Globalization and Alternative Localities

Robert C. Ulin *Western Michigan University*

Abstract: This paper argues against the all too common dichotomy of globalization into a process of homogenization or a process of significant diversification. The paper seeks to bridge this dichotomy by arguing for the relative autonomy of culture with respect to global political-economy, for the plurality of voices that constitute ongoing social interaction, and for a vision of actors operating in fields of power that position human agents differentially. The essay makes use of world systems theory to illustrate the merits and problems of global analysis while focussing on the ethnographic examples of French and Michigan wine growers.

Keywords: world systems theory, globalization, wine growing, France, Michigan

Résumé : L'article s'inscrit en faux contre la vision dichotomique et récurrente de la mondialisation selon laquelle il s'agit soit d'un processus d'homogénéisation, soit d'un profond processus de diversification. L'article cherche à surmonter cette dichotomie en soutenant l'existence d'une autonomie relative des cultures face à l'économie politique mondiale, d'une pluralité des voix qui constituent les interactions sociales en cours et d'une vision qui situe les acteurs au sein de cercles de pouvoir qui leur imposent des positions différentielles. L'essai se sert de la théorie des systèmes-monde pour illustrer le bien-fondé et les défauts des analyses de niveau mondial. Il met l'accent sur des exemples ethnographiques de viticulteurs de la France et du Michigan.

Mots-clés : des systèmes monde, mondialisation, viticulture, France, Michigan

The mobility of capital, manufacture and labour and the increasing influence of technology and mass communications worldwide foregrounds globalization as arguably the dominant theme across the critical social sciences and humanities. However, while there is little disagreement concerning the importance of globalization to social change, scholars often disagree as to how we should make sense of influential global processes. Eric Wolf (1982, 1999) suggests, for example, that globalization is the latest phase in capitalist development. He emphasizes, therefore, continuities in capitalist development and the tendency of capitalism worldwide to produce similar social and economic transformations through the capitalist appropriation of social labour. Arjun Appadurai (2002: 50-51) regards globalization, on the other hand, as a more novel process involving disjuncture and thus considerable social, cultural and economic differentiation within the capitalist world system (see also Knauft, 2002).

I argue in what follows that the current dichotomy between homogeneity and diversity that typifies globalization discourse in the human sciences can be bridged through engaging dialectically the relations between culture as relatively autonomous, praxis or agency, and the positioning of human subjects historically in differentiated fields of practice and power. Such a theoretical move or option preserves Appadurai's emphasis on diversity while incorporating Wolf's emphasis on global political-economy. This is, moreover, a theoretical option that is consistent with recent efforts among critical anthropologists (see, for example, Comaroff and Comaroff, 1992) to integrate political-economy as a global process with cultural theory articulated on the local level as formative human agency.

Homogeneity and Diversity

Wolf bases his argument on globalization upon what he claims to be historical continuities in capitalist development that date from the formative period of European

empires of the 14th and 15th centuries. In his celebrated *Europe and the People without History*, Wolf maintains that Europe in 1400 was weakly organized and not politically powerful until the ascendancy of Genoa and Venice as important mercantile centres. Trade through these two important northern Italian cities funded the warfare carried on by European monarchs and provided the capital for European expansion abroad. Wolf emphasizes though that it is not the circulation of commodities alone that launched Europe's new political destiny but rather transformations in the social relations of production. He distinguishes, moreover, the alternative paths of development between tribute-taking Portugal and Spain, dependent on foreign capital, from those of France and England. Wolf's historical narrative tacks back and forth between international political-economy and the local dynamics of small-scale populations. He thus presents a view of globalization that emphasizes the increasing importance of global markets, wage labour and the process of proletarianization that have similar but not identical effects in diverse world areas. However, as we shall see with respect to world systems theory, Wolf's emphasis on the uniform nature of capitalism has been criticized (Taussig, 1987) for ignoring human agency on the local level and thus acquiescing to the overdetermination of culture on the part of political-economy. While Wolf's (1999) final work addresses the above criticism by arguing for the relative autonomy of local culture with respect to the determinations of the world system of political-economy, in the end, it is social labour that endures as dominant in determining the articulations of both culture and power in social life.

Appadurai follows, on the other hand, Lash and Urry (1987) in supporting a vision of capitalism as a disorganized process and thus maintains that we should view globalization from autonomous "ethnoscapes," "mediascapes," "technoscapes," "financescapes" and "ideoscapes." According to Appadurai (2002: 50-53), ethnoscapes refer to the "landscape of persons" in a world that is constantly changing while technoscapes refer to the "global configurations of technologies," both large and small. Financescapes refer to global capital in its various forms and the multiple channels through which it circulates. Mediascapes are "image-centered, narrative-based accounts of strips of reality" while ideoscapes are concatenations of images that are more specifically political. Appadurai's intention is to elaborate global circulation as a multiple process and thus to evaluate the different avenues or channels through which human subjects, technology, capital, knowledge and political culture are disseminated and locally articulated, reproduced and challenged. Appadurai's vision of global circulation poses, therefore, a serious but not insurmountable challenge to field research typically focussed on circumscribed locales and to the commonly held assumption that globalization is "Americanization" or "Westernization."

While I believe that Appadurai is right in emphasizing the autonomy of different spheres of human practical activity, I am not convinced that the various "scapes" are the appropriate trope with which to grasp the diversity of capitalism or for that matter globalization in that "landscapes" appear to suffer from the same inertness as the once popular "hermeneutic text" (see Ulin, 2001). Textual metaphors of human action based in the influential work of Paul Ricoeur (1971) provisionally bracket out the external references in order to privilege the examination of the text's or action's internal dynamics. While Ricoeur does insist methodologically on returning to the external referents of the text, it is clear that he locates the critical moment of exegesis within the internal structure of the text rather than within the text's formation. Like the text, the visual imagery of a fixed terrain, although perhaps aesthetically pleasing, potentially glosses over praxis and thus the historical formation of the autonomy that Appadurai stresses.

