated experience becomes imbricated with 'immediate' experience" (p. 115) which correlates to Giddens' "reality inversion". However, an emphasis on the power of mediation to disrupt "reality" also undermines the fact that so much of

contemporary experience is mediated. A problem arises through the need to further contextualise mediated information. Because deterritorialisation can eliminate context, control over communications or “connectivity” – the ways we allow and experience cultural and informational flows – is shaped on many levels, from the individual, social, and national to the global.

## **CONTROLLING CULTURE AND CULTURAL BOUNDARIES**

Control of the communications sector is a complex tangle of influence. Governments, nongovernmental agencies, as well as major conglomerates weave this web of power, expectations of gains, and potential dependence. Jamie Browlee’s (2005) claim that media agencies partake in the “construction, dissemination and reinforcement of ideologies” (p. 44) is highly relevant in the scope of his look at cross-media ownership, cross-border mergers, and the fact that less than a dozen giants dominate the media market globally. These giants and their budding rivals have found larger audiences and markets, and with a hold on serious market share it is up to them to homogenise and/or differentiate, to mould the world’s understanding of globalisation, and shape global cultural constructs. Through multinational corporate or migratory linkages and exported or shared cultural content, culture is deterritorialised and the crucial question is to what extent and to what effect. Two key culture-shaping trends – in opposition to each other on many levels – are the international growth of corporate giants and of mediated communities.

Brownlee (2005) writes on mass media concentration in Canada as well as around the globe and analyses concentrated economic ownership and obstacles to it. If economics are newspapers’ number one priority, as many owners have declared, then ownership and control over content have serious direct and indirect consequences for the integrity of the disseminated information. Direct control over what is covered, how, and in what way is complemented by the influence of advertisers and the weight of their interests. Such control furthers a consumer culture approach of the media which has extensive consequences through cultural representation. Citing some grim figures, such as the 18 independent newspapers in Canada’s province of Ontario in the 1970s all gone a mere three decades later, Brownlee stresses how concentrated control affects information flows.

As technology has made possible the existence of corporate economies that overshadow those of nations (Brownlee, 2005), a trend in the formation of communities beyond the physical boundaries of nations has also emerged. As Ananda Mitra (1997) pointed out over a decade ago, computer-mediated communication (CMC) such as the internet presents new possibilities for the formation of communities. A clear example of this is immigrants who are scattered rather than clustered in specific areas yet able to interact through CMC using the computer as “a tool to image and imagine the group affiliation” (p. 58). Though the interpersonal aspects of the internet can be deemed impersonal and the agency or intentionality inherent in being able to use and rewrite texts can be seen as an inauthentic cultural re-imagining, Mitra notes that imagination

becomes common memory for group formation. Though the lack of restrictions and controls provides a forum where anyone with access may contribute, the challenge to traditional hegemony may not be as great. Mitra also points out the difficulty in locating the dominant online, since, for example, “[n]o grand narratives about India emerge on the internet space” where the “permanence of the image is subverted by the ongoing discourses” (p. 74). Individuals can subvert the cultural homogenisation that national mass media tend to cultivate and the economies of scale that corporate giants foster throughout the cultural arena. It is here that the deterritorialisation of culture shows a problematised congruity; while undermining old grand narratives it can offer new global ones not tied to time or place in traditional ways.

### **DIRECT CONNECTIVITY AND INTIMACY**

Contact encouraged by mediated interpersonal relations through telecommunications, multiculturalism, and travel, or what can be called “direct connectivity”, has rapidly become a satisfactory form of communication and cultural exchange. When Tomlinson (1999) asks whether email really is most like letter writing, he suggests that it be seen as a new form of oral communication through its significantly more synchronous application. This complicates our everyday assumptions about the way new media alter our lives and to what extent as this is more than a mere improvement to former methods of communications with changing preferences, habits, information flows, and webs of contacts. The amalgamation of oral and written, sent and instantaneous is also experienced in instant or text messaging as well as various social networking websites. According to Tomlinson, deterritorialisation disembodies intimacy through a “one-to-oneness” rather than “face-to-faceness” and enacts public intimacy, or change in acceptable locations for communication exchange. The focus on such intimacy underlines this look at “direct connectivity” through the highly global technologies of mobile telephony and email.

