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Since 1999, the co-editors, Gary Backhaus and John Murungi, have been engaged in projects involving annual international conferences, the creation of an international society, and the production of edited collections. These outlets are ways in which we have developed and promoted a fundamental philosophical insight. We have coined the term, “geographicity,”—the spatial component of all phenomena—and have entreated others to make geographicity prominent in their research. The investigation of geographicity requires what we have called, “the geographical turn.” Through the geographical turn, the spatial component, or geographicity, of a phenomenon is made thematic. We do not advance geographicity as an Archimedean foundation, which would result in geographism (suffering the same fate as psychologism or logicism). We still see, however, that because geographicity is one of the necessary ontological moments that it always can be addressed. But, importantly, we have found that spatiality is routinely overlooked, unless obvious, and this is an indication of a problematic paradigm and its consequences, particularly indigenous of Western uprooted abstractions. The fundamental consequence is that research remains at a much more abstract level than it would, if, instead, spatiality were to be taken more seriously as constitutive. There is nothing wrong with abstraction in itself (if recognized as such), but geographicity always involves a greater concretization. And, without the geographical turn, important aspects of a phenomenon remain unnoticed, concealed. We believe that the lack of a geographical turn in research is indicative of the uprooted character of Western culture that has been generative throughout its history with fundamentally uprooting doctrines such as immaterial souls suffering entombment in material bodies and idealized, geometrical space as the veritable spatial dimension.

Our projects have been interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary in a tone of sharing and dialog. We have favored conversation across the disciplines, evidenced in the fact that we have played the role of editors and conference facilitators, allowing exploration to occur in communal fashion, in a creative open dimension. Interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary space discourages the attitude of “my position” and the solipsism of the lone thinker. In this way we have not followed the
institutional paradigm of separating the disciplines whereby scholars are appointed their own territories. Instead, each discipline brings its own forms of excellence into a broader contextualization, and through our projects we have opened a space for sharing these forms and building off of them. We recognize a breadth and depth to the geographical turn, with each level exhibiting its own strengths. Our “conversations” are the multi-layering of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary developments.

The contributors to this volume have been selected on the basis of the geographical turn. Two historical studies from Alex Zukas and from Christine M. Petto show how ideology and theodicy, respectively, are spatially mediated by maps, which are strong agents of spatial production. Chad Kautzer makes the geographical turn with his historical thesis that the spatiality of property (its geographicity), dominium, has been overlooked in economic globalization and rights theories. Samuel A. Butler’s examination of urban versus rural, city/countryside, with his thesis of the reversal of roles concerning revolutionary force, involves the geographicity of identity, politicization, and solidarity. Celina María Bragagnolo’s thesis involves the geographicity of knowledge in which she argues for a transversal circuitry as the spatial opening for the democratization of knowledge. Brady Thomas Heiner explores what he calls a colonial feedback-loop, or the geographicity of interior colonizing processes in his investigation of carceral topographies. Eduardo Mendieta’s explication of morphological metaphors, a spatial thematic (geographicity) of ideology critique, and his discussion of the Pentagon’s map, exhibit the geographical turn in his research. The three chapters by Janine Chi, Lorna Lueker Zukas, and RDK Herman provide case studies of specific places—the interface of “colonialization” and globalization concretely displayed. The geographical turn is not to make us all geographers, for geographers carve their own domains of research; all of us enrich and strengthen our research by examining the spatiality of the phenomenon in question.

Thus, this volume faithfully follows our science of Geophilia—the geographical turn is consciously developed on the basis of a genuine eros concerning our earthboundness. The volume’s theme of interfacing colonial and global spatial productions is of utmost importance because as basic spatializing/spatialized processes, these pervade human forms of life.

We thank everyone who has participated in our conferences, who has joined our association, International Association for the Study of Environment, Space, and Place, and who has contributed to this volume of essays. Please visit our website: www.towson.edu/iasesp.
INTRODUCTION

FORMING THE INTERFACING MODEL*

GARY BACKHAUS

Questioning the Function of the Term, “Globalization”

The fact that globalization is topical and uncritically taken to be the determining horizon of today’s world is a prime motivation for creating this edited volume, but for more pressing reasons than making an appeal to a wide readership and contributing to the general buzz of discussion. The editors, of course, note these popularizing currents, and plan to respond philosophically—by problematizing the concept of globalization and bringing it to critical reflection. What strikes us is that “globalization,” which seems to be a kind of word that should lead us to question the fundamental spatiality of our existence, instead seems to placate us with vague abstraction (vestiges of the invisible hand?). In popular usage, “globalization” is bandied about in such manner that even uncritical minds are motivated at least to ask after the significance of this word—“to pin it down.” As it becomes even more widely used, though, the word seems to exhibit less and less “traction;” other terms better provide concrete articulation of the recent changes in space-time structurizations. Some critics have gone as far to argue that “globalization” is a vacuous construct, or an ideological tool, a magical incantation promoting economic activity!