Appadurai's vision of globalization is, in my view, consistent with poststructural theory's challenge to the ontological subject and thus, as we shall see, reproduces a now long-standing theoretical divide between political-economy and poststructural and postmodern social theory.

Although discussions of globalization may appear to be of recent origin, they are not, as Anna Tsing (2002) argues, novel. Early Frankfurt school figures such as Benjamin (1969), Horkheimer (1982), Adorno (1983) and Marcuse (1964) also addressed global themes by identifying hegemonic relations between modernity, capitalism and rationality that in their views produced parallel effects in art, culture and politics worldwide[1]. Marcuse argued, for example, that mutual reliance by the United States and Soviet Union on technical or scientific reason as the arbiter of truth and the medium for managing human affairs was transforming the multiple possibilities of being human into "one dimensional man." More recently, Jurgen Habermas (1984) has written prolifically on the relation between technical reason and domination, what he calls the "colonization of the life world." Habermas's claim is, like Marcuse's, an argument for the uniform consequences of technical reason globally in terms of the increasing capacity of the state to manage and control personal life, a capacity that in turn depoliticizes the public realm.

I allude to critical theory not simply to illustrate long-standing scholarship on global issues but also because critical theory since Marx has been long noted for chal-

lenging the "given" by directing our attention to the formative social processes that are often masked by experienced quotidian life. An emphasis on formation as process suggests that the local autonomy and differentiation associated with globalization, not to mention postmodern fragmentation (see Ulin, 2001), are mediated, that is, historically and socially produced, a point likewise advanced by the Comaroffs (2000) in their critical discussion of millennial capitalism. Moving our attention to the production of autonomy and differentiation is, as we shall see, a reflexive move that potentially avoids theory's uncritical reproduction of its object of knowledge.

Embracing potential continuities in capitalism, however, or arguing for uniformities that underlie diversity is not to dismiss Appadurai's vision of globalization altogether as I believe that he has identified important components of differentiation that challenge monolithic views of capitalism as producing like effects worldwide (see also Watson, 1998) and which in turn challenge a vision of modernity as a uniform process reproduced globally in identical form (Knauft, 2002). Anthropologist Brian Larkin (2002) argues, for example, for parallel modernities[2] and thus, like Appadurai, against the commonly held belief that globalization equals Americanization. Larkin supports his argument ethnographically by elaborating the Nigerian Hausa's preference for Indian films over those produced in America. The Hausa identify closely with the narrative structure of Indian films and representations of character. This allows them "a way of imaginatively engaging with forms of tradition different from their own at the same time as conceiving of a modernity that comes without the political and ideological significance of that of the West" (Larkin, 2002: 351).

Ethnographic examples, like the above, that illustrate parallel or even alternative modernities and the local recasting of globalization are numerous (Inda and Rosaldo, 2002; Lechner and Boli, 2000) and thus compel us to take notice of the considerable diversity of globalization and global processes. One could conclude, moreover, as does Larkin (2002), that arguments for capitalist continuity and increasing social homogeneity tend to replicate Western visions of modernity by ignoring indigenous histories (e.g., precolonial, colonial, postcolonial, etc.) as independent of the West. Recognizing the autonomy of modernity allows us, as Knauft (2002: 1) argues, to think about becoming modern as "contested and mediated through alter-native guises."

If we are to take Wolf and Appadurai as illustrative of the current academic debate on globalization, then we are left with the strong impression that global discourse has been divided into competing and mutually exclusive theoretical visions of homogeneity and diversity. As I suggested earlier, this also reflects the opposition of poststructural and postmodern theory to the "logic of production" (see Baudrillard, 1975) that ostensibly informs political-economy. However, dichotomizing globalization in this manner obscures what I believe to be complementary global processes. As Jonathan Friedman argues, homogeneity and diversification are "but two constitutive trends of global reality" (Friedman, 2002: 233) and thus understanding global processes would require their integration or unity.

Although Friedman, like Appadurai, believes that the hegemonic structure of the West has been largely dismantled, he asserts (1992) that capitalism remains a homogeneous process. For Friedman, it is culture and the cultural articulations of capitalism that are diverse. For example, anthropologists working in the traditions of political-economy and cultural theory have shown—and here Mintz (1985) also comes to mind—that proletarianization or capital accumulation as a general process has dramatically transformed local life in numerous peripheries, an insight that by no means negates the remarkable potential of local communities to forge their own identities and destinies in the light of global economic, political and cultural forces. We see this manifested even in Colin Turnbull's (1968) romantic account of the BaMbuti Pygmies of the Ituri Forest. Although Turnbull is an anthropologist remote from political-economy and global theory, he conveys considerable concern in the last edition of *The Forest People* that proletarianization will dramatically alter the Mbuti's relationship to the forest. Despite these concerns, however, Turnbull shows that the Mbuti find ingenious ways to appropriate Western technology to elaborate their own culture[3] while confronting the challenges of wage labour.

To pursue a complementary vision of globalization, as the above examples suggest, through a discussion of the general ethnographic and theoretical literature on globalization, and by extension modernity, is a task of immense proportion by any means. I propose, therefore, a more modest course in elaborating the merits and problems of an earlier version of global theory, that is, world systems theory. As we shall see, world systems theory anticipates very well many of the salient issues that have come to typify discussions of globalization in the academy, including the arguments advanced by Wolf, and thus pursuing these issues critically offers much to the contemporary theory and practice of anthropology. However, to better understand the merits and shortcomings of world systems theory requires, I believe, the application of this perspective to concrete ethnographic material. Conse-

quently, I turn to my own research among French wine-growers over the past 18 years and Michigan wine growers more recently to illustrate the problems of applying a global perspective to the ethnographically concrete.

