

Metaphors of Globalization

Mirrors, Magicians and Mutinies

Edited by

Markus Kornprobst
School of Public Policy, University College London, UK

Vincent Poulriot
Department of Political Science, McGill University, Canada

Nisha Shah
Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Canada

Ruben Zaiotti
Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Canada

palgrave
macmillan



Editorial matter and selection © Markus Kornprobst,
Vincent Pouliot, Nisha Shah and Ruben Zaiotti 2008
Foreword © Jan Aart Scholte 2008
Individual chapters © their respective authors 2008

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission.

No paragraph of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 4LP.

Any person who does any unauthorised act in relation to this publication may be liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 2008 by
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN
Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 6XS and
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10010
Companies and representatives throughout the world.

PALGRAVE MACMILLAN is the global academic imprint of the Palgrave Macmillan division of St. Martin's Press, LLC and of Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. Macmillan® is a registered trademark in the United States, United Kingdom and other countries. Palgrave is a registered trademark in the European Union and other countries.

ISBN-13: 978-0-230-52226-8 hardback
ISBN-10: 0-230-52226-2 hardback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

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

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

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

9

Conceptualizing Glocal Organization: From Rhizome to $E=mc^2$ in Becoming Post-Human

Sian Sullivan

Introducing glocal earth

Have you ever tried to locate your home using the online program *Google Earth*? I tried this recently. The program opened with a satellite image of the Earth against the black background of space. North America the default continent that loomed large in front of me. I typed in the simple six character postcode for my home in Norwich, United Kingdom (UK). Within seconds the globe had spun around and was speeding towards me – initially a blur of blue ocean, green vegetation and brown built-up areas, rapidly disaggregating into clusters of trees and the edges of buildings. The process made my stomach lurch, producing a sensation of roller-coaster vertigo. The dive from space to the hill that I live on, and the house that I live in, lasted approximately five seconds: a bewildering movement from global to local; a near simultaneous experience of inhabiting – of *dwelling* – in both a planet and a place.

For me, this is what is conjured up by the contemporary notion and phenomenon of *glocalisation*. Not only does this describe a collapse of temporal and spatial scales to produce simultaneous experiences and productions of macro and micro. It also combines with a post-dualist ontology that affirms a dynamic situatedness in *both* the local and the global; potentiating a corresponding embodied knowledge of comprising and constituting – of being and becoming – both a reflective and constitutive part of a whole.

Arguably, a key idea and practice distilling something of the *zeitgeist* of contemporary globalization phenomena is an intensification of

'glocal' organization. This clever term originates from Japanese business practices in the 1980s (Wikipedia, 2006) and was later popularized in the English-speaking academic world by sociologist Roland Robertson (1997). In combining and mutating the distinct terms 'local' and 'global' into a single word that signals an emerging geography of 'glocality', the term becomes an attempt to capture the interpenetrations of global and local social and spatial scales that are enhanced by rapidly globalizing digital communications technologies – particularly the buzzing trans-boundary connectivity and cyberspace imaginaries made possible by the internet (Dery, 1996; Bard and Söderqvist, 2002). It has been taken up by business in considering the provision of local services globally; in the customization of global corporate outputs for local circumstances (as in McDonald's attempts to woo local appetites via culturally-relevant menus, also see Towers, 2004); and in the amelioration of homogenizing tendencies through local agential and hybridizing uptakes of products and services (e.g. see <http://www.glocalforum.org>). A wealth of anthropological studies also are describing and theorizing the cultural hybridities produced via proliferating interactions between emplaced communities and global contexts, thereby shedding light on the negotiation of individual and social identities in these otherwise rather destabilizing circumstances (see, for example, Gupta and Ferguson, 1997; de Nève and Donner, 2006). As such, these explorations take seriously Massey's (1994:147) proposition that 'we rethink a sense of place that is adequate to this era of time-space compression'.

The multiplicitous social movements and resistances contesting the social and environmental consequences of contemporary globalization processes similarly celebrate, and are infused with, the simultaneously emplacing and dislocating sense of place that is glocality. Popular slogans central to these mutinous and inspirational movements – *The personal is political*, *Think global, act local*, *Unity in diversity*, and so on – thus play keenly to a sense that emplaced actions can effect significant sociopolitical changes in broader contexts. Unsurprisingly, a range of overlapping poststructural organizational metaphors also are significant in both describing and inspiring such 'glocal' organization. As elsewhere, these are animated by an exponential uptake of the internet and other new communications and media producing technologies, as key organizational tools in producing both social movement contestations and identities.

