

# What Is Glocal? Conceptual Systematization and New Theoretical Considerations on the Most Distinctive Techno-Cultural Invention of the Media Civilization

## *O que é Glocal? Sistematização Conceitual e Novas Considerações Teóricas sobre a Mais Importante Invenção Tecnocultural da Civilização Midiática*

EUGÊNIO TRIVINHO<sup>a</sup>

Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação e Semiótica. São Paulo – SP, Brazil

### ABSTRACT

The article presents the fundamental characteristics of the glocalization phenomenon, from its most remote technological origins to its current digital manifestations. According to the proposal, *Glocal* – neither global nor local, but a mixture of both – refers to processes and tendencies observed in the irreversible track of electronic communication in real-time. Concerning epistemological and empirical dimensions, the argumentation captures the glocal and glocalization's social-historical significance, focusing on its *modus operandi*, internal diversification, and multilateral consequences. The reflection adds aspects to enrich the thesis of glocalization as a civilizing process and a mode of reproduction of capitalism.

**Keywords:** Media civilization, glocal phenomenon, glocal condition

### RESUMO

O artigo apresenta as características fundamentais do fenômeno da glocalização, desde suas origens tecnológicas mais remotas até suas manifestações digitais atuais. *Glocal* – nem global, nem local, antes mescla de ambos, sem redução a nenhum – se refere, nesta reflexão, a processos e tendências observados no rastro irreversível da comunicação eletrônica em tempo real. Abarcando o tema por dupla dimensão – epistemológica e empírica – a argumentação apreende a significação social-histórica do glocal e da glocalização, com foco em seu *modus operandi*, em sua diversificação interna e em suas consequências multilaterais. A reflexão soma novos aspectos a respeito para enriquecer a tese da glocalização como processo civilizatório e como modo de reprodução do capitalismo.

**Palavras-chave:** Civilização midiática, fenômeno glocal, condição glocal

<sup>a</sup> Professor of the Graduate Program in Communication and Semiotics at Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, general coordinator of Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Communication and Cyberculture (CENCIB) at this institution and researcher of National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq). Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8764-3700>. Email: [eugeniotrivinho@uol.com.br](mailto:eugeniotrivinho@uol.com.br)

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.11606/issn.1982-8160.v16i2p45-68>

V.16 - Nº 2 maio/ago. 2022 São Paulo - Brasil EUGÊNIO TRIVINHO p. 45-68

MATRIZES

# D

## What Is Glocal?

*There won't be a door. You are inside  
And at the castle it embraces the universe  
And has neither obverse nor reverse  
Neither external wall nor secret center.*  
-J. L. Borges, *Obras completas: 1952-1972*

<sup>1</sup> See on this subject Robertson (1994, 1995, 2002), Robertson and White (2003), Sedda (2004), Trivinho (2007, 2012, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> The reflection is based on the author's previous research trajectory, of which this text constitutes a re-scaled synthesis, for dissemination to heterogeneous audiences. The main steps of this epistemological production can be found in Trivinho (2007, Part III, chaps. 1 and 2, 2012, 2014, Introduction). This notation covers the conceptual markers of the exhibition, dispensing with the need for systematic referencing.

A synopsis of the text is planned to be published in a work developed by researchers from Cencib at PUC-SP and the Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Lisbon (ICS/UL). (The release of the book has no set date.)

For the reader interested in delving deeper into the theme, there are two registers. Different perspectives from the one presented here (focusing on the socio-technological nature of the glocal, according to note 6) can be found in the works of the authors cited in note 1, referenced in the bibliography. A theoretical discussion on the relations between local and global and on the semantic trajectory of the concept of glocal in the humanities and social sciences was accomplished in Trivinho (2012), contemplating other relevant authorships, in addition to those mentioned.

THE TERM *GLOCAL* is one of the most original neologisms in contemporary technological culture. Apparently, it appeared in Asia, specifically in the Japanese corporate jargon of automotive production, in the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Subsequently, the word was adopted by the European geopolitical vision regarding ecological action. From this pragmatic circumscription to its insertion in universities in various parts of the world as an object of academic consideration in the humanities and social sciences, particularly in the area of communication studies, there was a relatively short chronological passage of no more than a third of a century<sup>1</sup>. Five decades after its appearance, the term has become as common as talking about its derivatives: *glocalization*, *glocalism* and *glocality*.