Globalization as "System"

The development of dependency and world systems theories in the 1960s and 1970s through Andre Gunder Frank (1969) and Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) respectively had without doubt an important influence on the scope of anthropological research and especially how anthropologists think about the concept of culture. Prior to their introduction, it was not uncommon for anthropologists to regard the circumscribed village as the unit of analysis which went hand in hand with a culture area concept that identified distinctive cultural traits as representative of a geographically circumscribed way of life.[4] However, both dependency and world systems theories refigured scholarly analysis from isolated societies, or circumscribed life-worlds, to broad regional and international connections of a developing global economy. Gunder Frank argued, for example, that the underdevelopment of Latin American societies was not due to anti-modernist "fetters of tradition" as local obstacles to "progress" but rather to the systemic exploitation of local economies on the part of North American and European metropoles. Wallerstein embraced and in turn elaborated Gunder Frank's emphasis on the unequal structuring of the capitalist world economy by explaining the origins of the global economy in mercantile capitalism dating from the 14th century. Wallerstein explains the global economy as emerging from unequal relations between core, semiperiphery and peripheral world areas. In short, core areas, or nations, are dominant in the world system as centers of trade, finance and production while periphery and semiperiphery areas are the suppliers of raw materials, labour and commodities.

While there are surely practical reasons for why the village was typically the predominant unit of analysis, a number of anthropologists, myself included (Ulin, 2001), have linked the general notion of circumscribed culture to anthropology's colonial legacy and the once dominant tradition of structural and functional analysis, especially among European anthropologists.[5] By establishing a theoretical framework that links reputedly *distinct* areas of the world and thus *distinct* cultures in terms of an inequality structured through an international political-economy, world systems theory (and global analysis more generally) provides a strong corrective to the historical tendency of anthropologists to reify culture as locally circumscribed.[6] Moreover, the critical parameters of international political-economy and global analysis provide, as I illustrate below with respect to French and North American wine growing, a theoretical basis from which to challenge veiled or "naturalized" renderings of a stratified and hegemonic social order.

I faced in southwest France the daunting challenge of demystifying a tradition of voluminous French scholarship that tended to "naturalize" the privileged position of Bordeaux wines while pushing to the margins of history the account of wines produced by small growers (see also Lem, 1999). Arguments that appeal to the "natural" are by no means unique, as Marx recognized early on the tendency of capitalism to mask social relations through the "fetishism of commodities," a theoretical insight that when pursued opens the study of commodities, as Sidney Mintz (1985) has noted, to the anthropology of modern daily life. Global and interregional analyses provided therefore precisely the theoretical insight needed to reconstruct an alternative historical narrative of southwest French wines.

I demonstrated with considerable detail in my *Vintages and Traditions* (1996), and so will only summarize here, that the reputed superiority of elite Bordeaux wines over those produced in the interior was not as numerous French scholars and oenologues suggested (e.g., Dion, 1977; Lachiver, 1988; Peynaud, 1988) based upon favourable climate and soil.[7] Rather, Bordeaux's pre-eminence derives from unique historical circumstances that arose as a consequence of the English occupation of southwest France from the 12th to 15th centuries. In fact, prior to the English occupation, interior wines from the vicinity of Bergerac enjoyed a significantly better reputation than those produced in the vicinity of Bordeaux. These wines were shipped, like those of Bordeaux, to northern Europe, especially England, through the lively coastal port of La Rochelle, a city which enjoyed a significant culture of production and consumption devoted to wine. However, La Rochelle fell to the French king, Louis VIII, in 1224, thus resulting in the closing of La Rochelle to English merchants. The English were in turn forced to search for an alternative port through which they could ship wine to northern Europe. Bordeaux, to the south, became the likely candidate to replace La Rochelle in that its location on the Gironde River gave merchants access to the Atlantic Ocean.

Bordeaux's transformation into the principal port of southwest France had significant consequences for surrounding areas such as the Médoc, arguably the most renowned of the Bordeaux wine-growing regions. In the early part of the 12th century, numerous crops were cultivated in the Médoc and much of the land was covered with forests. As wine commerce through Bordeaux began

to mature in the second half of the 13th century, entrepreneurial growers began to clear Médoc forests to plant vineyards. With the exception of local industries and some crude oil refining, the Médoc is agriculturally speaking monocultural, a significant contrast to numerous other wine growing regions of lesser esteem throughout France.

The most significant boost to the reputation of Bordeaux wines followed, however, from concessions that the Bordeaux councillors received in the 12th century from the English crown in exchange for acquiescing to English rule. The English crown granted special privileges to wine produced in the immediate vicinity of Bordeaux. These gave Bordeaux growers and merchants considerable advantages over wines produced in the interior of southwestern France. For example, Bordeaux wines were exempt from taxes which were levied on interior wines. Moreover, protective legislation designed to support Bordeaux growers prevented interior wines from entering the city of Bordeaux before November 11, a date that later on was changed to early December. This gave a noteworthy marketing edge to Bordeaux growers not distinct from the protective legislation enacted by nation states today to protect local and national markets. Thus the superior reputation of Bordeaux wines owes, at least in its formative period, more to English hegemony and the city's economic history than to the special character of climate and soil (Enjalbert, 1953, Ulin, 1996).

Although the historical narrative of Michigan wine growing is quite different from Bordeaux, the natural qualities of climate and soil are likewise invoked by wine experts to subordinate Michigan wines to those produced in California and to European wines as well. This is especially interesting given that American wine history begins not in California as one would expect but rather in the mid-West of the early 19th century.[8] Nicholas Longworth, an easterner, planted vineyards in Cincinnati and produced wine that was renowned for its quality. His sparkling catawba, for example, won high marks at the 1851 Great Exposition in London. However, vineyard blights made Longworth's efforts short-lived and by the late 1880s California would replace Ohio as the predominant wine producing region.