As theorized by feminist scholars such as Donna Haraway (1991, 1997), Rosi Braidotti (1996) and Sadie Plant (1998), as well as cybertecture theorists such as Kevin Kelly (1994) and Mark Dery (1996) and philosophers of

science such as Manuel Delanda (2002), these proliferations and intensifications require new concepts and metaphors for thinking and producing organization – in terms of both form and dynamics. As a mutinous technology – continually escaping boundaries and contributing to new communities, clusters and identities – the internet itself becomes a tool to think organizational metaphors which themselves might enhance mutiny. Metaphorical resonance here is not only to render 'one kind of thing in terms of another' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980:5; cited in Ingold, 2000:44). It also is to emphasize and enhance ontological self-similarities between qualities and phenomena, and thereby to lend power to coincident patterns and presences that otherwise might be conceptualized as disparate and disconnected.

Here I move through a range of what I consider and experience as mutinous and inspirational metaphors – opening with the fabulous organic metaphor of the rhizome as articulated by philosophers Deleuze and Guattari (1988), and closing with physicist David Bohm's articulation of the holoflux as the field of dynamic, enfolded, energetic indeterminacy where every point is connected and thereby mutually constituted. I suggest that these are differently empowering metaphors that, through indelibly and recursively entwining individual and social, as well as actual and virtual, might affirm possibilities for agency and awareness in the dynamic constitution of glocally emplaced and embodied lifeworlds. This both links with and departs from the ethical nihilism and desire for escape (from both the earth and the body) that is associated with hypermodernity and a cybercultural post-humanism (e.g. as critiqued by Arendt, 1998 (1958); Dery, 1996).

As such, the metaphors discussed here perhaps can both describe and guide a range of practices generating a contemporary (and amodern) mutinous politics of hopeful humans: from a groping towards a global autonomous do-it-yourself (DIY) culture in its myriad local manifestations (e.g. Bey, 1991 (1985); Notes From Nowhere, 2003; Spencer, 2005); to multiplicitous attempts to resist and negotiate identification by states and other bureaucracies in favour of fluid and hybrid 'identities'; and in the emergence of non-geographically defined communities and 'cultures' in both virtual and actual spaces (Hamm, 2006). I thus offer some reflections on what the term and concept of 'glocal' implies with regard to understanding what it means to be human under conditions of globalization, where the simultaneous consciousness of being both locally and globally emplaced is constantly produced, signalling both anxiety and possibility regarding desires for participation in socio-political change.

Distributed networks and glocal politics: From organic to energetic metaphors

Rhizome and mycelium

Deleuze and Guattari's (1988) now famous organizational metaphor of the rhizome¹ has become a common instrument for thinking through the organizational form and dynamics of networks. In botanical terms, the rhizome is '[a]n underground stem which grows more or less parallel with the surface of the soil' (Miller, 1984:32). Often, rhizomatous plants also are stoloniferous, stolons being '[a] part of the stem which grows horizontally along the ground, and often develops roots at the nodes' (Miller, 1984:33). Figure 9.1 shows a species of grass (*Cynodon dactylon* (L.) Pers.) familiar to wetter areas in dryland environments and which has a typically rhizomatous and stoloniferous growth form. Plant species such as this produce horizontally spreading tendrils in all directions both below and above ground: sometimes becoming rooted, sometimes producing inflorescences, fruits and seeds which on release might themselves become rooted, and sometimes coalescing at productive nodes. This growth form permits a rapid vegetative spread rate, such that it 'forms a thick mat under favourable conditions', can become a 'weed', and can be 'difficult to eradicate because of its underground runners (rhizomes)' (Miller, 1984:112). In African drylands (where I worked for several years in the 1990s, e.g. Sullivan 1996, 1999, 2000), rhizomatous plants comprise invaluable dry season grazing and are celebrated by local pastoralists, despite being dismissed as indicators of degradation by range scientists and ecologists (e.g. Bosch and Theunissen, 1992). Their underground root networks are inaccessible to grazing livestock which means that they cannot be 'overgrazed', such that it is possible for situations to arise whereby livestock die from starvation during droughts, even as the 'ungrazeable reserves' of underground plant material remain healthy (e.g. Homewood and Rodgers, 1987; Sullivan and Rohde, 2002).

In a conceptual leap that is prescient of the organizational phenomena deemed significant in the emerging sciences of complexity (Jantsch, 1980; Holland, 1992, 1998, 2000; Kauffman, 1993, 1995; Cilliers, 1998), Deleuze and Guattari (1988) employ the metaphor of rhizome to indicate a mode of organization that is a departure from the dominant organizing and structuring metaphor of modernity, namely that of the fixed hierarchical and binary splitting tree. The metaphor of the tree pervades such superficially disparate phenomena as cladistics in evolutionary biology,² the construction of genealogies, the structuralism of Chomskian linguistics, and the pyramidal structure, i.e. upturned tree,



Figure 9.1 Line drawing of the rhizomatous grass species *Cynodon dactylon* (Hitchcock, A.S. (1950) USDA-NRCS PLANTS Database, rev. A. Chase).

of modern hierarchical institutions. The structure of the tree is based on hierarchy, on fixed dichotomies (i.e. either/or classifications, binary oppositions) and on the assumption of a 'deep structure' to phenomena that can be revealed through processes of excavation or tracing 'backwards' to the 'truth', the origin.