“Globalization” is used to cover a large variety of phenomena. However, each taken by itself is well circumscribed, an empirically evidenced phenomenon. The label of “umbrella term” is given to a word that carries a comprising or encompassing function. But things that are placed/found under “a covering” can really be quite disparate. And, if we become interested in the substantive phenomena under the umbrella, why would we call such things by the umbrella term? As a putative example, I may make a list of things-I-have-to-do. One of the things may be to go grocery shop-
There is reality in the fact that I have to do it, but having to do it is not
the meaning of grocery shopping. And grocery shopping has nothing
to do with grading papers, something else that I have to do. I can talk
about “things-I-have-to-do,” but these “things” are an *assemblage* of unre-
lated chores, projects, favors, etc. that unless I had to do them, they would
not be formed into the assemblage; they are only comprisable on the basis
of the “umbrella,” not on the basis of an ontological connection. I am us-
ing the term, “assemblage,” in the same sense that it is used in art, as an
arrangement of unrelated objects. Confusion arises if it is forgotten that
the assemblage is formed through an *act of colligation*, and instead is
treated as if it were formed on the basis of an *act of synthesis*. In an act of
perceptual synthesis different parts are related on the basis of belonging
together as members of a whole. Globalization, if it is an umbrella term,
certainly may be brought to fulfillment in reality, but *not as a material
unity*. Its evidence is only constituted on the basis of a colligating act,
whereby the object-formation is a *formal unity*. A formal unity that is in-
tended through an umbrella term involves a categorial construction that is
different from a genus/species relation. If someone asks me what it means:
“to-go-to-the-grocery-store,” I do not define or explicate this activity qua
species by relating it to a genus called, “things-I-have-to-do.” I do not
define dandelion by relating it to the genus, “things-found-in-backyards.”
Globalization involves things-that-are-worldwide-in-scope. Many dispa-
rate things can be placed under such an umbrella term, but it seems that
the concept of globalization is meant to entail something other than a mere
assemblage.

I use the term “to colligate,” for it is the most appropriate word ety-
mologically. “Col,” for purposes of pleasantness of sound, stands in for
“com,” which means “together.” And, “*ligare*” is the Latin for, “to bind.”
Thus, “to colligate” is to bind together. It is a higher-order conscious ac-
tivity of binding together; the intended object is not given perceptually in
passive synthesis, as is a “bunch,” a “swarm,” or a “gaggle.”

Listening to news reports, reading newspapers, hearing discussions,
etc. provide us with a barrage of phenomena that are labeled globalization,
giving the impression that the more the term is used, the less “traction” it
seems to exhibit because of its growing breadth. This is because the “um-
brella function” seems to be expanding, getting quite large; perhaps soon
globalization will be utilized to colligate “everything under the sun.” But,
on the other hand, if more and more of life’s contents are being reorgan-
ized, motivating a growing impression that a new historical *paradigm* has
emerged, the colligation of “everything under the sun” has warrant. Still,
without critical reflection, its growing use in itself is not legitimating. What is the evidential basis that there is a principle of reorganization?

For the moment let us ask the “relatively informed citizen” what the term “globalization” means—to-pin-it-down. Several general aspects make up the informed opinion: corporations transcending national borders; a global network of economic activity; telecommunications and transportation technologies “shrinking” (truncations of space-time) the globe; and, worldwide problems that in some sense affect the earth globally and thus must be addressed globally. Very few people would deny the existence and the efficacy of these phenomena. Moreover, these phenomena are only the most well recognized features of a multifarious set of phenomena that we call globalization.

Husserl provides insight into the constitutive formation of a set:

For an object which is a set, this implies that no sensuous whole is constituted by collection; the members of a set within a set (whereby we assume that it is a question of sensuous objects that are colligated) are not related to it as the parts of a sensuous whole are to the whole itself. Here there is not that synthesis of partial coincidence which we have found between sensuous wholes and their parts; the members of the set remain in a certain way “exterior to one another.” Their form of connection is not sensuous but syntactical; it is precisely one of “being colligated.” And since we can colligate everything and anything we please [italics mine], this implies that this form of connection is completely independent of the conditions of homogeneity—at least of the relations of being like and unlike—which hold for the intuitive unification of the sensuous.¹

But we have to distinguish two meanings of colligation; the difference cannot be glossed, for a constitutive analysis may reveal a viable sense in which globalization exhibits “traction.” In one sense globalization is based, as indicated above, on a colligating act of merely putting together disparate realities—an umbrella term. In a second meaning, however, colligation involves bringing together isolated phenomenon through providing explanation or hypothesis. In the second sense, colligation involves an act-complex, involving a sophisticated form of evidence. Globalization can function as an explanatory principle or a hypothetical explanatory principle (by principle, I do not mean to suggest a single sentence, the “principle” can be quite complex). Husserl discusses the constitutivity of what he calls syntactical connection, which is ontologically grounded on a formal community. Connection “is of what belongs together in some way or other, of all the elements made prominent on the basis of community.”²

The difference on the ontological side of the two intended meanings concerns whether the object-formation is merely an assemblage, an arbitrary
set, or indeed the object-complex is a formal community constituted through an explanatory principle of connection.

By explanation, I do not intend a deductive-nomological model of physicalism. Rather, I have in mind a Weberian sense of explanation within a science of verstehen. We begin with the meanings already manifest and attempt to explain why those meanings have come about. But with our notion of geographicity, we emphasize the spatiality of meanings and their explanation. Let us coin the word, “calligraphy,” by which we mean the writing of binding together, in this case, the “inscribing” of earthly space. In this way spatiality is emphasized as well as the notion of deciphering (writing). Explanation, then, is a kind of deciphering of the spatialized/spatializing meanings in the colligating/colligated acts of globalization.