Like studies of similar populations in Ghana and Kenya, where mobile telephony has quickly surged while internet use has remained low, Radhamany Sooryamoorthy and colleagues (2008) focused on the south Indian state of Kerala to understand the social ties that these technologies build and localise. They found that frequent email and mobile users maintained technologically mediated networks more so than infrequent users and reported a greater number of friends than family members in these similarly sized networks, which is quite understandable through the extended reach of technologically mediated communication. The larger external and smaller local networks of frequent users are a similar case, hence the finding that email use can predict geographical diversity within the studied networks, while mobile phone use was negatively associated with such diversity. The finding of email users maintaining global contacts is explained by the greater difficulty in establishing connections across time zones via synchronous communication. The asynchronous nature of email enables a greater ease and diminishes time constraints, and this enhances the speed and ease of deterritorialisation on the individual scale.

The authors conclude that: "For the relatively high-status respondents, email and mobile phones are used in complementary ways to maintain social relations that are geographically distinct. One way of looking at this distinction is to see mobile phones as providing access to a proximate zone, while the internet provides access to distant zones" (p. 747). This would seem to place different forms of mediated communication at odds with each other in terms of their effect on communication's "complex connectivity", yet geographically limited "direct connectivity" through proximate networks is a part of cultural formation without which deterritorialisation could not be enacted. It is these local networks that maintain cultures that can be uprooted or exported. The extent of global interpersonal reach today has made the prevalence of deterritorialised culture an acceptable and even embraced occurrence through a newly growing willingness to consume culture or (re)learn it.

Other researchers like Daphne Winland (2006) have had similar findings in looking at groups such as immigrants. While travel home has been the more traditional area for scholars of immigrant communities, Winland discusses ways in which CMC "has intensified the nature and quality of linkages between Croats worldwide" (p. 274), from television, to radio, and internet sites offering message boards or chat rooms and access to local media. She points out that "numerous and diverse interactive and noninteractive Croatian-themed websites have been aimed at or generated mainly by diasporic Croats" (p. 274) and the dissemination of conservative politics are all elements of cultural flow that push culture and information into virtual spaces rather than physically bordered ones. Disembodied intimacy makes cultural sharing easier and quicker, while public intimacy allows individuals more opportunities to share.

Providing a sweeping look at various effects of globalisation, Giddens (2003) covers risk, tradition, family, and democracy in *Runaway World*. Key for Giddens are changes in communications technology: "Instantaneous electronic communication isn't just a way in which news or information is conveyed more quickly. Its existence alters the very texture of our lives, rich and poor alike" (p. 11). His example of the face of Nelson Mandela being more recognisable to many people than that of a neighbour elaborates on this point on a small and yet massive scale. We cannot know everyone both physically near and far, so it is this balance of priority of whom and what we chose to know that establishes links in the web of "complex connectivity". As more people know of more of the same ones "direct connectivity" changes its impact on everyday life. Yet technology aids this connectivity by surpassing more and more past obstacles associated with time and space. Giddens points out that the 40 years it took radio to garner an audience of 50 million, the personal computer managed in 15 and the internet in four. This speed and scope not only shows how globalisation is an "out there" phenomenon but is an "in here" phenomenon as well by influencing our lives on the personal level. All these developments point to the changing function of tradition in contemporary lives. For Giddens tradition is something invented and reinvented, and while some traditions have lasted hundreds of years, customs and rituals are generally much newer than we like to believe. What implications such a view of tradition has

for the arguable deterritorialisation of culture of the past is not as vital as the present deterritorialisation – faster, more prevalent, and global.