The networked organizational form of a rhizome, although similarly generated from a range of simple organizational principles, instead gives rise to unpredictably complex and decentred configurations. Multiple horizontal connections and varying flows – i.e. movement and information exchange – between nodes permit complex possibilities for connectivity and iteration (Chesters and Welsh, 2005). Increasing connectivity, both of numbers of nodes connected and the amount or strength of information exchanged, create possibilities for emergent change in the character or quality of the network. Multiple entryways or starting points, mean that a network is open in systemic terms and thus in continual and constitutive relationship(s) with its environment(s). Perpetual branching, i.e. in a fractal-like fashion, produce qualitative similarities (not quantitative sameness) in pattern and form when observed at different scales, producing the eternal return of fractal self-similarity (Gleick, 1987).³ And possibilities for spatial and temporal concentrations of activity form temporary, 'biodegradable', 'hubs' or 'plateaux' (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988; Chesters and Welsh, 2005).

These elements – multidimensional and below-the-surface multiplication, resilience and ease of spreading accompanied by dynamic coalescences of activity – make it easy to see why the metaphor of rhizome has become so potent in conceptualizing the form and possibilities of contemporary social movements (e.g. Cleaver, 1999; *Notes From Nowhere*, 2003; Chesters and Welsh, 2005, 2006). Thus:

As the networks grow more connected, by webs and actions, wires and stories, many things will emerge that we, as mere neurons in the network, don't expect, don't understand, can't control, and may not even perceive (...) The global movement of movements for life against money, for autonomy and dignity, for the dream of distributed direct democracy, are following an irresistible logic. It is a logic as old as the hills and the forests, an eco-logic, a bio-logic, the profound logic of life. (*Notes From Nowhere*, 2003:73)

* * *

Metaphors work, at least in part, because they embody immediacy and relevance in providing clarifying lenses through which to see and translate similarities between disparate phenomena (Lankford and Watson, in press 2007). And rhizome clearly is a powerful and beautiful metaphor for describing and thinking networked forms of organization. It is even empowering in conceptually elaborating and celebrating organizational possibilities that can contest and escape the hierarchical, and

often stultifying (or molarizing, to use Deleuze and Guattari's term), tendencies associated with conventional arborecent organizational forms.

But it has limitations. In part, Deleuze and Guattari stretch it to describe organizational phenomena that are not exhibited by 'real world' rhizomes. For example, it is problematic to imply that in rhizomes each point can be connected to every other – in literal terms, rhizomatous networks are rather more linear and less immediately dynamic than this (Ingold, 2000:426). And if glocality is an intensifying aspect of contemporary globalization processes as well as of the numerous organizational cultures refracting these processes, then we can perhaps do better in generating inspirational conceptual tools for reflecting emerging organizational forms as well as for enhancing rebellious possibilities.

This implies that it may be worth considering additional filters through which to both peer at and strengthen (dis)organizational phenomena, particularly those that affirm the distributed possibilities pregnant in appropriating and embodying glocality. Several studies are playfully opening up these possibilities. In invoking 'the oddities of slime' in theorizing the movement(s) of contemporary social movements, Sheller (2003:2), for example, takes literally the metaphors of 'flow' and 'liquidity' utilized in many recent framings of the global 'networked society' and of social movement dynamics in this context (e.g. Castells, 1996; Urry, 2000). The metaphorical significance of the phase-shift that is observed as 'a cellular slime mold transforms itself into a slug capable of crawling' is taken seriously here in guiding the question of how such a shift in organizational form and effect might occur in the absence of special governing 'activator cells' or leaders (Sheller, 2003:2; drawing on Fox Keller, 1985). The pertinence of such reflections on emergent organization are abundantly clear when considering the potency of mobilizations without visible leaders in the coalescences associated with the (anti)globalization movements (e.g. at the various 'counter-summits' to the WTO, G8, IMF etc. meetings, the Social Forums, and other activist gatherings over the past few years) (*Notes From Nowhere*, 2003; Böhm *et al.*, 2005; Chesters and Welsh, 2005).

Here I add my own reflections on phenomena that metaphorically capture, and imaginatively enhance, both the complex and glocal organizational forms that are breathing life into contemporary social movements. Staying first with organic realms, and drawing on a recent exploration of fungi (Spooner and Roberts, 2005), an illuminating, if at first perhaps unattractive, metaphor is that of fungal mycelium (Ingold,

2000:426). The fungi – exuberantly diverse, celebrating the beautiful, the bizarre and the grotesque – were recognized by science as a separate ‘kingdom’ of life only in the 1950s. Before this they were generally subsumed as ‘lower’ forms of life in the plant kingdom.⁴ The fungal multiplicity inhabits just about every corner, every cramped space, of the globe. With their spreading underground fibrous mycelium, they can constitute the largest organisms on earth, as well as being the longest-lived. They form intimate and frequently mutually beneficial associations with myriad other organisms, and play a huge role in making nutrients available from decaying material.