California wines of the 1880s, like Bordeaux wines of the 12th century, were not remarkable. Much of the wine was produced in bulk and consumed locally. However, this changed in 1900 with Percy Mogran's formation of the California Wine Association (CWA). Morgan, an entrepreneur and skilled financier, convinced wealthy bankers to invest in the CWA, which then managed to gain controlling interests in all the commercially significant California wineries. As Lukacs (2000: 53) relates, "The emergence of the CWA reflects the radical changes that transformed forever California wine growing, taking it from a collection of small, mostly individualized agricultural enterprises to a mercantile industry, from a local concern to a national and even international one." While it is certainly the case that California enjoys a very favorable climate for wine growing, we can see, as with the case of Bordeaux, that California's ascendancy as a wine growing region was surely more than "natural."

Michigan growers, on the other hand, like their California counterparts, replicate French standards by currently planting the European Vinifera stock and by aging some of their wines in oak casks.[9] Moreover, in order to advance the quality reputation of Michigan wines among wine writers and consumers, growers have embraced, with support from the Michigan Department of Agriculture, a system that classifies wine into four appellations state-wide. Michigan growers created appellations to replicate the European notion of *terroir* that wine experts argue links the distinctive quality of wines to a specific place and the unique characteristics of its soil. Ironically, in spite of a subaltern ranking, the cultural capital and potential financial success that follows from replicating French standards has made Michigan growers vulnerable to regional development and globalization. Silvio Ciccone, whose fame ranges from the production of quality white wines to being the father of Madonna, told me that the increasing success of Leelenau Peninsula vineyards, located just to the northwest of Traverse City, has caught the attention of multinational corporations looking to diversify investments by purchasing vineyards. On the development side, wealthy Chicago families have been attracted to Leelenau for its beauty and have been constructing 5 000-square-foot mock Victorian vacation homes on hills overlooking Lake Michigan on one side and the Grand Traverse Bay on the other. The scramble for land has created a situation where rapidly increasing prices for land put succession in wine-growing families in doubt. While the particulars concerning the price of land differ, the situation in Michigan is not unlike that in parts of France where succession has become problematic for growers with small- to medium-size holdings in vineyards.

As another informant, Ed O'Keefe, of Chateau Grand Traverse related, the price of land is too expensive to expand and yet expansion of vineyards is necessary to the economic well being of family wine growing enterprises. O'Keefe's winery is located on the neighboring Old Mission Peninsula, directly northeast of Traverse City. The Old Mission Peninsula is long noted for its production of sour cherries and presently has four wineries compared to the twelve on the Leelenau Peninsula. The local

government on Old Mission has sought, in contrast to the Leelanau Peninsula, to control development. On Old Mission, wineries must be a minimum of 50 acres and there is an absence of motels, golf courses and casinos that typically draw tourists to the Leelenau Pennisula in numbers. Nevertheless, O'Keefe confided that there is a significant difference between the cash value of farm land and development land. He is worried that at his death the vineyards of Chateau Grand Traverse will be taxed at the development rate, thus potentially forcing his two sons to sell the winery.

Although local circumstances that influence the cultivation of vineyards and the marketing of wine may differ on the Leelenau and Old Mission Peninsulas, all the Michigan wineries face a common problem of distribution. The marketing manager of Chateau Chantal, Liz Berger, told me that globalization, and mergers precipitated by globalization, have reduced considerably the number of distributors in Michigan. While wineries may sell directly to customers, they are dependent on distributors to market their wines to the large supermarket chains and to restaurants. Generally, these distributors are only interested in marketing high-volume wines from California and Europe and thus Michigan wines end up being poorly represented in larger commercial enterprises. This is not unlike the challenge of marketing faced by wine co-operatives and smaller producers in southwest France.

While the above examples are unrelated to conventional "village studies," they show that a privileging of the local, especially "climate and soil," can be demystified through historical analysis that like world systems theory focuses on the interregional and the global. In fact, the hierarchical interrelations between French wine growing regions today and the particular circumstances of French wine co-operatives that I researched are dependent upon and thus intelligible through their articulation with a global political economy. That is, what one discovers on the local level in France in terms of the social relations and wine-growing culture reflects the very historical circumstances of interregional exchange that begins with the English occupation and arguably even earlier. How else can one explain wines of distinction which have come metonymically to stand for the Médoc and perhaps French culture in general in contrast to wines of the interior that with few exceptions long ago lost any association with distinction? Contrary to Clifford Geertz's (1983) privileging of local culture as the context that informs ethnographic interpretation, local culture is marked and interpenetrated by a world system of political-economy and the political-economy of the sign (see Baudrillard, 1975). This is surely what John Cole (1977) meant in arguing that there is little that is traditional in tradition as all tradition is a product of political-economic (and I would add cultural) forces of now global import.

If we are to draw Michigan and California wine growing into the above historical scenario, although I am currently on somewhat less familiar ethnographic grounds, we discover likewise that local sociocultural circumstances are interpenetrated by, and to some extent replicate, interregional and global political-economic processes. The cases in point are the concentrations of capital that launch an industry and the consequences such as problems of succession that follow from multinational corporate interventions on the local level. This is surely what anthropologists like Wolf and Mintz have in mind in emphasizing the homogeneous tendencies of development associated with global political economy. Again, this is not to say that the results or consequences are identical, as people on the local level make choices that matter in challenging, redefining or even replicating economic and cultural articulations of global extent. It is in my view noteworthy, and not simply accidental, that Michigan wine growers replicate festivities such as marathons, the "Stompede" to be exact, that have come to typify the celebration of wine in the Médoc.[10]

Global Limitations

Although I have established the importance of a world systems perspective to the local terrain often inhabited through anthropological research, like all terrain the grounds are frequently shifting and so this is the case with world systems and global theories more generally. Some of the most significant critiques of this perspective have come from the very scholars, like Wolf and Mintz, who clearly have theoretical positions of their own which are sympathetic to Wallerstein. Mintz's *Sweetness and Power* established the dialectical connections between Africa, the Caribbean and Europe, while Wolf's *Europe and the People without History* showed that there can be no European history without considering the peoples in the margins through whose exploitation European empires were constructed. Nevertheless, both Mintz and Wolf have argued that world systems theory eclipses local dynamics that enable us to understand resistance and the mediums through which people on the local level struggle to forge their own destinies, what can be called "alternative localities." The localities are "alternative" in recognition of both indigenous histories and the formative capacity of human co-subjects to make as their own expansive social, cultural and economic processes.