According to linguistics, defined lexical elements emerge at specific times, for generally determined reasons or desires, accumulate semantic expansion and variation, merge or commute with exogenous elements, go mad, and then wither. This performance, designed to encompass equally demonstrable phenomenal clippings, should discourage attempts at retroactive application (of signifiers and/or signifieds), especially regarding the risk of equivocation. It would duplicate historiographical exaggerations, for example, to mobilize the concept of glocal and/or glocalization to understand events and processes in pre-Homeric Greece, in the transition from the High Middle Ages to the *Quattrocento*, in the revolutionary upheaval that shook Europe at the end of the 18th century, or in the decades of Balzac and Marx. Concepts are not playful pieces to be fitted, with convenient joy, into any cavity of historical time.

Idiosyncrasies aside, one of the reworking threads of the term glocal connects it to real-time electronic communication processes and therefore inserts it exclusively in the sociomedia atmosphere unleashed from the late 19th century onward. The concept of glocal, as it has been configured in the field of communication<sup>2</sup>, refers to processes, phenomena, scenarios, events and/or trends observable only in this social-historical time period, inaugurated and unfolded to complexity in the wake of machines and communication networks, which the functioning of current life has concurred to make absolutely banal.

## SOCIOMEDIA EMERGENCE AND THE BASIC *MODUS OPERANDI* OF GLOCAL

Of the totality of machines bequeathed by modernity since the end of the 18th century – in the biomedicine, military, transportation, industry, commerce, household appliances areas, and so on – the most prevalent in a utilitarian sense for the majority of the population and that from this angle are decisively involved in all modes of group and individual appropriation, considering the production of history and civilizing directions, are the electronic technologies of communication and information in real time. Not for a different reason, from the socio-technological, economic and cultural points of view, the glocal phenomenon (from now on also referred to only by the substantiation of the adjective) has a strong impact on the organization and modulation of daily life, in compatibility with the multicapitalist model of existence<sup>3</sup>.

The social-phenomenological epic of the glocal begins, strictly speaking, with the first machine capable of approaching or equaling real time as understood in the sense of Bergson (2006), namely an ordinary and fluid time, as perennial duration, in the form-flow of a bubble of uninterrupted succession, as irreversible as it is immeasurable, and therefore internally changing at every nanosecond; an eventful time, in block and full *per se*, i.e., without *a priori* exogenous causation in its autopoietic and self-creating nature; a inscrutable *Chronon modus* in its elusive core and fundamentally dependent on the perceptive, mnemonic and conscious faculties of the human being (also determined by duration) to be with such characteristics. The aforementioned machine is the telegraph, more specifically its electric version. This invention inaugurated, as of the 1830s, the simultaneous articulation of two diverse places, under the same time zone or not, through a relatively instantaneous technical process of codification and decoding, in the *mimesis* of real time. The sociomedia posterity of this basic scheme is well known. Its *empeiria* bequeathed the conventional telephone, the radio (amateur, commercial and PX), television (open signal, cable and interactive), the Internet (late 1960s), the world wide web (early 1990s), the cell phone, the GPS, the smartphone and the smartwatch, among other devices – all with their respective networks, either intertwined or interconnected, or exclusive, as electromagnetic bands equivalent to fields of frequency, occupation and/or action by subjectivity. This trail goes from speakers (captive only to sound) to different audiovisual screens, from websites and blogs to videoconference spaces, from classic chat rooms to search platforms, relationships and participation in social networks.

As signaled before, the concept of glocal is more definite about the “real time”, now quoted to evidence and demarcate a crucial distinction: it is a time invented

<sup>3</sup>This fringe of the process exposes at the same time both its political (*lato sensu*) and transpolitical dimensions. Regarding the latter see especially the topic “The Great Glocal: Glocalization as a Civilizing Process”.