These are interesting and inspiring phenomena. But it is their organization and dynamics that are compelling here. Fungi are comprised largely of rapidly proliferating, mostly underground or underside multidirectional networks of tiny, branching, and variously clumping threads (*myphae*) which together constitute a dynamic fungal *mycelium* or meshwork. This is the humming, below-ground, ‘virtual’ ‘backspace’ that erupts when developmental triggers are right as a variously colourful, monstrous, spectacular, tiny or huge, mushroom or toadstool. At these times an ephemeral mushroom ‘fruitbody’ – a knot of *myphae* – pushes through resistant strata at a rapid and forceful pace, eventually to release an invisible cloud of *billions* of information-carrying microscopic spores, all capable of germination given suitable environmental circumstances.

This metaphorical imagining seems to have a more exciting resonance with the (dis)organizational forms and rhythms of contemporary global post-capitalist politics. It captures the mundanity of the everyday work, the myriad exchanges and meetings, that produce actions, campaigns, networks, events and alternative values and practices of living. Think of the virtual online ‘backspace’ of decision-making of Indymedia Centres (IMC) and the global Independent Media network (www.indymedia.org) or the continual buzz of online negotiations ‘behind’ the collaborative wiki website that is the online encyclopedia commons *Wikipedia* (<http://www.wikipedia.org>). It mirrors the accelerating, even manic, pace of activity that enables the coalescence of diversity into the ecstatic counter-events that have met major international governance and economic meetings in recent years (*Notes From Nowhere*, 2003). And it is suggestive of the orgasmic proliferation of exchanges and experiences at the ‘plateaux’ of such events, released into cyberspace and global society to be jostled and buffered into who-knows-what mutated and germinated form. So, think again when you notice mould on your bread or athlete’s foot between your toes. Or wonder afresh at who the UK government is really trying to protect with its recent outlawing of the gathering of live *Psilocybin* mushrooms, the so-called ‘magic

mushrooms’ long-celebrated for their psychoactive and perception-enhancing significance (BBC News, 2005; Letcher, 2006).

At the same time, fungi are able to survive, even benefit from, catastrophe: The Palaeozoic closed, at the end of the Permian period some 248,000,000 years ago, with a mass extinction probably as a result of geological upheaval and exceptional volcanic activity. This immense ecological catastrophe is estimated to have destroyed more than 90 per cent of all species on Earth. But for fungi, as the primary agents of decay, it appears to have been a period of opportunity and plenty (...) It was a time of extreme fungal dominance. (Spoonier and Roberts, 2005:46)

Perhaps there is something to be said for quietly sharing thoughts and skills, for carefully building networks, communities and (sub)cultures, and for not burning out too much with the ecstatic headiness of conflictual engagement with macro-processes that are beyond control.

* * *

In part, what these metaphors move towards is a conceptualization that information/knowledge/power can be distributed throughout the system/network/complex/rhizome/mycelium, rather than located at the pinnacle of a hierarchy. Of course, this decentred (or accented, Deleuze and Guattari 1988:17) and distributed quality facilitates the deterritorializing momentum of global capital as it is transnogrified into flows of information via the uneven playing field of cyberspace. But it also is significant for contemporary social movements. Thus, if power is decentred and trans-local (De Angelis, 2003:5), i.e. is distributed throughout and located within the parts (nodes) of a complex, as well as in the movement of information, then – as with rhizomes and mycelium – the destruction or rupturing of a part of the complex cannot destroy the complex as a whole. Plant shoots and suckers will *mushroom* ‘above ground’ from unpredictable locations in the complex in both time and space. Crushing a bunch of protesters, a direct action, a ‘rave’ in one locality, will not prevent these from emerging elsewhere, given that these tendencies are present in broader, non-geographically located ‘cultures’. As Deleuze and Guattari (1988:9) state, a rhizome cannot be permanently ruptured (although, at large scales and in an unpredictable and non-equilibrium world, a nuclear bomb or meteorite indeed might have this effect). A social movement (un)structured on rhizomatous/network/mycelium/complex systems principles thus hierarchically might be grassroots and proliferating in n-dimensional space;

generating and becoming a multiplicity of resistances (Foucault, 1980) rather than the two-sided dialectics – the two-dimensional ‘frontline’ – familiar to us from conventional revolutionary politics. Frontlines, instead, are everywhere (Sullivan, 2003a).