### **INDIRECT CONNECTIVITY AND GLOBAL VILLAGE-ING**

The third aspect, the global village, will be explored through “indirect connectivity” by means of mass communication. Using Giddens’ phrases Tomlinson (1999) explains that: “People may still be ‘at home’ in their localities but they are at some level aware that these are ‘phantasmagoric’ places in which familiar features are often not unique to that locale and part of its ‘organic development’ but, rather, features that have been ‘placed into’ the locale by distanced forces” (p. 107). This aspect of features being “placed into” is deterritorialisation at work on an everyday level, and the approach to information exchange or flow needs to be complicated by oppositional realities such as US statistics of foreign news coverage shrinking in the last decades. What Tomlinson seeks to highlight beyond contradictory approaches to understanding the flows is whether our ability to intervene has grown. This is what “indirect connectivity” must include in order for it to be a complex, dynamic social process rather than something akin to a consumer-based marketing phenomenon.

Looking at the state of global news Simon Cottle and Mugdha Rai (2008) are wary of embracing the proclamations many have found while attempting to “re-examine the cultural flows of global news and discover to what extent cultural disjuncture and difference are valorised in today’s global ‘mediascape’” (p. 162). Their analysis of various “frames” employed by global news sources includes two which are particularly relevant to cultural deterritorialisation. One of these is the “cultural recognition frame” which “not only represents but also symbolises and/or affirms cultural values and community ideals – by, inter alia, acknowledging and/or celebrating cultural groups and differences, by recognising Others” (p. 171). The other is the “mythic tales frame” which “also functions culturally, activating and displaying cultural myths that have resonance for contemporary cultures” (p. 171). However, these two frames account only for a fraction of their findings. So even as the latter frame works on “resurrecting and/or recycling established values, symbols and affective narratives” (p. 171), it does this on a seemingly miniscule scale. Giddens’ claims about the pull of tradition waning is echoed in such findings, and yet the effectiveness of these frames to portray a new globalised world which requires neither a location nor a point in time to create or propagate cultural content is what seems more pertinent. Cottle and Rai (2008) refer to Ingrid Volkmer’s claim that new features and style of global news “contribute to a ‘thick cosmopolitanism’, or feelings of being at home within a culturally heterogeneous world” (p. 164), and this is the effect that deterritorialisation in many ways embodies – by attaching itself to ideas of cosmopolitanism which do not necessarily take privilege and unbalanced flows into account.

The pre-eminence of American content in a “culturally heterogeneous” world cannot be overlooked. While the prominence of the cultural imperialism thesis has diminished, “seen as an antiquated ideological imposture by the advocates of the

new school” and the globalisation approach is “sometimes referred to as a bundle of neoliberal dogmas that masquerade as postmodernist waffle” (Chalaby, 2006, p. 35), there is something to be said for the way in which these approaches work together. Globalisation has come to embody an aspect of American dominance and whether this is accepted, rejected, or somehow ignored, it deserves more detailed exploration. What Jean Chalaby (2006) proposes is not returning to the notion of cultural imperialism, noting that its “greatest shortcoming was its entrenchment in the national imaginary, a too narrow perspective from which to understand the transnational and deterritorialised nature of the emerging media order” (p. 36). While assessing American dominance in two key audiovisual sectors, European television as well as film production and distribution, Chalaby concentrates on the European experience of American imperialism. Preferring the term “cultural primacy”, he simply advocates for an adoption of the US perspective in marketing television since “American conglomerates are set to dominate the era of multichannel television” (p. 36). A dominating nation in a vital aspect of media and international communications has implications for the future deterritorialisation of cultures and the kind of reterritorialisation that will be possible – American reterritorialisation? Having “successfully adopted local adaptation of content and programming as an international strategy, creating hybrid television brands and media products that appeal ever more to European viewers” (p. 36), Chalaby is certain that US corporations are poised to secure European and other markets.