The problem then: do we have mere colligation forming a merely arbitrary assemblage to which we attach “globalization”—utilizing it as a “buzzword” and functioning as an umbrella term? Or, is it that globalization is a concept that offers a principle of explanation: an act of colligation constituting a syntactical formation (a categorial/explanatory judgment) grounded on a formal community (evidence)? The problem now can be refined on this basis, properly framing the empirical fact that amongst seriously critical minds, globalization is indeed a disputed hypothesis. If it does offer an explanation, or as I more cautiously submit, a hypothetical explanation, then globalization can be more than a “buzzword.” But this would mean, on the ontological side, that a connection between the colligated phenomena is recognizable, exhibiting relation as a formal community. The very fact that it is a disputed hypothesis is glossed in popular usage and thus the disputes and nature of the disputes are not critically kept in mind. And so in the popular dissemination, globalization does not stretch much further than a handy, uncritically accepted “reality.” The popularization misleadingly suggests evidence for a syntactical formation grounded on a formal community, when indeed it may be uncritically formed on the basis of acts of mere colligation.

Let us problematize the contention that globalization contains explanatory value through an illustration. Are there really transnational corporations, or is it more appropriate to call them multinational corporations? It seems that if corporations were transnational, the nation-state would have little role or more to the point, the nation-state would cease to exist, except maybe in purely certain bureaucratic functions. But it can be argued that this is not the case, and to claim that the processes labeled globalization lead to the shriveling of the state remains speculative. A better principle of explanation concerning new corporate phenomena might be labeled, inter-
nationalization, whereby the role of nation-states is not eliminated, as they compete with one another by manipulating corporate power geopolitically, especially concerning key resources such as energy. Volatile issues revolve around which nation or nations control oil production not which oil corporations per se. Another example: global warming is now a well-established scientific hypothesis that is associated with globalization. Global warming has occurred on the basis of the increase of human population and the human appropriation of biomass for human consumption that is exacerbated by pollution and land misuse. These phenomena have been operative long before internationalization and other economic aspects associated with globalization. Global warming is a “de facto” ecological and geographical problem regardless of whether or not processes that we call globalization are instituted. It is true that what we call globalization may contribute to these problems and deal with these problems in particular ways. Taking these two cases together, “globalization” may not be the best explanation or hypothesis, or may not carry any syntactical formative efficacy if indeed there is no community between global warming and the internationalization (alleged transnationalization) of corporations. Again, without formal community, the “relationship” remains merely an arbitrary assemblage, and thus the term globalization is employed in uncritical buzzword fashion.

But perhaps its arbitrariness is an intended appearance that veils an ideological projection. Globalization is to appear as a mere assemblage in order to seem innocuous or as “the exciting progress” in an expansive “freedom.” Pierre Bourdieu states that globalization is “a pseudo-concept, at once descriptive and prescriptive.” This precisely defines the neoliberal policy inseparable from the veritable economic propaganda that lends it part of its symbolic force by playing on the ambiguity of the notion.” The ambiguity veils the policy of depoliticization, which in the name of liberty actually liberates economic forces, forces that universalize a particular political world order. So here, the mere assemblage is an appearance that masks the community meaning (“colligraphy”) of an imperial project. The ambiguity of globalization functions like the term, “modernization,” by promoting a process of normalization through a universalizing evolutionary explanation that serves to mask imperialism. And obviously, this clue leads us to construct the interfacing model in order to explore how globalization may be linked with colonialism.

I here have recognized that there are ongoing critical debates among intellectuals/experts/activists questioning the realities of, or the nature of, globalization. I have submitted a brief constitutive analysis (acts of consciousness correlated to object-formations) in order to critically evaluate
the nature of legitimate evidence. But my next strategy is not then to enter further into these controversies directly. Rather, I step back from these debates in order to take an exploratory perspective on the problem by using “colonialization” as a looking glass. In other words, relating the notion of globalization to colonialization may provide insight as to whether or not globalization offers a viable explanation of emerging world structurizations. The chapters in this volume carry out studies in this exploration.

**Between Colonialization and Globalization:**

**The Interfacing Model**

I have employed the term, “colonialization,” a neologism, instead of “colonization,” because the latter merely means the process of establishing colonies. What I want to work with is the notion of colonialism—policies of a geopolitical power that extend control over foreign soils, making those cultures subservient and dependent, including the possibilities of decimation or forced absorption. Thus, “colonialization” is the process by which a geopolitical power establishes and maintains this control through its policies. It is necessary for this analysis to emphasize process/doing/making, which is the reason for the “ization” suffix of the neologism—the process involves spatial productivities.