Related to this notion (and empirical reality) of information/power/knowledge being located throughout the network/complex/rhizome, is the further possibility of the non-privileging of any single subject position. This emerges as an essential critique of the universalizing rationality associated with modernity, which, while aspiring to transcendentalism, i.e. to the possibility of universal truths located beyond individual human experience, nonetheless locates a normalizing subject position in the individual and socially-empowered European male (Trigaray, 1997) – a position that *via* the vagaries of history has become empowered to represent all other subjectivities (Habermann, 2004; Sullivan, 2005; Torney, 2006). In rhizomatous thought there is no single unity, entry point or ‘root’ subject position that can be traced as ‘truth’ *via* a genealogical or archaeological mode of inquiry. If we can speak of any unity at all, it is indeed the (dis)unity of ‘the multitude’ (Negri, 2002) – of ‘unity in diversity’, as a popular slogan of ‘the movement’ declares.

Complexity theory also affirms the possibility for ‘higher-order’ system change to emerge given a self-reinforcing increase in the strength of connectivity – the amount of interactions – between ‘nodes’ at ‘lower levels’. Change bubbles up from below rather than being imposed from above. Think of the way that heated, i.e. energised, water changes as it is coming to boil – tiny, discreet, bounded spheres begin to appear as bubbles on the base of a pan; they start to rise and burst as they hit the surface, and as the temperature rises, larger bubbles appear and rise at an accelerated pace until it is impossible to see where one ends and another starts. The qualitative character of these changes may be unpredictable and nonlinear, but are inevitable beyond a level of critical mass (of strength of connections, etc.).⁵ Thus the micropolitics of local-level interactions – the strength and number of connections/interactions – are able to influence macrolevel characteristics in spontaneous and unpredictable ways, *if* energy animating these interactions is present (see below). These circumstances affirm the latent possibilities embodied in the unpredictability of such nonlinear and nonequilibrium dynamics. Thus more indeed can be different. Or 1 + 1 can = apples, as Kelly (1994) somewhat flippantly affirms (also see Jensen, 2002).

It seems that the metaphors of both rhizome and mycelium can be heuristically and conceptually empowering, particularly in affirming

the potential of distributed local engagement in producing systemic/global/cultural change. But their botanical evocation of networks of lines and nodes, to some extent also reproduces the linearity in organization that they attempt to avoid. At the same time, in seemingly discounting the relevance of any hierarchical organization (other than coalescences of temporary nodes), they can contribute to a problematic stalemate between the binaries of networked horizontality and vertical hierarchy: a stalemate reproduced in Deleuze and Guattari’s (1988 (1980)) corresponding binaries of nomad and state science (Sullivan and Homewood, 2003), of the Body-without-Organs and the organized body, and of molecular and molar forms of organization. A conceptual organizational ‘meeting-place’ that collapses these binaries thus seems to be theoretically and pragmatically critical, particularly given the conflict regarding ‘horizontal’ versus ‘vertical’ organizational tendencies that has always plagued modern left-oriented politics (Lenin, 1993), and which recently has been vociferous in the UK (e.g. see Böhm *et al.*, 2005).

In other words, perhaps it is possible to reach for conceptualizations of organization that further celebrate dynamics, uncertainty and movement as well as form. Arguably the metaphors above remain locked-in to a modern ontological bubble that emphasizes the discreteness of parts between which information moves, producing linear, causal connections, however complex the networked organizational forms they might take (also see Sheller, 2003). They mirror modernity’s fetish of the actual, the discrete, the measurable: that which is amenable to mapping (also see Delanda, 2002). But the global multitudinous movements that somehow are enticed by the belief that ‘other worlds are possible’ embody and produce an energy, a desire, a joy for something different to what is now. And they invite, even deserve, a mirroring movement in the organizational metaphors they invoke and utilize. A step into the indeterminate, energetic yet embodied realms from which movement arises...

$$E=mc^2$$

This formula proposes that when a body has a mass (measured at rest), it has a certain (very large) amount of energy associated with this mass. This is opposed to the Newtonian mechanics, in which a massive body at rest has no kinetic energy, (...) the mass of a body is actually a measure of its energy content. (Wikipedia, 2006b)

To overcome the incompatibility between her plan and the limitations of her materials, Nature had to place the principle of a force, an

extraordinary *dynamis*, in the body and soul of the living creature (...) a marvellous, inexpressible (...) desire. (Foucault, 1990:106)

Why move?

Why and how does the energy embodied by a mass – of matter, of a body, of people – become released, thereby becoming something different?

Why and how does this release become woven, orientated, 'entranced' into coherence, perhaps becoming a 'social movement' and/or an effervescent event, with socio-political aims and effects?

I am not a physicist and no doubt could be lynched as an 'intellectual impostor' (Sokal and Bricmont, 1998) in invoking Einstein's famous equation here. But it seems so beautifully (and metaphorically) redolent of the dynamics of contemporary multitudinous politics.

It says that energy is mass, times the speed of light (as measured in a vacuum), squared. So, mass and energy are equivalences. But the alchemical transmutation of mass into energy – into movement (can energy be anything other than moving?) – requires the speed of light. Only more so. The speed of light, *squared*.

