INTRODUCTION:

Borderlines in Time of Globalization

Scholars of different schools have extensively analyzed world systems as networks of communication under the fashionable heading "globalization". Our collected new research pushes the argument one-step further. Globalization is not a homogenization of all social life on earth. It is a heterogeneous process that connects the global and the local on different levels. Furthermore, globalization is more often used as a catchall argument to pursue political goals than for sound scientific analysis. Eager followers of the concept of globalization largely overestimate its dynamics and its opponents forcefully deconstruct the concept under different perspectives. Yet, we also recognize, it is a social process thats leads to new forms of differentiation and thereby an evolution of functional imperatives for all differentiated social systems, not only for the economical system, the political system or households but also for ethnic and religious communities. Differentiation means distinction. Distinctions emerge on both sides: inside and outside. Analyzing the processes to bridge inside and outside, we find a set mechanisms of selection, which produce new zones of social change but also new borderlines and new frontiers within the social conduct. Networks perform these mechanisms of selection. Globalization is used as metaphor to describe the complex set of interrelated networks within an emerging global social structure. In a time of globalization the development of networks as an increasingly important part of a new social structure means as well other conditions of membership, particular forms of segregation and social conflicts without simple or consensual solutions. In particular sociologists such as in the tradition of Talcot Parsons overestimate the role of consent of values in social systems. It was a result of a continuation of the problem of legitimization as the basic feature of the political system following Max Weber's sociology. Today we recognize that no societal system (Gesellschaftssystem) can be controlled by the "imagined" consent among its members. We can not presuppose consent independent from the factor of time, for example, at which point in time is there an agreement between which members of social systems. In particular the system of modern society is not structured through value consent at all. On the contrary values are modified in an opportunistic way. Sociologists often do not take into account sufficiently, that subsystems of action of modern societies have their own temporal structure

and fixe and program their codes of membership in their own ways. Ignoring these processes leads to the illusion of an overall societal consent of values.

Yet, we are confronted with paradoxical social processes: in a global system inclusions and exclusions, universalizations and particularizations are mutually enhancing each other, such as in economic strategies of companies like world wide mergers and particularization of interests in local communities take place together. How stable these emerging borderlines are and how strong are the processes of exclusion in particular, is an open question. But we can recognize some patterns within these developments. It is the pre-adaptive advantage of members of social systems to participate in increasingly electronically mediated networks.

The world-systems perspective emerged in the 1970's as a critique of the premises and practices of nineteenth century social science. One of its primary concerns was a reconceptualization of the appropriate unit of analysis in studies of long-term, large-scale social change. This reconceptualization took the form of a single and singular spatio-temporal unit, the Modern World-System, which emerges in Europe and parts of the Americas at the beginning of the long sixteenth century. In retrospect globalization is not at all a new phenomenon. In the development of the system of modern societies globalization is nothing which emerged out of the blue but something eagerly produced by nation states: it was a central trait of the economic development of western societies, as the empirical work of such as Volker Bornschier has demonstrated. Thereby Roland Robertson, among others, argued that "globalization" is a condition of modernization. But it is wrong to belief that the classic theory of modernization has now only another cases of application. To understand contemporary developments we need other concepts, strategies of research, and explanations. In our view these are the different *borderstructures*, new *borderlines*, and *conditions of membership* which emerge in a global world system. As a world-system expands it incorporates new territories and new peoples. The process of incorporation creates frontiers or boundaries of the world-system. These frontiers or boundary zones are the locus of resistance to incorporation, ethnogenesis, ethnic transformation, and ethnocide. It is found that different types of globalization have different temporal characteristics. Some are long-term upward trends while others display large cyclical oscillations. The factors that explain the recent emergence of the discourse of globalization are to examine, and this discourse is analyzed in terms of the contradictory interests of powerful and less-powerful groups.

Our research project has explored how this central features of globalization the de- and re-production of borderlines can be fruitfully employed on a theoretical and empirical level. The triumph or disaster of the buzzword

globalization is closely linked to the changes we faced in the world over the last decade. From the perspective of social theories in western industrialized countries – and nothing more we wish to address here – the last decade was characterized by trembling borders and the emergence of new boderstructures at all levels of social live. The notion of globalization bares the promise to capture these processes of de-bordernization and re-bordernization. The concept of borders restructures our perception in order to overcome the sheer lag of useable categories to explain today's social world.