To invoke a nearly forgotten figure in the recent history of Marxism, that is Louis Althusser, there is a sort of

overdetermination of the local on the part of world systems theorists. This does not mean that Wolf and Mintz believe that we should atavistically resort to a local or circumscribed unit of analysis. Rather, they suggest that critical research in anthropology must examine how the global is present in the local and the local in the global. Michael Taussig (1980) shows this in describing the resistance to wage labour of Bolivian tin miners who refigure capitalist social relations culturally in terms of making a pact with the devil. Taussig's example is by no means idiosyncratic. It resonates with my own experiences of French and Michigan winegrowers who struggle against, and sometimes borrow from, the cultural capital of elite growers and the forces of multinational corporations.

For all their considerable merits, world systems theory and homogeneous versions of global analysis have the tendency to overdetermine the local and thus eclipse the formative power of human agency. As Bruce Knauft (2002: 37) argues,

> Capitalist analysis is far weaker, however, when it comes to engaging the cultural meaning, motivations, and significations of action, both in the metropole and, even more, in the reticulated periphery. Without an understanding of cultural engagements with and resistances to domination—the focus of modernity's alternatives and alterities—capitalist analysis rings culturally flat.

That is, without some appreciation of formative activity on the local level, human agents simply become a conduit for the realization of the global system. This, I believe, is not unique to world systems theory. It is intrinsic to all systems theory and its predecessors in structural and functional analysis. Structural analysis borrows significantly, as does systems theory in general, from formal linguistics, emphasizing the interrelationship of component units within a self-contained and finite system. Units in themselves have no value except in relation to other units. The scenario is by now all too familiar. While a strong corrective to methodological individualism (the belief that social reality can be reconstructed from the position of the individual as a bounded and distinct entity) systems theoretical and structural approaches joined formal linguistics in overlooking praxis. Praxis is conceived to be the concrete activity through which human subjects engage each other in the collective formation of the social world, inclusive of their potential to self-reflexively monitor their own actions. Contrary to both systems and structural theory,[11] the praxis position accounts for the capacity of human subjects albeit not always consciously, freely or deliberately to shape their own destinies and thus opens the analysis of the social world to historical processes. In fact, it is generally argued that structural theories in particular treat social change and history as superfluous, and in the case of Lévi-Strauss epiphenomenal.[12]

To counter the charge that structural analysis is ahistorical and indifferent to human agency, Marshall Sahlins (1985) has suggested that structured culture prefigures human experience, a position that, like Foucault's, has been influential in poststructural anthropology's deemphasis of the subject. The Hawaiian's identification of Captain Cook as the god Lono rather than a wayward mariner when he arrived at the beginning of their annual ritual cycle devoted to Lono follows, for Sahlins, from this proposition. Sahlins believes, however, that the prefiguration of human experience is not absolute, for if it were, we would never be able to account for anything new. To the contrary, he argues that experience has the potential to transform the cultural code. Nevertheless, despite the acumen Sahlins has applied to solving the perennial problems of structural, and by extension systems analysis, I believe that he too falls subject to a formalism that equates culture to a univocal and automatically enacted code (Roseberry, 1989). This is precisely Gananath Obeyesekere's (1997) point in asserting that Sahlins' structural approach glosses over the multiple voices of Hawaiian subjects by assuming that the indigenous population could not distinguish myth from reality. Obyesekere's critique suggests, moreover, that Sahlins unknowingly imposes a Western vision of rationality and thus precludes the parallel or alternative modernities introduced as a critical alternative to homogenous renderings of globalization (see also Knauft, 2002).

It can be legitimately objected that Wallerstein's world systems theory and global analysis more generally does not participate in the structural and systems theoretical eclipse of history. After all how can one raise questions concerning the formation of capitalism or the interrelations between core, semiperiphery, and periphery without invoking historical analysis and process at some level? However, there is more to historical analysis than the self-evident contention that things change. Without the potential to point to the choices human actors face and how they go about making choices that are interwoven and textured by history, we arrive at social and historical narratives that seem to tell themselves (Taussig, 1987). Stories that tell themselves contribute to what Johannes Fabian (1983) has identified as the "denial of coevalness," and thus align world systems theory with the very historical negation associated with structuralism and Europe's colonial legacy. Moreover, unless attentive to the particulars of a constitutive human agency, it is all too

easy to represent culture as epiphenomenal or to incorporate culture in a fashion (as noted above) that glosses over significant distinctions and points of contestation. While world systems theory identifies how elites profit at the expense of subalterns, the mechanics of the system that postulates core, semiperiphery and periphery risks essentializing local culture as non-differentiated in contrast to the relational positions in the global economy of which it is a determined part.

The treatment of local culture as undifferentiated is the primary point taken up critically by anthropologists like Appadurai and Larkin who regard both the process of late capitalist globalization and responses to globalization as highly diverse and locally articulated. Moreover, while it can perhaps explain the mobility of labour or migration through analysis of the core-periphery relation, world systems theory glosses over subjectivity and intersubjectivity, and so does not help us much in understanding seminal issues of transnationalism such as imagined relations to the homeland. (see Gupta and Ferguson, 1997). To grasp the complexities of peoples on the move and the ever-shifting terrain of local and transnational identities, it is necessary to focus on engaging and engaged human subjects.

Let me, however, re-emphasize that the above criticism is not a dismissal of global analysis or generalizing processes. Such a position would be indefensible in light of my own use of interregional and international economic connections. These connections, as I have argued, are essential to grasping the formation of the wine growing hierarchy in southwest France and beyond. Let me suggest, rather, that ethnographic inquiry must proceed from recognizing how the regional and the global are present in "alternative" localities and how "alternative" localities can in turn be present, as Mintz (1985) illustrated with respect to sugar even when fields of action are transcended. Such a dialectical perspective points to the complementarity of the local and global, and by extension to that of the heterogeneous and homogeneous, rather than to their intrinsic opposition.