The term, “interface,” is crucial to the theoretical model that I develop for the purpose of exploring the link between colonialization and globalization. “Interface” is defined as the surface forming the common boundary between two parts. A “common surface boundary” between the parts of a whole can be recognized as another part, but yet functions as the surface for both of the interfacing parts. “Face” comes from the Latin, “facere,” meaning “to make,” and the root, “fa-,” meaning “to appear or to shine.” The prefix “sur” means “over” or “above.” The idea of bringing something to the surface is what I have in mind. Reflection upon the relation of colonialization and globalization brings to the surface (makes appear) phenomena that they both share, but in different ways—an interface. This is exactly how the interfacing in articles of clothing functions. It is material between the outer and inner material of a lapel, collar, etc. that gives strength to the whole article of clothing. Interfacing is able to lend its strength allowing for the whole to be a viable whole (article of clothing). It is sewn to the inside cloth so that it functions as its face (to the outside cloth) and it is sewn to the outside cloth, functioning as its face as well (to the inside cloth). Yet the interfacing can be separated from those parts and inspected as to its own quality (weave, weight, color, etc. of its constituent fibers). The interfacing in the craft of tailoring offers a con-
crete example, an analogy, for the more abstract usage from which I intend to articulate a research model.

The key point in the establishment of viable evidence is that the model attaches the interfacing phenomena to the “era of colonialization,” which is a well-documented historical period. And, it projects, hypothetically, another era labeled “globalization,” of which the world supposedly has now begun to embark, and to which the interfacing phenomena are also attached. But through being bound together through the interface, both globalization and colonialization are apprehended as parts of a whole—an historical meta-narrative. The essayists in this volume identify the interfacing phenomena that “sew” these two eras together.

Readers are cautioned not to jump to conclusions concerning this editorial choice of model and its strategy linking globalization to colonialization. I take this line of inquiry to be an exploration of the possibility of a substantive link. In exploring this possibility through an interfacing model, I have no preformed opinion as to the reality of an era of globalization or its link to colonialization. The point of the inquiry is to take up a strategy in which as a hypothesis, globalization is anchored to the reality of the era of colonialization. “Colonialization” already exhibits “traction” and thus provides an access to evidence—a grounding that provides a possible concretization that can reveal the reality of globalization. Moreover, by relating the hypothesis of globalization to something that is undeniably a well-established era of history, projections can be made as to what it will look like through various developments and ramifications of material processes and political policies. This is a viable projection, because even though globalization, qua era, is a hypothesis, globalizing processes have been legitimately evidenced. Thus, the interfacing phenomena do not play a dual role—as grounded in colonialization, but merely hypotheticals concerning globalization. These interfacing phenomena rise to the surface on the globalization side of the interface through examining globalizing processes/trends. In this way they serve as legitimate markers that help us project how the era of globalization might look, and more importantly allow us to envision those alternatives that will bring about a better, not worse, world. And this is the goal of this volume: to provide a clearing whereby a better world can be envisioned. If the interfacing phenomena are well established by the essayists in this volume, it means that the globalizing processes, suggestive of an explanatory principle called globalization, can be reckoned with in a way to have influence over the explanatory contents, that is, inform its principle of organization. If an interface is established with colonialization, then agencies are brought to light and predictions of consequences are made more insightfully. Before we, as researchers, can
say, without hesitation, that we are witnessing (present within) a new age of globalization, we should be able to say that we have already contributed to informing/warning/influencing policy.

The hypothetical quality remains even if the interfacing model brings forth quite a bit of evidence, because I maintain the notion that globalization taken as an historical age/era/period/paradigm is a hypothesis awaiting more development over time. But I believe that apprehending evidence based on preliminary indications is all that can be done at this point in time. Nevertheless, if our findings exhibit the explanatory value of globalization through this interfacing model, then our findings provide evidence for establishing globalization as a fundamental principle constitutive of an historical era (which then is appropriately named). I believe that the studies in the volume, which examine the interfacing phenomena linking (sewing together) colonialization and globalization, help to establish the connection of globalizing phenomena constitutive of a formal community, which provides the evidence for establishing globalization as an historical age. At such a time, I would advocate a different strategy. But the beauty of the current model is the recognition of the hypothetical nature of globalization, for hypotheses are malleable and predictive. We have the opportunity to project current trends/possible alternatives and their consequences, and to advocate or to discourage various policies. What we do accomplish is to provide an opening for axiological and ethical dimensions to be concretized by advocating practices that can be implemented presently.

There are three possibilities within a “new/old” matrix concerning the interface between globalization and colonialization. What we are calling globalization is: nothing new—merely a new name for continuation of already existing, but further developing, cultural/material forces; a completely new, emergent organization of forces that cannot be explained on the basis of anything past; or, a mixture or combination of new and old elements. One might think that by exploring the possible interface between globalization and colonialization that the second possibility above would be disregarded and that the first is favored; but this is not so. The evidence constitutive of the linkage (the interface) will determine the outcome concerning the three possibilities. The further importance of recognizing this matrix is that it frames our examination historiologically, that is, as a hermeneutic-historical interpretation. We do not train on the “what happened” per se of history, but rather the interpretation of the “what happened” as a continuation, a rupture, or a combination of continuity and emergence.
A Systems-Approach: Space-Time Structurizations

The systems-approach implements a geographical turn by which formal space-time structures are articulated. The geographical turn involves the notion of geographicity, the spatiality of all phenomena. And so each of the germane concepts that are important to this discussion are to be investigated on the basis of their formal geographicity. The two fundamental space-time structurizations of life most relevant to our theme are to be elucidated: a globalizing process and a colonizing process, the latter of which has two main modalities. These processes as mobilizing certain space-time forces are far from establishing globalization and colonialization as explanatory principles defining historical eras. Yet, such paradigms would be generated from these fundamental processes, if indeed the processes succeeded in restructuring the whole by becoming a hegemonic principle of spatial organization. Globalization and colonialization can be understood as generated from a context of virtualities promoting the processual development of life. By “virtualities” I mean space-time conditions brought about through the nexus of self-organizing patterning of events that allow for and are amenable towards the generation of an overall style permeating the whole—appropriately labeled by terms such as era/age/phase/period/style. Our first strategy is to recognize how the globalizing and colonizing processes manifest as basic modes in the space-time structurizations of human life. Only after these processes are understood will it be possible to enter a discussion concerning the eras/ages/periods in history whereby processual styles of these processes dominate the whole.