Where does this impetus, this ecstatic momentum – this speed of light – come from? And metaphorically, where does this momentum come from in the multitudinous politics of continual escape that is a *zeitgeist* of the contemporary moment?

Yes, of course it comes from being dismayed, angry, frustrated, depressed: at inequalities; at the barbarism of war; at the cynical busyness as usual of the arms trade; at the twisted (non)relationships that modernity (re)produces with the other beings inhabiting and making the planet; at the proliferation of controllable identity categories; at the desecralization of everything. But to look at this another way is also to see that somewhere there remains the experience – the knowledge – that this is not the only way that things can be. Is it here that resides the sting of desire for remembering? An alchemy of desire that produces the inspired knowing, yearning and erotic *puissance* to endlessly, repetitively, (re)visit and become what one is; which might be different from what modernity structures one to be. Desire as something very different to the consumptive drive for a commodified and sexualized instant gratification that is supposed to induce satisfaction and certainty in today's hyper-capitalist and cybercultural society. Desire for the possibility of change(s) as the speed of light (squared!) – the breath-inspiring contemporary hopeful social movements, organizations and activities.

But from where does desire bubble up? My guess is that it has something to do with those empty moments of no time, no space, no identity, no categories. From those ecstatic, entranced experiences where it is not simply that the borders, the lines, the boxes have dissolved: it is that they don't exist. The unspeakable experience of the swirl of immance, which now too is being captured in a plethora of terms (the virtual (Bohm, 1982; Žižek, 2004); holoflux (Bohm, 1982); the Body without Organs (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988); the Real (Lacan and Granoff, 1956)).

(...) so someone bursting out in such ecstatic laughter is without memory and without desire, for he is emitting his shout into the world's present moment and wishes to know only that. (Kundera, 1978:81)

Nevertheless, these individual escapades and lines of flight are nothing socially or politically if not articulated with other desirous movement(s). But do these articulations need to be only materialist: joined by the connecting lines of networks, and mappable as rhizomatic meshes of coalescences and dispersions? What happens if at the same time as collapsing body/energetic dualities and affirming the earth-emplaced geographies of glocality, we also call in a holoic ontology that embraces the possibilities of always being constitutive and resonant parts of broader wholes? In philosophical terms, holons are open, such that energy and information flow bidirectionally between different scales and thereby parts influence wholes and *vice versa*, i.e. they are in communicative and mutually constitutive relationship (e.g., Koestler, 1975; Edwards, n.d.; Wilber, 1995; Wikipedia, 2006c). Such openness again generates potential for emergent phenomena, i.e. for unpredictable change and becoming. The 'movement of desire', '(...) constituted, not [as] an exercise in solitude but as a (...) social practice' (Foucault, 1990: 87, 134).

These conceptualizations are mirrored by a complementary organizational phenomenon: namely, a holographic refraction of parts simultaneously containing information about wholes, such that the character of broader scales is both distributed and emergent and, to some extent, can by 'read' or implied from smaller scales (Bohm, 1982). Energetically, 'parts' become enfolded and distributed throughout wholes at the same time as every aspect of the whole contributes to – produces – the whole, whilst additionally influencing every other part. 'To see a world in a grain of sand (...)', as William Blake observed. Or, '[i]n a certain way,

one is always the ruler and the ruled' (Foucault, 1990:51). And, in stretching these energetic metaphors even further, does it become possible to affirm a shamanic 'action-at-a-distance' in producing and becoming entrained with desired changes in values (Wikipedia, 2006c, 2006d)? Perhaps the internet effects a movement towards this, in, for example, its facilitation of simultaneity in solidarity actions in geographically distant locales, and the coalescence of embodied actors via cyberspace interactions, information sharing and collective hactivism (cf. Jordan, 2002).

* * *

These phenomena are in stark contrast to the organizational assumptions infusing modernity, which valorize circumstances in which wholes, the molar structures of modern institutions, constrain and violate the desire for molecular movement (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988). They suggest that if power – *puissance* – is both distributed and subjectively realized, then, in conjunction with this holographic tendency, each part/node indeed contains something of the productive potentiality of the whole and thereby can act and move to shift values.⁷ Such conceptualizations provide theoretical succour for the possibility (and necessity?) of a molecular and minoritarian politics that, in multiplicitous and even mysterious ways, might infiltrate, infect, dislocate and refract molar structures whose destructive (i.e. unhealthy) tendencies seem rather clear (mass production/proliferation of death technologies; unprecedented suicide rates; palpable disregard for the non-human world [unless amenable to commodification, Sullivan, 2006], etc.). In terms of social-political organization, these organizational phenomena affirm, conceptually at least, the possibility of a proliferation of democratic processes (Gilbert, 2005) in which people participate and which people self-organize, together with fostering the dynamic feedback possible via connectivity between scales, producing a fractal democracy: or libertarian anarchism to use another appropriate label.