Although my own work on French and Michigan wine growers does not speak directly to the very important issue of transnationalism and imagined homelands, the symbolic or culturally contested play of French wine growing history nonetheless illustrates the complementary nature of global and local analysis, and thus the potential to conceptualize transnationalism as playing both sides of the "global divide." I have argued elsewhere (see Ulin, 1996), for example, that the formation of the southwest French wine growing hierarchy arose not only from economic initiatives that linked southwest France to northern Europe and more distantly America and Russia, but also to an invented tradition that established symbolic and cultural ties in the 19th century between a nascent bourgeoisie and a reputedly superseded nobility. That is because, in the post-revolutionary era, the vast majority of lands owned by the French nobility were seized by the Republican government.[13] Wine growing properties were expensive to maintain and thus in the long run numerous of the elite Bordeaux wine growing estates fell into a state of neglect and ill repair. Bourgeois merchants from the large Bordeaux trading houses were the only individuals with sufficient capital to acquire and restore the once celebrated Bordeaux estates, especially in the renowned Médoc. Bourgeois merchants who acquired Médoc estates elected to build their homes as small-scale replicas of the celebrated medieval French chateaux in order to distinguish themselves and their wines culturally from the wines produced by the peasant masses. These same elite proprietors were involved, along with the wine growing associations over which they presided, in the creation of the 1855 classification of Bordeaux wines, initiated at the invitation of the Universal Exposition in Paris in the Spring of 1855. The ranking of wines from first to fifth growths as illustrative of a culturally distinct group of proprietors contributed proportionately to the distinctiveness of French national culture, not to overlook the considerable commercial advantages that ensued from classified wines. Small growers in the Médoc to this day have tried to appropriate the considerable cultural capital, in Bourdieu's sense (Bourdieu, 1984), of the symbolic and hegemonic ordering of human action, and the commercial advantage associated with the elite estates of this region. Because grapes that are brought to the wine co-operatives come from the vast range of members' various small properties throughout a delimited region, in contrast to the more consolidated properties of elite growers, these selfsame small proprietors have sought to negotiate a narrative of wine-growing history that presents their wines as those truly "authentic" to the region. Co-operative growers also have successfully sought to bottle a portion of their wines under the chateau label. This is another indication of local subaltern populations having the capacity to creatively appropriate and reproduce to their own advantage hegemonic discourses.

Globalization as Discourse

The above discussion has focussed, as has much of the debate concerning globalization, on the relationship between the local and regions that lie considerably beyond. It has been my intention to show through ethnographic examples the vitality of general global analysis and, most

importantly, that local and global dynamics and analyses of these dynamics are more complementary than opposed. However, it is also the case that local and global as concepts are often taken for granted, perhaps even, like the anthropological notion of "tradition" (see Cole, 1977), reified, and thus reproduced unreflectively in virtually all the globalization literature. One noteworthy exception is Anna Tsing (2002) who has taken up critically the discourse that produces and reproduces the local and global divide. In her provocative essay on the "global situation" Tsing evaluates the discourse of globalization by examining, for example, the seductive symbolic contiguity of globalization and modernization. Moreover, she also unveils and critiques with acumen the guiding theoretical paradigms or interests of global research by looking at how the discourses of "futurism," "conflations" and "circulation" inform the work of anthropologists. "Futurism" involves a turning away from isolated local cultures to looking at the systemic dimensions of a global capitalism. "Conflations" are focussed less on the systemics of global capitalism and more on the mobility of culture, that is cultural connections across wide terrain. Its fault, like that of "futurism" is looking for a "singular anthropological globalism." "Circulation" has to do with the flow of knowledge, technology, people and culture and suggests the newness of the global epoch, although she rejects, as noted, the novelty of globalization discourse. Tsing concludes (2002: 471) that the "circulation" metaphor often fails to examine "different modes of regional-to-global interconnection."

Tsing (2002: 472) believes that with globalization "scale" must become an object of analysis. She asserts that "Understanding the institutional proliferation of particular globalization projects requires a sense of their cultural specificities as well as the travels and interactions through which these projects are reproduced and taken on in new places." Tsing goes on to say that the evaluation of scale involves two analytical principles: one, to pay close attention to "ideologies of scale," to trace the "cultural claims about locality, regionality and globality"; and second, to "break down the units of culture and political-economy through which we make sense of events and social processes." "Instead of looking for world-wrapping evolutionary stages, logics and epistemes, I would begin by finding what I call "projects," that is, relatively coherent bundles of ideas and practices as realized at particular times and places."

Tsing's discussion of globalization is important in that she deconstructs the language and practices of global theorization, a reflexive move that reminds one of the best of critical theory. Moreover, Tsing argues for the importance of human agency and self-determinations on the local level that are more than the simple responses to determining global processes. This resonates with my own work. According to Tsing (2002: 464):

> No anthropologist I know argues that the global future will be culturally homogeneous; even those anthropologists most wedded to the idea of a new global era imagine this era as characterized by "local" cultural diversity. Disciplinary concern with cultural diversity overrides the rhetoric of global cultural unification pervasive elsewhere, even though, for those in its sway, globalism still rules: diversity is generally imagined as forming a reaction or a backdrop to the singular and all-powerful "global forces" that create a new world.

Tsing is correct in arguing that anthropologists shy away from a homogeneous global future as even political-economists such as Wolf and Mintz who envision capitalism in largely homogeneous terms argue for diversity and the struggle for self-determination on the local level. Tsing is furthermore right to argue that instead of paying specific attention to locally originating projects and local articulations of culture, many anthropologists view diversity as a reaction to global processes. To disregard local determinations is to take away any substance that we would otherwise attribute to local subjects. Hence there is much merit and potential to Tsing's theoretical argument. She avoids the trappings of global and local abstractions or reifications and challenges us ethnographically to recognize the concrete quotidian practice of situated human subjects.