What I call globalizing and colonializing processes manifest as dialectical, self-organizing patterning exhibiting space-time structurizations—meaningful fields of activity, that is, events. Historical eras concern space-time structurizations of human affairs that are pervaded by a horizontal style, informing all events. In terms of globalization, a figure—specific globalizing event-processes—would occur on the background of a particular geographical expanse prolific of such processes, which in turn is hori-zoned by globalization as its fundamental space-time structurizational style, a context by which all process are colored.

At all levels of life, energy is spatially exchanged. Energy exchange involves crossing a fluid boundary of what we can term the [inner↔outer] space-time field. This primal field is a bi-polar concentricity (for the self-organizing “de-centering center” is indeed also ambiguously a constituent of the environmental field). It is a monumental metaphysical mistake to partition “the inner and the outer” as did Descartes, leading to
the erroneous modern representational theories of epistemology promoting an egregiously dualistic metaphysics. The primal field contains, as one of its poles of meaning, a nexus of energies that are self-organized, but dynamically open. This is what is meant by the “inner,” a self-organizing system of energies that continually engage in an exchange with “outer” energies in order to maintain its perdurability in life. But this exchange is fluid, meaning that it constitutes an open dynamic field. In this way the self-organizing system is developmentally interrelated with its surroundings, which functions as an environment. The environment (qua “natural”) also features self-organization, maintaining its perdurability as, in one sense, a biosphere. This inner-outer energy exchange always involves spatializing/spatialized patterning of events, space-time structurizations. Thus the boundary of the self-organizing system is not the boundary of its body; it extends over a geospatial expanse as its space-time structurizations are qualitatively contextualized while appropriating the environment as its umwelt. There is a space-time structurization that qualitatively functions as “home,” and this involves a nexus of energies that interrelates with outer energies. If we think of a human residing in a protective environment (home) and going out to forage, perhaps picking berries and digging tuber plants, energy exchanges take place as space-time patterning or events. A self-organizing system, a plant, is modified, destroyed, or preserved in its appropriation as food. In this activity and others, a territory is established. What is meant by “territory” is the spatial extent of the patterning of events or space-time structurizations that are necessary for the perdurability of life, including life qualities that transcend mere survival. Territory is the field in which a self-organizing system actively appropriates an environment for its life-maintenance.

Bands of humans work together (cooperate in space-time structurizations) and adopt various practices (institutionalize patterning), which can be transmitted (socialization of space-time patterning) to others through some medium of transmission, perhaps observation and language (enculturation). When interrelated space-time patterning is maintained for the perdurability of a group, a complex self-organizing system comes into being that we call a “community/society.” Space-time patterning manifests, and results in, objectivations of human expressions/intentions—cultural products. But important to recognize is that objectivated productions always entail their own being—an agency of structurization that retrojectively “in-forms” us. The interrelation between a society’s expressions and its objectivations forms a space-time field that is called “culture.”
Forming the Interfacing Model

The Globalizing Process

There is a biophysical limit to the space-time structuring of an individual, a band, or a culture. There can be too little or too much space-time appropriation for the perdurability, or maintenance of life. This depends on the size of the group and the nature of their cultural patterning interrelated with the nature of the environment. A space-time structurization that transcends immediate limits on the basis of a technological medium, either by expansion or diminution is to be called a globalizing process. Diminution may sound strange in association with globalization, but is there not a diminution in the time it takes to travel through the technological medium of air travel? Does not globalization also involve a centripetal intensification of certain processes and not merely spatial expansion? A globalizing process occurs on the basis of a medium, because it necessarily involves transcendence. A technological medium makes transcendence possible. “Transcendence” in this sense means the capacity for modifying space-time structurizations, overcoming limitations that would be insurmountable without a technology. Experientially, spatial diminution can occur when space-time is transcended by a technological medium in such a way that something is brought “to me” via the technology. I have no need of going to the reservoir, since the water comes out of the spigot, as it does for others of my socio-geographical locale. Spatial expansion can occur when, for example, space-time is transcended through the capacity to operate in secondary zones, such as the use of email to communicate around the world. It is obvious too that just because some energy exchange occurs, “all over the globe,” it is not necessarily a globalizing process. And even if everyone practiced a particular space-time structurization, it would not necessarily be a result of, or a manifestation of, a globalizing process. A globalizing process requires an objectivating medium, a technology that allows for patterning, not only to transcend, but also to become a constituent of the everyday fabric. A lone team of explorers hardly carries a globalizing impact, unless symbolically—claiming some landscape in the name of their country—planting a flag on Antarctica. A transcending objectivating medium allows for the inscription of culturally constitutive patterns to be operative in transcending environments, which includes one’s own. Europeans were able to watch early American TV programming such as *Lassie*; in the early 1960s, America was inundated with Japanese transistor radios. Such facts of globalizing processes seem rather frivolous or pop, but such consumer phenomena should be recognized as the most obvious effects of much deeper globalizing processes.