The figures analysed include top media companies and the US is the only nation with double-digit entries as well as more than double that of its nearest competitors of Japan, the UK, Germany, France and Italy. Meanwhile, European companies have addressed regional concerns with some success but other than a few exceptions lack international reach. Furthermore, comparing the numbers of films and series on European television, US films had increased by 25 percent from 1988 to 1997 while series went up by nearly 78 percent. The only other increase in categories of National, Europe, USA, and Other, was European films – but even this was a mere 5.3 percent. There is no indication that this American trend is reversing as data from five years after that period were putting US films at over 70 percent market share. Also significant for what will be shown and where, the US already controlled over half the EU distribution market. Meanwhile, initiatives such as the Television Without Frontiers Directive from 1991, intending to bring diversity and growth to the European industry, instead “facilitate[d] the crossborder operations of media multinationals by lessening the legal barriers of entry to national markets” (p. 44). Chalaby notes that MTV and CNN have already learned that local adaptation is “a prerequisite to decent ratings” and have “transformed into hybrid cultural products” (p. 45). Mixing local and international content, in the most profitable proportions, such global giants cover all their bases with foreign and indigenous programming. Jetix, Cartoon Network, Discovery, and National Geographic all duplicate content but also participate in local co-productions while creating economies of scale.

In line with Chalaby’s assessment of MTV’s success in Europe, Anthony Fung

(2006) examined MTV in China in more depth to find the balance of global/Western to local quite unequal. Reaching over 340 million households in 140 countries, MTV remains “a global youth phenomenon” (p. 72). Fung argues that the commercial formula employed must account for taste, style, quality of content, as well as appropriate politics. This results in Chinese repackaging while “the symbolic meaning, values and moral norms associated with the localised MTV programme is still not local” as “the strategy of localisation remains confined to the production process” as “MTV syndicates sell a modern symbol of the capitalist West in connection with MTV consumption” (p. 76) through programs like *MTV Global Village* which introduces foreign popular music and infotainment or *MTV Star Profile* which promotes internationally famous movie stars. As local as MTV China might pretend to be it is selling the same consumerist values, and Fung’s conclusion is that in daily production, as with glitzy award shows, Chinese authorities allow MTV to privilege Western forms in order to provide a means of reaching youth culture.

Chalaby (2006) too sees this kind of hybridisation as “a key to the success of this strategy” (p. 46). Stressing “US primacy”, he attempts to sideline any implications of cultural imperialism, presuming an objectivity to a strictly business approach. He advises European public broadcasters to “think less in terms of national market and more in terms of genre” (p. 49). This is really advocating deterritorialising cultures based on profit margins and marketability of genres. Chalaby further stresses this position in closing when he asks who is to blame for future US-based domination: “Media executives who do their job, identify and exploit gaps in the markets? Or European public broadcasters and politicians locked in 19th-century-style imperial rivalries?” (p. 49). Meanwhile, it is such an approach to globalisation, of stagnant national rivalries while mass cultural imperialism stems simply from a job well done, that makes aspects of “indirect connectivity” so susceptible to excessively uneven cultural deterritorialisation in terms of where so-called global culture finds most sway and from how far away.

## **RETERRITORIALISATION, NOT TRANSTERRITORIALITY**

Tomlinson (1999) acknowledges the unevenness of deterritorialisation, with less choice for some, but he also stresses the possibilities for reterritorialisation amidst such unevenness. Reterritorialisation encompasses the “various attempts to re-establish a cultural ‘home’” (p. 148). It is a means of recontextualising global culture in the local setting. Does a reterritorialisation of culture become merely a new cultural amalgamation that is heavily influenced by commodified culture and its homogenised consumption? If so, the liberalisation of the cultural and communications sectors and profit-seeking approaches are offering big corporations means of manufacturing this culture. Alternatively, reterritorialised culture can remain centrally rooted in more traditional, intangible notions of culture. This is seen predominantly through “direct connectivity”, when extended networks and diasporic communities engage in it through everyday communications or organised virtual communities and share these reconstituted forms of culture. But while mass means of “indirect connectivity” and slack controls in the face of nation-size corporate economies are the stronger homogenising factors, even

these must work with an element of differentiation in order to be successful, as global MTV has shown. As to whether the available types of reterritorialisation are of the American variety, the MTV example seems to point to yes. However, this is one of the stronger examples to support that assumption and youth culture is highly susceptible to popular and consumerist trends. The bigger question is what will continue to happen – with continued corporate eminence, worldwide American film and TV markets, global internet and mobile telephony use, and the many other means of “complex connectivity”. This overview presents the globe as the same culturally mixed “village” as it has been throughout history. Global culture is certainly capable of consuming the smaller types, and yet these smaller cultures are often resilient or subversive – not to mention many – and reterritorialisation is rooted in their resilience.