Talking about the global or the world system one has to keep in mind that there is no world system or *no* global as such or in singular. There are many, partly connected world systems. The global can serve as a multiple point of reference to processes that are totally different in origins, dynamics and outcomes. It is exactly the complex system of global world systems, which has to be taken in to account in theorizing the emergent processes of particularization, fragmentation, hybridization and exclusion. World systems form a set of borderstructures, partly overlapping, partly referencing to each other, but always relating the universal and the particular as well as the *in* and the *out*. Furthermore borders do not only define in and out; they structure as well the "in between". Borders separate *in* and *out*, but by doing so they structure the contact and control the influence between different social systems. A person may live in an autochthonous native community, defining his or her belonging to the community (something particular) in relation to human kind (something universal). But being a member in such a community means as well to stay in contact, communicate and exchange with other native groups, politicians or tourists and use all means of communication in order to structure and to sustain the own autochthonous community. In some sense sociological theory was always a theory of borderstructures because every social system consist of roles and statuses, which forms the way each person belongs to a system. Nation states, families, ethnic groups, villages, or economic organizations – every collectivity – has to draw a line between who and what belongs or does not belong. In general: all borderlines between social systems and their environments are relationships which make a distinction between in- and outside. It is an essential feature of social systems that they have borderlines and a code of membership. These lines of discrimination has to be produced, reproduced, and stabilized otherwise the collectivity disappears. In a time of globalization sociology of borderlines has to emphasize the de-construction and re-construction of borderlines within global settings. Our collected studies put together bits and pieces that are useful to come into terms with bordernization processes.

In order to pursue this, we approach world systems from three different perspectives. The first part sets the stage in exploring the main ideas and problems in theorizing globalization processes and their relation to borderlines. The next two parts reconsider the concept of borders under the dichotomies of member/non-member and of global-local. The second part considers different forms of memberships as re- (or de-) bordernization processes. And the third and last part examines borderlines in the interaction of local and global processes.

In the first part "Reconceptionalizations of the Global: Borderlines in World Society" we collect useful hints for further theorizing global processes in social sciences by introducing the concept of borders. A brief account of European history reveals, collective identity is produced by the social construction of boundaries. These boundaries divide and separate the real manifold processes of interaction and social relationships. On a global level different cultural programs of modernity were shaped by the continuous interaction between the cultural premises and repertoires of societies. Moreover, all societies continuously develop new questionings and reinterpretations of different dimensions of modernity – and all of them have developed different cultural agendas. *Shmuel N. Eisenstadt* employs the concept of borderlines to reconstruct the production of collective identities in European history. He argues that the discourses of identities and solidarities, the symbolic level, could not be separated from the level of social structure were they structure the allocation of entitlements and life chances. In this view modernity is a highly heterogeneous project driven by the different premises and repertoires of societies. *Christopher Chase Dunn* choses another road to re-conceptionalize the global as a multi-layered and heterogeneous process of bordernization. Different types of globalization have different temporal characteristics. Some are long-term upward trends while others display large cyclical oscillations. The factors that explain the recent emergence of the discourse of globalization are examined, and this discourse is analyzed in terms of the contradictory interests of powerful and less-powerful groups. The different trajectories of the "types of globalization" are the reason for the emerging different discourses of globalization, which are expressions of power and interests of different actors. These discourses mirror the lags between different kinds of globalization that led to severe structural tensions within the world system. *Thomas D. Hall* explores the potential analytical usefulness of the notion of borders within the concept of world systems theory. "Frontier formation" within the processes of incorporation of territories and alien peoples is discussed in the light of rich examples from Europe and North America. It turns out that the image of the border as a straight line on the map is highly misleading. The process of incorpo-

ration is enacted within large frontiers or boundary zones, which are the locus of the transformation of ethnic identities, ethnogenesis and ethnocide. The theoretical discussion is illustrated with examples drawn from the interaction of European societies with the indigenous peoples of North America. This part ends with an account of the historical genesis of world system theory and its contemporary challenges by *Richard E. Lee*. He reconstructs, how the choice in the unit of analysis improved the capacity of world system theory to describe the long trajectories of social change. Within these processes he sees a chances of reflexive control of processes even on a global level.