# D

## What Is Glocal?

<sup>4</sup>It is more precisely at 299.792.458 m/s.

by techno-scientific rationality, instantaneous time, time of the speed of light (at 300,000 km/s)<sup>4</sup>. An artificial chronic model, with an entirely captious profile: it plagiarizes the creative volley of nature and the daily course of history, restless in the *hic et nunc*. Equally incessant, it passes itself off as being the primal or original time itself, as well as the city and measurable time of minutes and hours, despite being a commodity offered by electronic communication companies, wired or wireless, by cable or satellite. It's worth explaining the evidence, for the sake of additional clarity: "real time" is *not* real time (either *in natura*, hermetic and unreachable, or given in the social-historical, as a process mapped by mathematical science). The social-media emergence of the glocal phenomenon has made these two types of time prevail in a regime of equivalence. The "real time" is as fluid and lived in and by the subject of perception as the plagiarized time and, not by chance, it is confused with it. The difference, subtle only to a fly-over analysis, is, in fact, gigantic and noisy: to round off the antipodean expressions, on one side, there is the immediate time of technology; on the other side, the autopoietic time of nature<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>From this moment on, the argumentation will operate with both terms, "real time" and real time, the quotation marks indicating the mimetic socio-technical artifice, by connection to the media instantaneity; and the absence of the quotation marks, the originality of the *natural* layer of the continuous duration of perceptual data (in this last case, in general, the term appears preceded by the preposition "in" or by the locution "capable of": "in real time", "capable of real time", synonyms of "in network", "capable of network").

Analytically, for the glocal phenomenon to occur – i.e., as an apparently unison block, with internal factors mixed together – it is necessary, *strictly speaking*, to have three elements: communication technology, subject (from an individual to billions of them, as audience and/or interactants) and "real time"; in an empirical equation, it is necessary to have a network capable machine available to be used by individuals; and vice-versa, in another equation: that there be networked individuals from the appropriation of devices capable of real time. Such elements are already present in the communicational structure of the electric telegraph. These notes follow *strictly* because more recent trends of glocalization have abolished the subject. Machines, themselves, communicate with each other automatically and instantaneously, so that the *tout court* equations of before are now cumulated with another, that of machines and networks as *autonomous subjects* of the glocalization process, whether or not there are people (*as beneficiary object*) on the periphery of this automated concatenation.

For the purposes of this study, this characterization excludes from the list of glocalizing inventions both the vehicles and printed products (newspapers, magazines, books) and the film projector, the gramophone, the cassette tape, the video, the DVD and similar, due to the fact that none of them *per se* are capable of real time.

The regular pre-existence of instantaneous time mediation in social relations establishes a watershed in the matter. In its elementary classification, the process of glocalization involves two clear types:

1. the glocal *stricto sensu*, whose occurrence necessarily depends on the direct presence of technologies and/or communication networks for the interactions (with human and/or artificial alterities) to take place; and
2. the glocal *lato sensu*, whose sociocultural metabolism of relationship with the circulating media contents totally disregards, in the scope of the interactions, any technology capable of networks.

In the track of the irreversible ascendancy of electronic media over the others and without excluding mixed types of glocal in between the two markers above, the *stricto sensu* modality of glocalization has predominated for decades over the *lato*, dragging it towards or relating it to some closer techno-communicational object<sup>6</sup>.

From the most extensive social-phenomenological point of view, in the analytical ascertainment of its empirical details, the glocal *stricto sensu* is equivalent to a paradoxical hybridization between, on the one hand, the immediate perceptual site in which the body is and the consciousness acts, and on the other hand, the global dimension of the communication networks, embedded in the invisibility of the electromagnetic field. In the glocal, the site of the body, in particular, remains inextricably immersed in the web of communication as ambience, while the networks *flood* (entangle from within) the local. The observed hybridization self-demonstrates what it is all about: an amalgam that cannot be unraveled and, as such, is irreversible.

Exposed in an unfolded way, the glocal *stricto sensu* amalgamates two types of space: the conventional, historically and culturally inherited, and the invisible spatiality bequeathed by technological advances (cf. Ferrara, 2007, 2008; Virilio, 1984, 1993a, 1993b, 1995). This imbrication occurs favoring media surfaces – initially exclusively sound, in the wake of the telephone and the radio; and later, audiovisual, from the emergence of television; and currently, still with the predominance of various types and sizes of screen, fixed and mobile. Likewise, the glocal, as *mimesis* is, roughly speaking, the mixture of two social forms of time: that of the time zone, which encompasses the intensity of a temporal course intercepted and indexed by the universally accepted geophysical metric instituted by national states; and the time invented by technology as a specific area of knowledge. This imbrication tends to favor the overdetermination of “real time” in relation to the ordinary time of everyday life (the time of the clocks and the calendar, linked to the duration counted in successive steps). The two coordinates of imbrication – of space and time – are, in turn, merged in the hybrid bubble of inherent and inconvertible confusion of the glocal phenomenon, which is the predominant reality of human reference and/or performance for

<sup>6</sup> As this study focuses on the rule, the entirety of the argument will prioritize the glocal *stricto sensu*, without prejudice to the fact that some theoretical premises are also valid for the more volatile glocal, free from the technological imperative.