Daniel Mato (2005) finds in his study of Latin American telenovelas that territorial references remain meaningful and continue to emerge. He addresses the “perception of globalisation as a deterritorialised and/or deterritorialising process” and argues that “the practices of social actors are not deterritorialised” (p. 425) but transterritorial. According to Mato Miami does not become a “nonplace”, “non-Latin American place”, not-“ours” place, or even a “deterritorialised” space. He sees it as “a clear territorial reference, a place, a part simultaneously of two spaces – Latin America and the United States” (p. 432). Yes, the number of Spanish speaking residents of Miami makes it Hispanic and American, but it is more adequate to say that the Hispanic element is reterritorialised in the city for it remains American in many other ways. Constructing a bilocated “transterritorial” space is an easy way of avoiding the “complex connectivity” of such a place. By ignoring the complexity of deterritorialisation, Mato assumes that it could be complete and disregards reterritorialisation, in favour of a vague or somehow neutral transterritorial space. This example of Miami touches on cultural reterritorialisation through the lens of multiculturalism.

Gerald Kernerman (2005) discusses Canadian cultural policy and the social sway over the last decades through the Canadian “ambiguous zone” of multicultural nationalism, something deeply embedded in the country’s national mythology. The political and ideological roots of multicultural nationalism can illuminate a non-consumer reterritorialisation of culture and this multicultural nationalism differs from corporately-driven homogenisation because the combined homogenisation and differentiation is not a means of market access, but an integral agent of cultural coherence. This socio-political facet is where culture flows end up as well as why “[d]eliberative democracy’s interlocutors” claim that “[u]nderstanding the Other, agreeing to disagree and living with difference are all necessary capacities ... for successful co-existence in agonistic, culturally diverse and interdependent societies” (Cottle & Rai, 2008, p. 166). While the “collage effect” or “reality reversal” affect our understanding of reality, a viable plurality of choice and cultures can resist global homogeneity and remains an avenue of intervention.

Finally, the insertion of ethnic, local, and national cultures into the market and the convergence of communication and cultural studies is described by Jesús Martín-Barbero

(2006) as “the multidimensionality of all communication processes and their increasingly strong influence in the deterritorialisation and hybridisation that modernisation brings about” (p. 283). He asserts that the convergence occurred when the mediation of communication stopped being instrumental and became structural, and this is what has made it so central to culture: “today, technology refers not only to new machines but also to new ways of perception and new languages, to new sensibilities and discourses, to cultural mutations caused by the association of new means of production and new ways of communicating that turn knowledge into a direct, productive force” (p. 285). Such a view highlights the influence that modern communication technology has on our lives and why future developments, whether magnifications of what has happened or a reversal of the trends, will be extremely interesting to observe. After all, cultural deterritorialisation through globalisation and modern communication technology can be seen not as an end to locality “but its transformation into a more complex cultural space” (Tomlinson, 1999, p. 149). The process of reterritorialisation provides a means of ensuring that differentiation remains an integral aspect of globalisation, along with the massive homogenising forces integral to local and global villages alike.

## CONCLUSION

Returning to Tomlinson’s question of our ability to intervene in the cultural flows that shape the direct and indirect portions of the “complex connectivity” that is globalisation, Giddens (2003) also believes that individuals still retain power over it. By reconstructing institutions which can intervene, individuals possess a power to mould aspects of globalisation rather than being continually shaped by it. This is a vital influence if we are reminded that “globalisation is not incidental to our lives today”, being instead “a shift in our very life circumstance” and essentially “the way we live now” (p. 19). Though not everyone acknowledges the deep impacts of globalisation, a concept both held up as a saving grace of a nationalistic globe and the very exploitation of the modern age, it is crucial that it not become an empty term that is easily ignored. Beyond these dramatic extremes it is difficult to deny that many of the ways in which much of the world communicates and interacts have dramatically changed and that through this change culture, tradition, and physical geography have shifted or shrunk in the minds of citizens and consumers alike through “direct” and “indirect connectivity”.