Clearly, and as with any instrument, the internet and other new communications and media-generating technologies facilitating the production of social and spatial glocality are only as good as the values with which their appropriation is imbued. Post-capitalist politics is not the only emerging 'netocracy' – to use Bard and Söderqvist's term (2002). As well as the explosion of financial markets over recent decades, which capitalize on this same 'anti-structural' potential of new communications technologies as a means of avoiding regulation and accountability

(Strange, 1998), violent insurgencies similarly have demonstrated their ability to utilize this form of rhizomatous (dis)organization, to devastating effect. In addition, the accessibility of these technologies becomes simply another means of facilitating capital's colonizing of new consumer practices and markets and may itself enhance the potential of their use by states as a surveillance tool. I also am not blind to the realities of the global inequality that exists in terms of the ability of people to access these technologies; although since they are relatively cheap and require low energy inputs, they potentially are able to be dispersed throughout communities and across the globe and currently are being used by people in remote areas of the 'developing world' as a means of sharing experiences and publicizing campaigns.

Nevertheless, a 'joining up' of the different symbolic orders of similarly-orientated autonomous groups – permitted by the transboundary technology of the internet and other communications technologies – also is facilitating a subverting and embodied biopolitics that is animated by glocal geographies and values in its contestations (and subversions) of the draining and coopting values of 'Empire' (Hardt and Negri, 2000). These may all be 'singularities' (Baudrillard, 2003). But as networked and entrained singularities and 'coalitions of discontent' (Estevea, 1997:304) – sharing concerns, experiences, desires, ideas and fears – they may indeed constitute a meaningful element in an inexorable and creative moving beyond to a post-capitalist world, the 'audacious project' of the 'alternative globalization movement' (Chesters, 2003:50).

Concluding remarks: Think glocally – act glocally!

Globalization is not only about the deterritorialization of capital and the governance issues regarding justice and distribution at a global level that arise therefrom. As Scholte (2005) remarks, what distinguishes globalization from earlier epochs is the attendant creation and emergence of new conceptions of social space and culture. For the first time in history it is possible easily to conceptualize ourselves as functionally interconnected beyond the boundaries of geographical territories and bounded cultural identities: the populist phrase 'think globally, act locally' neatly captures this conceptual shift. Aided by visual images first produced in the 1960s of our spherical planet floating isolated in space is a forcing of the recognition that events in one locality and/or moment in time can generate ripples of unpredictable effects in places/moments that seemingly are far removed. Relentless but always embodied

interpenetrations of global and local abound. Hybridization is the name of the glocal game.

Thriving in these exhilarating, exhausting, disorienting and dislocating contexts requires ideas and concepts that are enabling and empowering: that produce a sense of possibility (as well as necessity) to counter subjective submersion. But I confess that I find it hard to maintain optimism when considering some of the other glocal patterns that are emerging: a resurgence in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay (etc.) of 'the camp' as 'the subterranean stream of western history' (Arendt, 1951; Agamben, 1998; Varikas, 1998); the move towards biometrics and molecular management of identity ('[t]he Kafkaesque plot is working its way through my genetic apparatus' (Braidotti, 1996:7)); the intensification of citizen surveillance as the informatics of control society (Haraway, 1991); the abusive exertions of authority by petty officials (Russell, 2006); the multiplicitous proliferation of arms. All of these seem to me to signal a world teetering on the brink of global identity fascism, encapsulated in the alarming Project for the New American Century statement that '(...) advanced forms of biological warfare that can "target" specific genotypes may transform biological warfare from the realm of terror to a politically useful tool' (Donnelly, 2000:72). No wonder that much cybercultural embrace of the intensification of networked organization made possible by the internet avers transcendence and escape into a hyper-reality seemingly untainted by the cloying materiality of body and earth (as critiqued in Dery, 1996).

Nevertheless, the collapsing of temporal and spatial scales, coupled with the simultaneity, the non-locality, enabled by the internet, perhaps also can offer the potential for an empowering, entrancing, 'glocal politics' which affirms that local (and embodied) practices – from 'care of the self' (Foucault, 1990) to ethical consumerism to voluntary care to DIY exchange and other social practices – can contribute to emergent, life-affirming global change. This is a post-dualist orientation that resonates with a similar collapsing of boundaries and binaries familiar in post-structuralist ontologies. Donna Haraway's (1997:474) articulation of our post-modern ontology as cyborgs – the 'perversely fruitful alliance between technology and culture' (Braidotti, 1996:2) – structuring '(...) any possibility of historical transformation' is, for example, also an affirmation of the glocally-located, the simultaneously centred and dispersed, post-human(ist) human.