Starting from the notion of bordernization the second part "Defining Borderlines in World Society: The Emergence of New Memberships" gives insights on how membership in different social entities could be theorized and related to empirical processes. One of the elementary conditions of a social system is its code of membership and programming that code. Such conditions draw the borderline between social systems and their environments. Without it there is no domain of the social. It is recommended to analyze conditions of membership at three levels: the societal system and its differentiation, the system of organization, and the system of interaction. For comparative studies in the theory of social evolution the discrimination of the typical code of membership of segmentary, stratificary and functional differentiation is *one* indication of complexity of the societal system. In modern societies the partial variability of membership and processes of inclusion are essential features. The restructuration of these "features" is *one* of the basis requirements in contemporary social development of solidarity and bordernization in different communities. The emergency of a global world system, today, leads to new conditions of membership and role sets on the basis of social implementation of new media. *Gerhard Preyer* explores the evolution of membership as a basic feature of every collectivity, and distinguishes the conditions of membership on the levels of the differentiated social systems, formal organizations, and elementary systems of interaction. The conditions of membership within a global setting change the structuration of solidarity and bordernization processes need to relate the local and the global by medium of electronic communication. In a global world system the social change shows new features: it is a system in which globalization and new particularization are not contrary but a result of social change in time of globalization. *Barrie Axford* undertakes a close examination on what membership means in a globalized world. The notion of network, exemplified in transnational networks, is used to describe the dialectical relationships between bordernization and globalization. *Axford* examines the role of transnational networks of actors in the deterritorialization

of social relationships in a globalized world. It adopts a modified structuralist perspective on the ways in which actors both reproduce and transform the conditions for action, and explores the dialectical relationships between bordernization and globalization in light of this approach. A consideration of the applicability of the "network metaphor" for understanding some of the dynamics of globalization, leads to a critique of the activities of transnational networks and of their "thickness" or "thinness" as contexts for identity formation. Finally, three different areas of network practice are discussed to exemplify the argument. The empirical analysis is structured around the question how actors relate themselves within these global settings.

Increasing immigration, poly-ethnicity, and stabilization of ethnic identities is a common trait for all western societies. Increasing poly-ethnicity forces the political system of the open society to give rules who belongs to society and who not. With the implementation of these policies different paradoxes arise. The paradoxes of external border-structures are of special importance because they blur the member/non-member distinction of the open society. Other paradoxes arise when we look at the normative definitions of membership within the open society. These paradoxes can be interpreted as a product of the interaction between the collectivity of the open society and its political system. Talcott Parsons calls this collectivity 'societal community'. *Mathias Bös* systematizes the paradoxes within the normative patterns of membership introduced by immigration in open societies. Nationally constituted societies are conceptionalized as sets of internal and external borderstructures institutionalized in a setting of three different policies of membership: immigration policies, nationality laws and citizenship policies. In this context the example of refugees in Germany after World War II serves *Uta Gerhardt* and *Birgitta Hohenester* as the basis to explore the chances of phenomenological sociology in reframing membership processes as processes of typification. Re-typification is shown as embedded in institutional settings of citizenship that can be – and in fact were – highly influenced by political actors. Integration by social equality accompanied by cultural diversity transformed the entire German society from dictatorship to democracy. Following Schütz, it is argued that a "formula of transformation" is needed that could help merge two realms of typifications – that of foreigners as the formerly out-group and that of inhabitants as the formerly in-group – into one. Citizenship as a category that provides rights has become a more inclusive category. However, the domain of politics has also gone through many changes. *Marja Keränen* approaches the problem of political membership introducing "time" in the analysis of the categorizations of identities. The increasing internal inclusiveness of citizenship as membership in a nationally constituted society is reinterpreted by the

changing democratic practices, their reification and naturalization, and their deconstruction and politicization.