Sending smoke signals is a globalizing process, for immediate spacings of symbolic interaction are transcended and a message is received at dis-
tances, limited only by perception and weather conditions. These messages can be mimicked and sent along across an entire region. The smoke signals connect various groups of people on the basis of common information. Now, this globalizing process does not literally take on the proportions of the globe (globalization narrowly understood), but it functions to constitute a whole, interrelate socio-geographical entities through a nexus of energy exchange that prior to the process of employing a technological medium of space-time transcendence were unrelated separate wholes. A globalizing process can be viewed as a systems-colligating-act that exhibits syntactical-form by constituting a formal community. I am not sure that the term “global village” is viable, for the sense of village seems to me to imply a relatively small contiguous geographical expanse in which people engage in face-to-face interaction. But there is constituted a formal community, not on the basis of perception—a material community, but on the basis of a technology that links non-contiguous entities and peoples in various ways. By manifesting syntactical-form, the globalizing process exhibits constitutive agency, enculturation. Through globalizing processes of technology a material culture expands beyond the confines of separately organized social units. This material carries with it a spirit; enculturation involves a symbolic dimension. A certain culture may gain hegemony, so that other cultures are made in its image, but it is important to distinguish that this process is not necessarily the result of a colonial project.

A globalizing medium connected with the Roman Empire was the building of a standardized system of roads. The roads allowed for space-time structurizations that transcended the immediacy of environmental space, which allowed for the codification of life on the basis of Roman culture. The creation of a system of banking and a system of minting money were the technological media that formed a space-time patterning in Northern Italy. These phenomena are global agencies, initiating an economic era called mercantile capitalism. These technologies constituted the catalyst for globalizing processes. With the invention of the promissory note, the new banking practices allowed for many events transcending immediate environments to take place, especially intensifying the development of a space-time nexus for increased and expanded trade. These examples obviously exhibit crucial globalizing processes: the expansion of Roman civilization and the emergence and expansion of capitalism. But even though these concern monumental western historical moments, these globalizing processes seem to fall short of the historical situation of the contemporary world. Why this is so is quite a complex topic, but it is quite reasonable to want to claim that we are now verging on a new historical era of globalization.
The Colonizing Process

Due to the incongruities of times and spaces (biological, social, natural, etc.) that arise on the basis of fundamental laws of space-time, conflicting circumstances arise. To deal with conflicting circumstances, the political dimension arises. The political dimension is institutionalized as an instrument for maintaining certain qualities of self-organization of a social unit. In situations where there is non-resolvable internal conflict, a group can splinter off and form a similar society elsewhere. Sometimes internal conditions make space-time structurizations precarious such that it is necessary to expand, sending a portion of the population off to found a new but separate area, or sometimes to retract, abandoning an area a leaving people behind. In these situations a colonizing process emerges: it means to set-up or to allow for the set-up of an already constituted cultural space-time structurization at a new environmental location, that is, to remodel a transcending environment in order to appropriate and to adapt to its particular characteristics. At other times the space-time structurizations of two different social groups overlap in a conflicting way. Conflict arises when two space-time structurizations are incommensurable. This can lead to a project of controlling or dominating another social group through gaining control over its territory. A colonizing process involves a culture establishing dominance over another culture by the structuring of the dominated culture’s space-time on the basis of the dictates of the dominating culture. A colonizing process involves implementing one’s own forms of life in another group’s territory such that the other group, to varying degrees, adopts, either forcibly or willingly, an externally directed appropriating socialization and the parameters of foreign cultural objectivations.

A colonizing process leading to colonialization does arise in external conflicts, but it need not. In situations where the colonizing process is adopted for its own sake, that is, not out of space-time conflicts or space-time deficiencies, but rather as a self-organizing project of power domination, then the colonizing process becomes an imperializing process. But let us consult etymology in order to make a distinction.

The word colony can be traced back to the Greek word, ποικ⇔α, which is defined as a settlement far from home, a colony. But the Greek colony is a body of emigrants who governed themselves independently, yet maintained cultural ties through a continuation of religious ties. Roman writers used the word, colonia, to translate the Greek term, but eventually it was realized that the two words were not equivalent. The Latin word meant, tiller, farmer, cultivator, planter, and settler in a new country. Colonia was the appropriate term for “a public settlement of Roman citi-
zens in a hostile or newly conquered country where they, retaining their Roman citizenship, received lands, and acted as a garrison, being mostly formed of veteran soldiers who had served their time; hence it was applied to the place so occupied, or to towns which were raised to the same privileges. The difference between the Greek and the Latin terms consists in the Latin term’s connection with imperialism. The OED offers the following for the word, “imperial.” “Of or pertaining to an empire or emperor. . . . Of or pertaining to an empire, or to the empire in question; *orig*, belonging to the ancient Roman *imperium* or Empire; hence, to the Holy Roman (or German) Empire, or to so-called Empire or modern times.” But if we look at post-Columbian history, there seem to be manifestations of both Greek and Latin senses. To the extent that colonies ignore, manipulate, or resist promulgations laid down for them, and attempt to govern themselves independently, even if surreptitiously, follows the Greek sense. But to the extent that they extend power over the indigenous peoples, colonies follow the Roman sense. This is another reason why I see a need to distinguish “colonization” and “colonialization.”