# D

## What Is Glocal?

all everyday purposes. The phenomenology of the glocal becomes compatible with its perceptual obliteration of the artificial shuffling of both coordinates, favoring an impalpable unitary composition that finally prevails *as if it did not exist* or, at least, let itself be apprehended only by its reverberations, outside the Cartesian-empirical pantheon. The whole shows itself as a *concrete metaphysical construction*: metaphysical, in the sense of the etymon, extra physical, but not chimerical or illusory; concrete, in the sense of *something* factual, effective and practical, stable and available, as a complex synthesis of several processual determinations (cf. Kosik, 1976), without being solid, compact or thick, materially tangible. It could be asked: where then is the glocal, if it cannot be seen or verified anywhere? The question has an equivocal or improper source, viciously physical, to ascertain or deduce an existent and/or to certify about it. Among so many forms and possibilities of existence in culture, a phenomenon, in order to exist, need not have a literal place in atomic reality. A fluid objective process among the objects of the world (not necessarily corporeal or palpable), the glocal will never equal the most banal and surrounding, furrowed in the density of matter, even being the most trivial of *objects*, camouflaged or clouded by the diversionism of supposed non-existence.

In the historically most recent socio-technological equation, the hybridization that engenders the glocal is hypostasized in the screen as a redoubt of intra-action in which the time zone experienced by the body is already presumed, with this important detail: this socio-technological spatialization, the active screen, is, deep down, time – real time tied with city time, both in the typical flow-form of “real time”. The fact that the screen as a reference surface is rather time and not merely space, contrary to any perceptive evidence, reveals *per se* in the simplicity of the manifestation of its own flow-entity: it is enough to turn off the screen to verify that, in a snap of a finger, the socio-technological spatiality disappears. In the glocal, time as the hegemonic coordinate commands the entire process, as it roots – with the power of life and death, so to speak – in the principle of every dynamic: as a technocultural construction, the glocal is *disconnectable*. The consciousness, seemingly freer than the body in the midst of all determinations, wanders in and through them: the technological conditions in real time, by allowing the consciousness to break with the limits of the local, also make it capable of *touching* others at a distance and producing multiple effects where they are.

This exemplification of the glocal by the metaphor of the temporalized socio-spatialization of the screen – a phenomenon that can be turned off by a simple act – contributes to the apprehension of an inherent injunction to the glocal that deserves to be emphasized. As signaled above, what at first sight, under

an exclusively descriptive concern appears as an inextricable integration between ultra-antiquity and cutting-edge technological modernity, conventional reality and the techno-scientific innovation, and the visible and the invisible, changes completely its silhouette the more the cognitive interest deepens its focus, searching for the fundamental under the sieve of criticality. Far from being the equivalent of any neutral synthesis, the glocal is not harmless either. It is the flagrant symptom, in scarred scar at the social-historical level, of the subtle technocultural subordination of ordinary space and time to the time created by teletechnologies, the industrious time of the false day so to speak (Virilio, 1993a, 1993b, pp. 22, 113), for all pragmatic purposes in social, political, and economic matters. Expressed in the opposite way, the hybridization subsumed in the glocal represents the authoritarian ascendancy of technological spatiality and “real time” over conventional space and time. The glocal freezes and eternalizes this verticalization in the improbable field of electromagnetic invisibility: for all its self-dissolving drawbacks, it is as if this diagonal power scheme does not effectively exist either.