Despite largely agreeing with Tsing on the question of human agency, however, I part ways with Tsing when it comes to her rejection of uniform global processes. Tsing believes, I conclude, in the surpassing of Marxist political-economy as a consequence of the complexities of globalization. In reviewing the discourse of globalization, Tsing asserts that the leading trope in anthropological versions of political-economy is "penetration" and thus anthropologists operating in this theoretical paradigm are ill equipped to address the multiple avenues of "circulation" as represented (in my understanding) by Appadurai's "scapes."

Tsing is right to argue that "penetration" is an important metaphor for Marxist political-economy, one that connotes the violence of capitalism as it disrupts and ultimately transforms subsistence economies. Moreover, as I argued earlier, certain versions of political-economy potentially gloss over, and ironically so, human agency and thus are somewhat theoretically out of step with

locally generated projects and local resistance. Nevertheless, one must not forget that it was Marx who challenged circulation as the dominant trope of classical economics by pointing to the tendency of the circulation of commodities to conceal the social relations of production. Given that circulation has again become the dominant trope for understanding the contemporary human condition in its multiplicity and diversity, one must ask what this figure of speech reveals and conceals in terms of praxis or human formative activity.

No one questions that people, commodities and technology circulate. However, to accept this as simply an empirical condition of life, or as autonomous symbolic or cultural exchange, is to turn away from the historical and social processes upon which circulation depends. As we have seen, the symbolic capital of Bordeaux wines or the subaltern status of Michigan wines is a complex historical outcome. With that said, I ally myself more closely with Wolf and Mintz who emphasize the homogenizing tendencies of capitalist development while acknowledging the potential of peoples on their local levels to make their own destinies. If we are looking for a new trope, it will, as Friedman argues, have to borrow from both global and local domains.

Conclusion

The examples of the wine growing hierarchy in southwestern France and Michigan wine growers point to three theoretical issues that can go a long way towards clarifying the practical importance of global and interregional analyses while mediating and thus potentially reconciling opposed visions of globalization as either homogeneous or endlessly diversified. First, contrary to the economic teleology of some versions of global analysis, it is important to recognize the relative autonomy of cultures with respect to political-economy as well as their historical independence and interpenetration in certain circumstances. Elite growers worked, as did small proprietors, from the context of international political-economy in forming a distinctive cultural and symbolic construct. Michigan growers have sought in turn to reproduce the symbolic capital or distinction associated with European wines while challenging the notion that California wines are superior because of climate and soil.

Second, contrary to systems and structural analyses, local culture is never reducible to a code to be enacted but rather must be recast to account for the plurality of voices that are woven into the social fabric, sometimes at the center and sometimes at the periphery. The various claims for the "authenticity" of particular wines are illustrative of the contested discourse that contributes to the plurality of wine growing culture. Paying attention to differentiated voices within and between social fields of action also speaks to the capacity of human agents to initiate projects on the local level that are more than a simple reflex of global processes, while not neglecting altogether the potential of global processes to weigh upon and penetrate local cultures. It must be kept in mind, however, that just as global processes can be reified, so can those on the local level when human agents are regarded as having unquestioned autonomy to direct or originate projects of their own. Moreover, as Wolf and Mintz have argued, the local is not an undifferentiated social space but is itself fragmented and hierarchically ordered.

Finally, it is important to recognize, as an extension of "differentiated voices," concrete human actors who struggle individually and collectively over the terms of their own existence. These actors must be recognized as operating in fields of power that position human agents differentially in constructing the social world, an insight that forces us to pay attention to the competing narratives and social practices of history.

While the above points are neither comprehensive nor all-encompassing, they do offer to move the discussion beyond what are essentially non-productive dichotomies of the social world. Moreover, with the three correctives above in mind, the relative autonomy of culture, the importance of human agency, and the recognition of differentiated fields of power in which individuals and collectives forge their social existence, it is evident that global analysis continues to offer much to a critical understanding of both past and contemporary human affairs.

Robert C. Ulin, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 49008, U.S.A. E-mail: robert.ulin@wmich.edu

Notes

1 The Frankfurt School never specifically wrote about globalization, probably because the term is of rather recent origin, following especially the collapse of the Soviet Union (see also David Harvey, 2000). However, there is little doubt that the Frankfurt School was interested in a critique of global capitalism through analyzing the relationship between modernity and rationality in its various forms. The Frankfurt School's emphasis on the importance of technical reason globally could lead one to conclude that state bureaucracies are increasingly similar in spite of political differences.

2 Larkin (2002: 352) defines parallel modernities as "the coexistence in space and time of multiple economic, religious and cultural flows that are often subsumed with the term "modernity."

3 The Mbuti appropriated discarded metal drain pipes which then could be used as *molimo*, or horns, that would be blown to wake up the forest. Turnbull was worried, however, that

the trading camps and Western tourism would in the long run take the Mbuti Pygmies away from their life in the forest, transforming them into wage workers.

4 Within the anthropology of Europe, Ernestine Friedl's (1962) *Vasilika* is clearly one of those exceptions in that Friedl examines the articulation of the local to the national economy as well as the long-standing influence of Turkey on Greece.

5 Among contemporary anthropologists, it has been Jean and John Comaroff (1992), Johannes Fabian (1983) and John Cole (1977) who have succinctly connected the notion of circumscribed culture and structural-functional analysis to anthropology's colonial involvement.

6 In spite of this considerable merit, and here the critical intent of Appadurai's "scapes" come to mind, there is a tendency on the part of world systems theory, and by extension, of global analysis, to participate in the very theoretical claims that one would expect it to supersede. However, before proceeding with critique, I look first at what world systems theory in particular and global analysis in general have contributed to my own ethnographic research.