**The Intertwining of the Colonializing and Globalizing Processes**

These two fundamental processes frequently intertwine, especially through conquests of war. It seems that whereas globalization need not entail colonialization, colonialization must necessarily entail globalization. This is due to the fact that the colonized people become an instrument to achieve transcendence. If the colonized people work and produce goods for the colonizers, then the culture of the colonizers is expanded beyond the otherwise limits of achievement. Let us take an example. The Romans systematically destroyed the Celtic culture, which was rooted to the land and in many ways much contrasted with Roman culture: egalitarian, non-centralized, etc. The Romans thoroughly eradicated the Celtic religion and its priests—Druidism. This they did first in Gaul and then expanded their imperial designs into Britain. Deva, as it was known then, was established as a fortress by the twentieth Roman legion Valeria Victrix. Deva had an excellent harbor and a strategic geographical position. The twentieth legion was responsible for suppressing a massive Celtic uprising. Claudius had sent sixty thousand troops to colonize Britain in 43AD. The Romans allowed the kings to continue “to rule” their people as long as they became a client-kingdom of Rome. In 61AD, the king, Prasutagus, died leaving a
will for his wife and two daughters. Not only was the will not honored by the Romans, they demanded monies be paid for their beneficial Roman upkeep. The Romans publicly beat the queen, Boadicea, and raped the two daughters. Boadicea then led an army of Celts, numbering perhaps one hundred thousand, against the Romans, embarrassing them for two years before finally vanquished. The Romans finally withdrew from Britain c. 400AD. In such an example, the globalizing technologies of Roman bureaucracy, laws, military organization, which were to be universally applied, allowed them to establish Roman life anywhere. But in order to carry out globalization of Roman civilization, it was necessary to appropriate cultures to serve them, which meant the implementation of colonializing processes in strategic (imperial) fashion. Roman civilization globalized by expansion and then by internal intensification. The ways of many other cultures, rooted to the particular landscapes that they inhabited did not develop technologies that allowed for globalization. Unless faced with disaster, such as the sharp rise in population in Viking culture, many peoples do not develop or use technologies of globalization for colonization/colonialization. Rome, an imperial-minded culture developed globalizing technologies expressly for colonialization.

The short history lesson above is meant allegorically. The geopolitical tension in the world today in light of the horizon of globalization is volatile and threatening. We see, in the lesson above, the intertwining of globalizing and colonializing processes. This is why it is so important to recognize the distinction between these two processes. Without the distinction, some researchers argue that globalization is nothing new for it has been around for a very long time in different guises and some researchers argue that colonization has never ended and that globalization is merely a new name for colonialization. Both of these views have merit, but my strategy here is to make the distinction in order to examine how as processes (not as eras) they intertwine. It may be of great difficulty, but it is necessary “to untangle the strands.” This is another reason why the interfacing phenomena are so important. In the interfacing the strands can be untangled and we can have better success in recognizing colonializing strands that we might want to eliminate, or even globalizing strands that too often enable colonialization. But the empirical fact is to be documented: we will find colonializing processes within the interfacing. How could we not find them, given the histories of the world, and most especially, following the era of colonialization?
Introduction

Historical Eras/Ages, Interfacing, and Narrative

A systems-approach for identifying an historical era has already been articulated: an era indicates the horizon characterizing the multifarious event-patterns (space-time structurizations) occurring over broad geographical expanses. Horizon implies a limit that sets the range of positive phenomena that appear—they appear on the basis of the character of the horizon. These appearing space-time phenomena are implicated in character of the horizon, regardless of whether or not the specific space-time structurization specifically supports that horizon. Let me illustrate, in an age/era of faith, secular activities take on a particular character due to the horizon of faith. Yet we must note that secular activities do not promote that horizon in a positivistic/factual sense, but their significances are measured on the basis of their contextualization within the faith horizon. It is not my purpose here to entertain empirical facts concerning what historians could call the age of colonialization or the age of globalization. Let us grant that there can be such eras in order to promote a discussion of what is constitutive of their interface. Again, I follow the sense of the word, interfacing, as it is used in the craft of tailoring in order to proceed by way of analogy. The interfacing material is neither that of the inside material nor the outside material, but a third material that allows them to be bound together in the making of something. The era of colonialization consists of colonializing space-time structurizations that pervade broad geographic expanses (mutatis mutandis, so also for the era of globalization). The interfacing phenomena must exhibit structurizations that bind these two together, which altogether then exhibits a whole. Since we proceed inductively, the first step is to become aware of these interfacing phenomena so that a synthesis can be intuited. That synthesis then perhaps can be labeled. But here there must be caution: the synthesis is not another age, but a historical dialectical process (of interfacing), not in a deterministic sense of “crude” Marxism or Hegelianism, but rather a process that binds historical succession as if it were occurring in one stream of consciousness. Let me illustrate with a mundane example. A person may be living in the “age (life-phase) of school-study,” by which life’s contents are meaningful through its horizon, and then one may begin the “age (life-phase) of professional work,” by which life’s contents are meaningful through its horizon. But how are these two ages interfaced such that they bind together into one life? What are the phenomena that interface them, such that they can be bound in a dialectical whole, called one’s life? We should not merely address these phenomena in a positivistic sense, as times of transition. And, as I have intimated, but have not made clear, we
are not looking for contradictions in one age that lead to the age that follows. Neither is it a time transition, analogous to the sheer stream of life experience. A person, who reflects on their life, asks after the question, “what does it mean,” and so tries to make sense of the phases and how they interconnect. The integrating principle of that life is a meta-narrative. We must look at the contents that function as the interfacing, for these are the moments of interpretive integration. The meta-narrative of one’s life is an on-going interpretation, but nevertheless, it also guides one through the phases of life. So, “cutting to the chase” of the analogy, the meta-narrative, which is the privileged construction of hegemonic geopolitical powers, serves to guide their policies as we enter the age of globalization.