The last part "The Global and the Local: The Collapse and Reconstruction of Borderlines" is devoted to the dichotomy of the global and the local and its relation to borderlines in a time of globalization. *Christie Davies* and *Eugene Trivizas* talk about what they call "the imposition of liberty". They analyze the erosion of particularistic moral standards in Ireland in 1980s and 1990s due to powerful de-bordernization processes, which replaced these standards by the universalistic values of the legal and political institutions of the European center. There was a de-borderization in the field of law and morality such that international European institutional structures displaced those of the Irish state and enforced unwanted civil rights on Irish territory. The Irish nation state has been made subordinate to regional moral, legal and political institutional structures and been forced to uphold an external and universalistic set of rules in place of a particular Irish moral tradition. The individual citizens of the country are now freer but the collective identity of Ireland has been eroded. Contrary to the political rhetoric the so-called "transformation" i.e. the end of the SED-regime in Germany – an attempt to bring about speedy yet extensive social change – is in reality a change which scarcely allows for spontaneous order, self-organization, social evolution or development. In analyzing this example, *Walter L. Bühl's* contribution aims to clarify the structural dynamics of social evolution and to demonstrate the various control-media and the few alternative steering strategies available in a global world system.

With the fall of communism across Eastern Europe in 1989 and the official end of the USSR in 1991, the fundamental borderline that divided both Europe and the world after the Second World War, the line that defined "East" and "West," has ceased to exist. *F. Peter Wagner* surveys one of the most important publicly recognized de-bordernization processes: the collapse of the communist world. In reconstructing the historical cleavages between the "East" and "West" Wagner lays out the issues of development in regard to spatial displacement and representation that influences "western" ways of imagining the "East". How global introduced migration patterns established furthermore local forms of racism within the centers is the question *Ramón Grosfoguel* tries to answer in his contribution on colonial Caribbean migrants. The increasing marginalization of these migrants in countries so different as France, the USA, Great Britain or the Netherlands is the puzzling process, which is explored here. Today, virtually the whole of the world's population is immersed in a global context. From a society, which existed above all at a state-nation level, we have passed into another that operates economically,

institutionally and socioculturally on a planetary scale. This situation is bringing about socio-economic restructurings of local settings, which can be seen in deterritorialization processes and attempts at their reterritorialization. Here deterritorialization refers to the tendencies of these settings to break down socio-economically or culturally due to the fact that the processes and decisions over their organization and running, taken on a world wide scale, become ever more out of control of the people who live within them. *Francisco Entrena* explores the de- and re-territorialization patterns of local settings in an era of globalization. The restructuring of borderstructures along the distinction of the global and the local manifest themselves in the stressing of local particularisms and group social bonds, which become strongly territorialized and localized.

In a global worldsystem we face the growth of violence because new ascribed differences and borderlines emerge, such as militant Islamist movements, terrorism and the on. Most social scientists are helpless towards the interpretation of these trends. Although we badly need sociological answers to the problems those processes pose it remains an open question if we will find ways to get this new forms of violence under control. *Thomas Konrad* reconstructs the sociology of violence in the work of René Girard, which is widely unknown in the sociological community. According to Girard, based on a survey of literary sources from modern novels back to early myths, the breeding ground of collective violence is always a crisis in society. Violence follows the pattern of counter-violence, i.e. revenge. Revenge needs not to punish the guilty, but follows the scapegoat-mechanism. Which means, to declare someone as guilty is more important than finding real causes. In this mechanism violence becomes legitimate, by being sacred, in order of its function to end revenge. The biblical tradition unveils this way of legitimization and opens the modern understanding of delegitimating violence. According to this explanation, hence, the only peaceful way to overcome violence without counter-violence, even legitimate, is to control crisis itself.