This kind of inherent relationship covers, in turn, another fundamental feature of the glocal, one that pertains to its original identity and will accompany it forever. The glocal, as a technocultural invention of capitalism that was lately *industrialized*, is violence: it breaks the identity of the diverse and/or the dispersed in order to frame and unify all the factors in the molds of a unitary *construct* that publicity takes care of selling as unison, expunging under the carpet of history any and all tension involved. The liquefied ascendancy of the network over the time zone, synonymous with the imperceptible overdetermination of the global in relation to the local, is performed in the subsequent trail of mixing between the near and the far, the public and the private etc., without the occurrence of *stricto sensu* impositions. The invisible authoritarianism of the process dissolves itself in the acceptability of the phenomenon by all age groups, in all social class positions, in all domains. The social-historical legitimacy of the glocal passes, in the smallest inscrutable detail, through the desire for consumption and performance by each individual. This validation, rooted in the morality of days, is embedded from before the first trivial empirical act presupposed in it: that of acquiring a machine capable of real time, to be in force at the epicenter of what is lived, henceforth already from the body (in ultra-portable prostheses, mobiles), available for daily enjoyment. In this ambit – *in between* co-fusions – it will be up to the most politicized uses only to contest the mentioned subordination or overdetermination, in favor of its minimal reversal, always precarious, via instrumentalization of the network for purposes of opposition to the status quo – i.e., of the local against the global embedded in it, from inside the glocal itself; and also against the glocalized structural state of things.

**GLOCAL AS *EMPEIRIA* AND *EPISTEME***

The characterization of the basic aspects of the glocal phenomenon finds, at this point, a vortex of rescaling of the approach. The complexity of the subject requires that it be apprehended in greater depth.

Ironically integrated double-bladed paradox, the glocal is simultaneously *empeiria* and *episteme*. These two dimensions, each in its own way, were implicated in the course of the exposition, as they remain in the subsequent topics. They appeared, one in connection with the other, when the argument, focusing on the basic mode of being of the glocal, signaled its potential to unfold to the apex of its socio-technological complexity. Its worldwide spread independent of any political regimes, its presumed peculiar *modus operandi* in recent decades, cyberculture, here taken as a category of time. Likewise, they were also present when the argument, reangulated in prism, reported the incorporation of the term glocal into the human and social sciences, especially in the field of communication and cyberculture studies, a sign of radical semantic modulation of the word in favor of its elaboration as a concept, for theoretical tension with the mode of social-historical reproduction of advanced media civilization.

As *empeiria*, the glocal has been in the world since at least the commercial heyday of radio – a typical social-historical form, on a media basis in real time – unfolding the socio-technological traits and potentials pointed out: it is in force on all continents, in a more saturated and accumulated way in certain territories, more rarefied and scarce in others. As an *episteme*, it is a paradigmatic prism for the production of knowledge and, above all, criticism and dissection of this same world, based on entangled economic-financial plots, mostly capitalist. For the optimization of this analytical distinction, it is worth mentioning that, as an *empeiria* originated in instantaneous communication and the world mirrored in it, the glocal was born in the last third of the 19th century; as an *episteme*, especially in the human and social sciences, it begins its trajectory a century later, from the 1980s.

**GLOCALIZATION PROCESS AND ITS SOCIAL-HISTORICAL SIGNIFICATION**

The two sides of the question imply the perception that the glocal phenomenon, in its empirical stratum, galvanizes, in the limit – it is also worth remembering – an orb entirely permeated by *processes of glocalization*. This apex of social-historical significance, clearly civilizing in nature, is based on several inherent and correlated tracks that sustain its manifestation. The sequence of this reflection succinctly demonstrates this injunction.



The presumed social-phenomenal magnitude integrates the most antipodal references, from micro to macro: just as there is no current pattern of daily action that has not already been glocalized and/or accomplished via glocalization, there is no society that does not need this process, in some of its technological modalities and network reach. Even isolated societies marked by discretionary borders, such as North Korea and Iran depend on glocal resources, regardless of whether or not they are subjected to ideological censorship by the state or official religion.

Potentially representing the socio-technological suture of the totality of possible experience in the spatiality of communication networks, the extended glocalization indicates and marks a planetary model of civilization process whose essential characteristic is that, by veiled and *sine qua non* dependence, it can never dispense with communication technologies<sup>7</sup>.

The social-phenomenological goal of this overwhelming *empeiria* involves a re-reading of the millennia of human life based exclusively on the local materiality of existence: by making what is experienced happen irremediably and *allegedly* only at the core of intersection between this materiality and the *immateriality* of networks, in each hybridization between local and global, it would be a matter of moving towards a structural state of technological functioning equivalent to *real time existence*, even if this state is not exclusive and/or compulsory, but *imperatively* available.

As a civilizing process, the glocal, as it could only be, is the irreducible *modus operandi* of articulation and modulation of its own civilization – the macro-structural condition unfolded in the form of a real time civilization, the *glocal civilization*, today in a digital and interactive social-historical phase, based on miniaturized and mobile media, linked to the body.