The “feelings of being at home within a culturally heterogeneous world” (Ingrid Volkmer quoted in Cottle & Rai, 2008, p. 164) can obscure the potentially unidirectional flow of information and culture. The homogenising aspect of this phenomenon is not something to underestimate as most research on American prominence in many cultural sectors and parts of the world indicates. The differentiating aspects of globalisation can also be exploited, and the exportation of culture cannot be permitted to diminish the individual’s cultural agency, whether it occurs through reterritorialisation as Tomlinson suggests or institutions as Giddens proposes. This cultural agency remains a source with which to balance corporate dominance and regional or national imperialisms. Simply accepting deterritorialised culture as common cultural capital denies the chance for truly diverse cultures to thrive in a seemingly post-traditional and globalising world

where a diminishing prominence of place and irreverence to time often define everyday life.

## REFERENCES

- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimension of Globalization*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Banerjee, S. B., & Linstead, S. (2001). Globalisation, Multiculturalism and Other Fictions: Colonialism for the New Millenium? *Organisation*, 8(4), 683-722.
- Brownlee, J. (2005). *Ruling Canada: Corporate Cohesion and Democracy*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Chalaby, J. K. (2006). American Cultural Primacy in a New Media Order. *The International Communication Gazette*, 68(1), 33-51.
- Cottle, S. & Rai, M. (2008). Global 24/7 News Providers: Emissaries of Global Dominance or Global Public Sphere? *Global Media and Communication*, 4(2), 157-181.
- Fung, A. (2006). 'Think Globally, Act Locally': China's Rendezvous with MTV. *Global Media and Communication*, 2(1), 71-88.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2003). *Runaway World: How Globalisation is Changing Our Lives*. New York: Routledge.
- Jacquemet, M. (2005). Transidiomatic Practices: Language and Power in the Age of Globalisation. *Language & Communication*, 25, 257-277.
- Kernerman, G. (2005). *Multicultural Nationalism*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Martín-Barbero, J. (2006). A Latin American Perspective on Communication/Cultural Mediation. *Global Media and Communication*, 2(3), 279-297.
- Mato, D. (2005). The Transnationalisation of the Telenovela Industry, Territorial References, and the Production of Markets and Representations of Transnational Identities. *Television & New Media*, 6(4), 423-444.
- Mitra, A. (1997). Virtual Commonality: Looking for India on the Internet. In S. G. Jones, (Ed.), *Virtual Culture* (pp. 55-79). London: SAGE Publications.
- Sooryamoorthy, R., Miller, B. P. & Shrum, W. (2008). Untangling the Technology Cluster: Mobile Telephony, Internet Use and the Location of Social Ties. *New Media & Society*, 10(5), 729-749.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalisation and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Winland, D. (2006). Raising the Iron Curtain: Transnationalism and the Croatian Diaspora Since the Collapse of 1989. In V. Satzewich & L. Wong, (Eds.), *Transnational Identities and Practices in Canada* (pp. 261-277). Vancouver: UBC Press.

-----

## AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

Aleksandra Bida is a PhD student in the Communication and Culture joint program at Ryerson University and York University in Toronto, Canada. She received an MA in English Philology from Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland, specialising in North American Literature, and a BA in Cultural Studies and Economics from McGill University

- CULTURAL DETERRITORIALISATION -

in Montreal, Canada. Her current research interests focus on deterritorialisation and transnationalism, and include cultural deterritorialisation, the globalisation of American and world cultures, changing approaches to world literature(s), and contemporary transnational fiction. Email: [aleksandra.bida@ryerson.ca](mailto:aleksandra.bida@ryerson.ca); [abida@yorku.ca](mailto:abida@yorku.ca)