The presented studies explore borderlines in respect to general theoretical frameworks, membership and locality. The notion of globalization is used but anchored either in reference to a specific theoretical construct or in reference to an empirical process. By doing so the concept of globalization loses much of its ambiguity. Which does of course not mean the processes the word describes are not ambiguous and paradox, they comprise the entangled aspects of the universal and the particular of the global and the local. Nevertheless the different contributions show the borderlines within world systems are a much more useful starting point for theoretical or empirical consideration on today's social world. The concepts of borderline and membership are capable to

pinpoint globalization as a process with his own "heterogeneous" evolution, discarding the picture of globalization as a development to a homogenous global system. The theoretical and empirical research on economies, cultures, and politics in a global world system is only at its beginning. But some conclusions could be made.

In the sphere of economic changes one has to notice that global strategies of production in the economic system lead to ongoing evaluations of the comparative advantages of locations. Globalization does not mean that all are winner. On the contrary we have to face the development of large new region of exclusion in South-America, Asia, and Africa. Yet, also in western societies such regions of exclusion may emerge, the so-called processes of "Brasilanization". Furthermore the development of technology and overpopulation take effects in ecology which as well leads to conflicts within and fragmentation of societies, and these "effects" are not to limit to a local level, they are global in their very nature. We have to assume that the success of global and regional economic and political problem solving differs highly. The question is what are the effects of these differences. It is the task of further research to study the role of nation-states in the networks of a global world system above all in the changed constellation between the political and the economic system. Important is to keep in mind that there will be no inclusion of all human beings as members in one "global community" and one "global culture". But there will be many global communities and networks in which people are members: The home of the employees of Siemens, which operates in 152 states at present, is not a global community as such but their local firms which process in reference to the whole trust. Concerning socio-cultural aspects of globalization, we recognize that in a global world system the cultural traditions of the world regions overlap mainly in the interactions of the political, scientific and economic elites, and it is appropriate to assume that the mutual interests are weak. Traveling and worldwide tourism are no mechanisms of global social integration because they are structured by luxurized ghettonization. It is unlikely that the world system leads to a universal lifestyle and homogenous identities in classic sense. In the system of religion and culture new "fashions" emerge together with different kinds of fundamentalisms. The catchword "hybridization" might serve as a reference point to approach the problem from a different angel. Not in theorizing difference and separation but in theorizing mixture and creativity. Perhaps many phenomena can be explained not only by diffusion but also by multifunctional conditions of membership. Collective identities and there borderlines are heterogeneous projects still as well driven by premises and resources of the different societies which constantly have to adapt to the evolution of

forms of membership. Some sobering remarks are as well at place concerning the political realm. It is doubtful that powerful global political regimes will emerge. In this context it is not at all sure if there is an increasing differentiation between political and juridical praxis in all parts of Asia, Africa or South-America. The same is true for the influence of private networks in business and politics. A global world system can not be regulated as a whole by norms and directives. There is no hegemon. In this sense it is the end of the universalistic claims of modernity, yet not of generalized "cognitive orientations" like Niklas Luhmann has called it. It is a pluralistic and chaotic system without any center or regulation of the whole system. One of the key questions is, which structures and networks of exchange between the economic system and the political system are to be expected. The restructuring of the political membership — non-membership distinction, which means citizenship, is constantly at hand in order to cope with refugee flows or regional integration.

Generally speaking: Social change in time of globalization is a *heterogeneous* development driven by premises and resources of *different* social systems. Therefore it is to expect that *different* forms of globalization produce tensions and a-synchronicities within the world system. It is a chaotic and pluralistic system: it is a system of systems. World systems have borders zones, but there are no coherent regulations of borderline processes in such systems. Therefore the control of borderline operations is not given. Theorizing the complex picture sketched here is surly no easy task. But like this volume hopefully shows there are promising ideas and approaches which can and should be explored. The research give us evidence that social system is structural determined by its code of membership, and its re-programming is one of the functional imperatives, which emerges in continuation. Yet, all these is to understand by adding the factor of time in the empirical and theoretical research of the evolution of the system of modern society, and the developments which are shown in our research. And the theory of social evolution has to be orientated along the dynamic of the global world system not on the subsystems of action in it. Further researches have to show the consequences of these processes in respect of the restructuration of social systems in time of globalization.

Gerhard Preyer,
J.W. Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Mathias Bös
Institut für Soziologie
Ruprecht Karls – Universität, Heidelberg, Germany