7 I am not saying that climate and soil have nothing to do with the quality of wine produced. However, quality is a subjective judgement, as some consumers prefer aged wines while others have a clear preference for young wines. Generally aged wines are regarded by experts to be better. As for climate and soil, one informant in the Médoc whose vineyards were in close proximity to a famous chateau estate, complained of the enormous price differential between her wine and the chateau wine. Surely, climate and soil were nearly identical. The price differentials arise from historical and social factors that cannot be reduced to the "natural."

8 My account of California wine growing history follows very closely Paul Lukacs's excellent *American Vintage: The Rise of American Wine*.

9 There was considerable difference of opinion in the early 1970s between Michigan State's Agricultural School and grower Ed O'Keefe over whether or not the Vinifera could be grown in Michigan. Michigan State favored what were believed to be robust hybrids while O'Keefe was adamant that the Vinifera would prosper and produce better wine. Today, most growers in Leelenau and the Old Mission Peninsula of Michigan have successfully planted and produced with Vinifera.

10 In 2002, I participated in the "Stompede" finishing third in my age class. It is my intention with my Michigan research to pay more attention to wine festivities than I did in France.

11 Jürgen Habermas and Niklas Luhmann are perhaps best know for debating the praxis theoretical and systems theoretical positions respectively. Habermas has maintained that Luhmann does not account for the self-formative potentials of human agency, including the potential of human subjects to monitor their own actions reflexively.

12 For Lévi-Strauss, all meaning, inclusive of history, is reducible to universal structures of mind. It is for this reason that I argue that Lévi-Strauss transforms history to a consequent of invariable structures, thus making history epiphenomenal to structure.

13 The seizure of noble land was not entirely complete. Some noble proprietors managed to reacquire their estates through intermediaries. This was rare, however, in the wine growing sector.

References

Adorno, Theodor
1983 *Negative Dialectics*, New York: Continuum.

Appadurai, Arjun
2002 Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Economy, *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo (eds.), Oxford: Blackwell: 46-64.

Baudrillard, Jean
1975 *The Mirror of Production*, St. Louis: Telos Press.

Benjamin, Walter
1969 *Illuminations*, New York: Schocken.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1984 *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cole, John W.
1977 Anthropology Comes Part-Way Home: Community Studies in Europe, *Annual Reviews in Anthropology*, 6: 349-78.

Comaroff, John and Jean Comaroff
1992 *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*, Boulder: Westview Press.
2000 Millenial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming, *Millenial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism*, Jean and John Comaroff (guest editors), *Public Culture*, 12(2): 291-343.

Dion, Roger
1977 *Histoire de la vigne et du vin en France*, Paris: Flammarion.

Enjalbert, Henri
1953 Comment naissent les grands crus: Bordeaux, Porto, Cognac, *Annales*, 8: 315-328, 457-474.

Fabian, Johannes
1983 *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Friedl, Ernestine
1962 *Vasilika: A Village in Modern Greece*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Friedman, Jonathan
1992 The Past in the Future: History and the Politics of Identity, *American Anthropologist*, 94(4): 837-859.
2002 Globalization and Localization, *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo (eds.), Oxford: Blackwell: 233-246.

Geertz, Clifford
1983 *Local Knowledge*, New York: Basic Books.

Gunder Frank, Andre
1969 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

Gupta, Akhil and James Ferguson (eds.)
1997 *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
2000 *Culture, Power, Place: Explorations in Critical Anthropology*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen
1984 *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. 1: Reason and The Rationalization of Society, Boston: Beacon Press.
Horkheimer, Max
1992 *Critical Theory*, New York: Continuum.
Inda, Jonathan Xavier and Renato Rosaldo (eds.)
2002 *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Knauft, Bruce M. (ed.)
2002 *Critically Modern: Alternatives, Alterities, Anthropologies*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Lachiver, Marcel
1998 *Vins, vignes, vignerons*, Paris: Fayard.
Larkin, Brian
2002 Indian Films and Nigerian Lovers: Media and the Creation of Parallel Modernities, *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo (eds.), Oxford: Blackwell: 350-378.
Lash, Scott and John Urry
1987 *The End of Organized Capitalism*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Lechner, Frank J. and John Boli (eds.)
2000 *The Globalization Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Lem, Winnie
1999 *Cultivating Dissent: Work, Identity and Praxis in Rural Languedoc*, Albany: SUNY Press.
Lukacs, Paul
2000 *American Vintage: The Rise of American Wine*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
Marcuse, Herbert
1964 *One Dimensional Man*, Boston: Beacon Press.
Mintz, Sidney
1985 *Sweetness and Power*, New York: Penguin.
Obeyesekere, Gananath
1997 *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Peynaud, Emile
1988 *Le Vin et les jours*, Paris: Bordas.
Ricoeur, Paul
1970 The Model of the Text: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text, *Social Research*, 38(3): 529-62.
Roseberry, William
1989 *Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History and Political Economy*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
Sahlins, Marshall
1984 *Islands of History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
1996 *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook for Example*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Taussig, Michael
1980 *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
1987 History as Commodity in Some Recent (Anthropological) Literature, *Food and Foodways*, 2(2): 151-169.
Tsing, Anna
2002 Conclusion: The Global Situation, *The Anthropology of Globalization: A Reader*, Jonathan Xavier Inda and Renato Rosaldo (eds.), Oxford: Blackwell: 453-486.
Ulin, Robert C.
1996 *Vintages and Traditions: An Ethnohistory of Southwest French Wine Cooperatives*, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
2001 Understanding Cultures: *Perspectives in Anthropology and Social Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell.
Wallerstein, Immanuel
1974 *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*, New York: Academic Press.
Watson, William
1998 *Globalization and the Meaning of Canadian Life*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
Wolf, Eric
1981 *Europe and the People without History*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
1999 *Envisioning Power: Ideologies of Dominance and Crisis*, Berkeley: University of California Press.