In the interfacing contents, we can see the construction of this narrative, but if the narrative, the whole that binds together colonization and globalization, is not a positive phenomenon, it just may function as the “veritable invisible hand.” If we define globalism or colonialism as the belief system, or meta-narrative that serves to foster the hegemony of a worldview, we then can also recognize globalizations that function as counter. In other words, there are non-hegemonic alternatives.

With regard to the new episteme of space and time, for example, the Zapatistas have established a global reach through real-time Internet communication, despite their physical isolation in Chiapas. They took strategic advantage of the shrinkage of space and time in a pioneering manner, which has represented an important basis of their power. Further, much of that communication has been launched not by the ELZN directly, but by a network of supportive NGOs at new ways of knowing time and space have precipitated new forms of political organization.

Thus to struggle against globalism, it seems necessary to implement the technologies of globalization—a fascinating paradox of complexities.

Let us return to our interfacing analogy. The interfacing material is just that, material. Although we cannot properly speak of one historical period being the inside and the other the outside, still the succession of time allows for one to be thought of as the inside and the other the outside, depending upon which serves as the orientating referent. This is not an essential point but it does allow us to recall the “inside/outside” energy exchange between systems. Now the interfacing is cloth, and so is the inside and outside of the collar or lapel. But even though a cloth, the cloth fibers are of a different selection. Let us say that the inside cloth is satin and the outside cloth is woolen while the interfacing something else yet again, but all are cloth. Together they constitute a durable piece of clothing. As a whole, the clothing exhibits a certain quality. The unity involves
providing an interfacing that allows the inner and outer cloths to be brought together in a way that makes up for their differences so they can become unified.

In systems-language the interfacing structurization allows for the exchange of energy, or in terms of the previous analogy with the stream-phases of one’s life, the interfacing is a meaning-context that binds two different phases of life experiences on the basis of a certain exchange of significances.

It is now possible to discuss the nature of the interfacing. The interfacing consists of characteristics of material forces found in both eras that nevertheless are functions of each respective era. So, while operative in an era the character of a material force submits to the significance of that era. There is no way by interrogating that era so that one could know that such and such a characteristic will function as an interfacing structure. But upon envisioning two eras, one recognizes shared forces whose qualities are transposed on the basis of the difference in “horizontal style.” Still, they are recognizable, and appear, precisely due to being brought to light through the juxtaposition of the two eras. If a person reflects on their life and considers the life-phase of school/study and the life-phase professional/work, certain forces light-up as being in both phases, but functioning differently. These are noted to be the interfacial binding of these two phases in the greater meaning-context of a life.

A person just starting a new phase in life recognizes phenomena from the past phase that are refashioned on the basis of the new phase. This is the interfacing that surfaces as shared boundaries. Most phenomena are not interfacial and become “history,” but interfacing phenomena directly influence the “success” of the anticipated phase. Moreover, how these interfacing phenomena are interpreted inform their direction (policies). The world is beginning a new phase, how are we going to interpret the interfacing phenomena that we now experience, so that we inform policies?

**Concluding Remarks: The Organization of the Volume**

The volume has been divided into three major sections: historical geneeses, interfacial processes theoretically articulated, and particular locations/places as instantiations of interfacing spatial productivities. Each of these sections include components of the others, nevertheless the sections delineate the main thrusts of the related chapters. It is intended that each of the sections inform the others in a dialectical fashion, for as an edited volume there is not the linearity of argument. In the investigation of historical
phenomena, the genesis of material forces and ideological narratives in historical interfacing phenomena allow us to have a better sense of the meaning of emerging contemporary spatial productions. Then, specific processes and structurizations evident to interfacing phenomena that are operable in the contemporary sphere can be recognized as having benefited from the central strands of historical genesis and thus show continuity. Yet, they show transformation, as they operate as interface for both colonialization and globalization. Then, by placing the reader in specific place-worlds, (s)he is brought to ask about the significance of historical genesis, how indeed such worlds have emerged through historical processes and the development of structural agencies. A rich reading will emerge with a zigzag approach that allows the significance of each section to permeate the other two.

Notes

* Although I have written this introduction, its substance is the result of on-going conversations with the co-editor, John Murungi. Our ideas, together, are to found here, but in “my hand.”
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