<sup>7</sup> On glocalization as a civilizing process, see the topic “The Great Glocal: Glocalization as a Civilizing Process”.

### **Glocal phenomenon and the reproduction of capitalism**

The history of humanity, by material needs accessible to analysis, has allocated in Western culture, in its most recent time period, all the socio-technological developments subsumed in and represented by the glocal phenomenon.

As pointed out before, the glocal is a technocultural invention of capitalism. It is famous. It is famous. In Marx's (2005) work the perception that the business and interests of the 16th century emerging bourgeoisie, which founded the capitalist regime of labor and production in a break with the hitherto secular aristocratic system of feuds, have always been in line with the abolition of geographical boundaries. Such businesses and interests require not only the breaking down of physical boundaries, but also horizons of permanent expansion. The process of glocalization, subordinated to the liberal version of freedom, constitutes the

# D

## What Is Glocal?

most radical historical manifestation of this demand to overcome customs, whatever they may be: strictly speaking, the glocal is an invisible monument to free flows, regardless of the type of censorship that may restrict their reach.

The glocal emerges historically – it should be stressed – with the industrious reworking of real time, the technological simulation of *khrónos in natura* and of the ordinary time of everyday life: “real time,” immediate time, at the speed of light, is a commercial decal of autopoietic time, which flows unstoppably; it is, as such, a commodity. The hybridization presupposed in this technological simulation is a direct result of the ideology of progress forged in the late 18th century (not to go back to the Renaissance), at the most developed tip in which electronic media and their networks are inserted. As it could not be otherwise, the glocal is intended, from its inception, to expand the multilateral operating power of production relations and the realization of exchange value, as well as to perpetuate the capitalist social formation in historical time. Expressed more precisely – to emphasize it – the glocal is the *sine qua non modus operandi* of social-historical and technocultural reproduction of the civilization that is compatible with it. Its extensive and heavy infrastructure (in the wire that encloses satellites, electricity and fiber optic cables, city and residential antennas, and terminals), as well as the spiral of its symbolic production, respond to structural needs for the continuous expansion of capitalist modes of production, unequal distribution, and concentrated accumulation of wealth. In this sense, the glocal is implicated in both the originary basis and the consequences of all mediatized and/or real-time models of life in the glocal civilization. By reverse angle, the most recent social-historical reproduction of capitalism could never occur except through the extended process of glocalization, as grounded in, by, and from the diversity of possible *glocal practices*<sup>8</sup>. Furthermore, by the most robust planetary trends, the glocalization has supposedly become the only technological-structural mode of social-historical production and reproduction of human life, under whatsoever political regime this process occurs.

<sup>8</sup>The point is addressed in the item “Glocal Practices”.

<sup>9</sup>Pre-glocal or glocal preliminary conditions, so to speak (in historical perspective, considering today’s multiglobal saturation), since at the time of the German philosopher’s political militancy and writing, in the 19th century, the only machinic representation of real time was the electric telegraph.

### The great commodity

The reflection goes along with this evidence: the glocal is the great commodity of advanced media civilization. The commodity theorized by Marx (1983), based on exclusively local material conditions (in the dimensional sense of this study)<sup>9</sup>, corresponded to the millennial and conventional stratum of capitalism. *Mutatis mutandis*, the glocal relatively accomplishes the same instances in

strict correspondence with social and production relations *immaterialized* by real-time communication and information networks. The empirical needs for the perpetuation of capitalism conditioned the historical mutation of the state of the commodity, without essentially dehydrating its macrostructural function. In other words, the logic of the commodity, as an irreducible and decentered axis for the viability of social and production relations, prevails, in glocal conditions, relatively the same, but on different bases.

This mutation of state coincides with the edges of commodity *dematerialization*, a process by which not only is its macro-structural function removed from the field of vision, but also the commodity character itself is irreversibly cast into the invisibility zone. This *dematerialization* espouses, at times, an apparent absence of exchange mediated by general equivalents (money, check, credit card etc.) concerning the most cartoonish aspect of the commodity. The glocal as a commodity appears even where no strict economic relationship exists, just confirming the reality as deception. Thus, the glocal is a social product that is always paid for, even when access to it and the network to which it connects is widely promoted as *free*. Bargaining and advertising actions keep the tone of economic exchanges elsewhere, outside the immediate field of vision, allowing the glocal to dispense with any direct monetization by the consumer.