Thinking and acting *glocally* thus might move towards reclaiming a critical 'discourse of freedom' and autonomy (De Angelis, 2003:9; see

also Fromm, 1993; Black, 2001)⁸ by making possible a cultural politics of embodied subjectivity which holonically and holographically mirrors and refracts macropolitical scales. Problematizing what it means to be (and become) human infuses post-capitalist resistance politics, which thereby simultaneously becomes a politics of the 'post-human(ist human)'. This is a multiplicitous politics that, in thought and action, contests the universalizing Enlightenment/humanist traditions of Western science and rationality: what feminist authors such as Haraway (1997:474) frame as '(...) the tradition of racist, male-dominant capitalism; the tradition of progress; the tradition of the appropriation of nature as a resource for the productions of culture (...)'. Becoming a politics of experience (Lainig, 1967) that knows that the map is not the territory, the sign is not the signified, the doctrine is not God. And elucidating a constellation of subjective tendencies that designate self-interested, competitive economic rationality as only one aspect of the range of affective motivations influencing choices and decision-making (Lumpkin, 2000). This makes room for understanding 'the human animal' as relational as well as individual (Kumar, 2002); for affirming cooperative relations as integral to the health of individuals and communities – a far cry from the selfish genes of self-interested economic man which are the fettered rationalities of capitalist modernity; for understanding ego-consciousness – the 'particulate' as opposed to energetic, relational self (Zohar, 1990), as only one aspect of 'the self' and for suggesting that individual and cultural identities are linked indelibly with recursive and constitutive experiences of dwelled-with environments (Ingold, 2000).

Awareness of these phenomenological aspects of human subjective experience takes 'the movements' into a simultaneously pre- and post-capitalist moment – where it is possible to imagine, and thereby manifest, an idea of 'being human' that is not solely defined by position *vis à vis* either the state or the market. Monstrous, agential, shamanic cyborgs traversing and collapsing boundaries between machinic, organic and spirit realms. Subverting static gender and sexual categories – resisting orientation, as Jamie Hecker (2005) puts it. Celebrating the information produced by ecologically experiencing the Body-without-Organs (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988), subjective experiences which themselves are produced paradoxically via the holoarchitect and relational organization of 'the body'? Enmeshed with the similarly post-dualist notion of 'glocal' experience and organization, perhaps these can offer movement from the ontological closures of modernity and humanism, producing mutiny, metaphorical or otherwise.

Notes

1. Possibly after Gregory Bateson's description of the proliferating kinship network of Iatmul people as 'like the rhizome of a lotus' in *Naven* (1958:248-9; see Ingold, 2000:426).
2. Cladistics is a method of hypothesizing and analysing evolutionary relationships among groups of organisms to construct family trees or cladograms. These are based on: shared derived characteristics; a bifurcating (splitting) pattern of cladogenesis – i.e. of splitting into clades or branches; and the principle of parsimony, which assumes that the simplest pattern of branching is probably correct in terms of evolutionary trajectories and relatedness (Clos, 1996).
3. For example, as illustrated at <http://micro.magnet.fsu.edu/primer/java/scienceopticsu/powersof10/> or <http://www.wordwizz.com/pwrsof10.htm> or in computer-generated fractal geometries of the Mandelbrot set and other fractal equations, e.g. <http://www.jracademy.com/~jtucek/math/picts.html>
4. This in itself rather resonates with an ongoing and contemporary subsuming of the effervescent 'radical left' today as a 'less serious' constellation of conventional class/work/capital-orientated left politics and civil society.
5. This potential is well recognized with 'the movements,' as signified by the use of names such as 'critical mass' and 'rising tide' for cyclists and activists against the petrochemical industry (e.g. www.criticalmasslondon.org.uk and www.risingtide.org.uk).
6. The term 'holon' refers to a seemingly consistent organizational phenomenon that organs/organizations always are simultaneously both parts (of broader scales of organisation) and wholes ('in themselves'), or 'part-wholes'.
7. Perhaps this is simply another way of affirming the possibility for 'class consciousness'. I hope that it is not read in this way, however, for while economic locations in society clearly bear a relationship with possibilities for self-determination I do not think or feel that these are the only sources of alienation permeating society under conditions of late modernity (cf. Sullivan, 2003b, 2005). Accordingly, I do not consider that practices of contestation of the status quo are or should be animated only by the organized struggle for the redistribution of material wealth and security, although I also greatly affirm the importance of such struggles.
8. Although, as numerous thinkers have described, 'freedom' – being awake – also comes at a cost: namely, the fear of letting go of the familiar. Thus Sartre (1966:243) writes of being '(...) condemned forever to be free', while Fromm (1993:113) speaks of our 'fear of freedom' and 'the attraction of unfreedom', acknowledging that '[t]o be free, rather than have security, is frightening (...).'
9. As Braidotti (1996:12) suggests, 'the last thing we need at this point in Western history is a renewal of the old myth of transcendence as flight from the body.'