In this stratum of manifestation, the glocal, with explicit exchange value or not, is the historical proof of how much the commodity has assumed, throughout capitalism in the 20th century, an absolute and unimaginable abstract form, by installing itself in dimensions equally unimaginable centuries ago. There is also a major detail: the invisible occurrence of the glocal as commodity is only the operational shell of a social-historical event as profound as it is gigantic. The scene of this event, captive to closed curtains (but dotted with lateral micro-edges), is also buried under various mediations between part and whole and vice versa. The labor of the concept needs to dissect them in order to grasp a modest sign of the macro-structural resonance of what is preserved obliterated. The glocal as commodity-major, by infrastructurally articulating commercial, industrial, and post-industrial processes, moves all other forms of commodity, from its conception and circulation to the realization of its exchange value. The glocal is, at the social-historical and technocultural level, a general equivalent and, in this capacity, the great structurer and modulator of human life. Its event dimension indicates the scale of rooting of the glocalization process in history.

**GLOCAL CONTEXT AND GLOCAL CONDITION**

The preceding excerpt indicates that the planetary process of glocalization has made history enter a new phase. Since its origin, the glocal actually silently divides history into pre-glocal and glocal, without ever indicating whether the future of humanity holds any post-glocal society, in the sense of a social formation that, being technological, does not need, for the totality of its functioning, the instantaneous articulation between body location and satellite conduction. The social-historical time period that is subsequent to the aforementioned division has been fully realized in the diametrical scales envisaged, as follows.

The social-historical reproduction of human life based on the glocal as the major commodity carves, in the invisibility of the socio-phenomenal processes, two diagrams at the antipodes of the procedural and articulatory *empeiria* at play: one, microstructural, the *glocal context*, is inscribed in the concrete scene of the conductive body; the other, macro-structural, the *glocal condition*, reaches the dimension of history.

The concept of glocal context covers the environment of access/reception/transmission/radiation of contents circulating in communication networks in real time. As such, it corresponds to the concrete, pragmatic and obliterated arrangement of the glocal phenomenon in everyday life and, at the same time, to an immediate scenic symptom of the glocal condition of history, specifically in the network core (fixed or mobile) in which the body finds itself and from where subjectivity exerts material and symbolic influence (locally or elsewhere) on the world.

As a media redoubt, the glocal context is the daily *modus operandi* of the glocal condition. In its macro-scale diapason, this condition designates the universal and irreversible situation of the human adventure after the entire planet has entered the stage of multimediatization by real-time technologies and networks (mass, interactive or hybrid, taken in its unity or imbricated). The concept names the condition of history from the 20th century on, especially in the rapid post-World War II period. More precisely, its temporal cutout is equivalent to the technocultural condition of the present, invariably based on the almost compulsory fatal linkage among body, subjectivity, and technologies (mainly mobile) capable of instantaneous speed of interactive contacts. The glocal condition is a symbolic cell sculpted in the invisibility of nature' and historical time, its condition embraces the rooting of various types of "real time" in the scope of practical life, due to the multilateral social appropriation of these media from the daily fusion of human and machine, networks and action, screen and influence at a distance.

The glocal condition is self-legitimated in, through, and from the myriad of glocal contexts, i.e., the unique environments of networked practices (of audience,

dialogue, political intervention, irradiation etc.). Vice versa, the infinite myriad of glocal contexts underlies, at its roots, the glocal condition of history. More than that, this condition concerns the status of ongoing history in the arc of universal history. Thus, the glocal and its derived configurations appear as the unprecedented sign of electronic communication at the level of history, a watershed not computed by all historiographical strands, especially the official ones.

The historical continuity of the glocal condition, by rejecting or circumventing the threat of entropic self-desegregation of the social, in its autopoietic social-phenomenological sewing, supposedly supports the trans-generational wheel of perpetuation of cultures, projecting glocalization as a civilizing process.

The complete vicious circle is thus set in its tautological and self-legitimizing equation: the procedural, articulatory and invisible *empeiria* of the glocal, which spreads in the form-flow of planetary glocalization, anchors in the social-historical the glocal contexts of human action and introduces history into the glocal condition, ensuring the permanence of the glocal itself and its manifestations in favor of the social-historical reproduction of glocal civilization. In the thread of glocalization, which by multilateral appropriations links everything to media and hangs in networks to compensate for the physical isolation it conditions itself, the aforementioned mosaic of vicious socio-structural factors avows, by assumption, *glocal subjectivities and glocal practices, concatenated*<sup>10</sup>.

### Glocal subjectivity

As it could not be otherwise, the glocal mode of production and reproduction of the civilizatory process has repercussions in matters of the formation of its corresponding modalities of *conforming subjectivity*<sup>11</sup>. From the most conservative and adherent to the most politicized and tensional in relation to the conditions of the social media status quo, all of them are, as a rule, confluent towards a conformation such as the *glocal subjectivity*. Such subjectivity is (or tends to be), by nature and context of insertion, dromoapt, i.e., articulated, from the root, by speed and traversed by its demands and/or moved by direct interest in it.

The glocal dromoapt subjectivity has in the glocal context its captive locus of maturation and operation. Acculturated in the immediacy of the processes of this communicational redoubt, it obeys the principle of acceleration of practical life and, thus, the regime of urgency in terms of the production of results. A systemic ingredient of the multimedia civilization, the glocalized and dromoapt subjectivity is, evidently, subject to the principle of productivity, i.e., the achievement of goals in the shortest time possible. This detail, in fact, must be grasped in and from its historical scale. An illustrative example should cover the fundamental. At the

<sup>10</sup>In a simple architectural metaphor, applied to the current process of self-construction of the social, it can be said that the glocal phenomenon fulfills the role of a batch of bricks; the glocal context operates as the girder; and glocalization and its derivations (subjectivities, habits and conforming practices), as the general foundation; life intertwined under glocal conditions would amount to the immediate outcomes, at each stage of building; and the civilization guided by the Great Glocal, to the utopian maquette, the anticipated all-random prototype of a model of everyday life dependent on at least some kind of network-capable machine. The issue of the Great Glocal is resumed in the topic "The Great Glocal: Glocalization as a Civilizatory Process".

<sup>11</sup>The expression draws on two integrated theoretical strands: in the case of subjectivity, the biopolitics, coined by Foucault (2004, 2016), and the existentialist post-Marxism of Sartre (2015); another, the conception of social fields, by Bourdieu (1982, chapters "Genesis and Structure of the Religious Field" and "Field of Power, Intellectual Field and Class Habitus," 1983, pp. 38-45, 122-155, 2002, chapter "The Genesis of the Concepts of *Habitus* and Field"), regarding the adjective used. The power of subjectivity, in the philosophical perspective of the first authors, is relatively submerged in the imperative of conservative adaptation dissected by the French sociologist. The qualifier *conform*, in Bourdieu, works as an indicator of systemic reproduction: it designates processes and practices in correspondence to a certain socio-structural dynamic (in the field of religion, art, sports etc.) in which they are inserted and to whose perpetuation they collaborate.

# D

## What Is Glocal?

time of the great maritime expeditions of the 16th century, a command missive from Europe to the colonies took more than a month to reach its destination and take effect. Currently, a click on a computer key, cell phone or tablet solves the transfer in seconds. For the current democratic standards of conforming subjectivity, a wait equivalent to the 16<sup>th</sup> century time interval constitutes absurdity. The spatio-temporal contraction of the present rereads, under the evaluative prism of an implacable impatience, the normal and extended experience of time of previous centuries. It is in this historical context that one must understand the fast, background character of glocal subjectivity. The banal aspect of the acceleration of the fulfillment of activities is not, in theory, the best angle to unravel what is at stake. In general, the extraordinary shrinking of space-time synthesized in the last four centuries, as in the example given, escapes this level of observation. As much as glocal democratic subjectivity concerns productivity or productive social practices of optimizing results in the shortest unit of time (whether in the sphere of work or leisure), events and processes at this level of mere task fulfillment can, for example, be subordinated to voluntary, functional, or accidental slowness, which confuses and impairs the apprehension of the fundamental meaning of the democratic character involved.

In practice, glocal subjectivity invariably concurs to legitimize everything that technological speed has socially conditioned: the recyclable excess of information, images, and data, the extreme fragmentation of knowledge and culture, the improbable fluctuation (in the sense of the etymon: unprovable) of factual veracity, and so on. As glocal (mass, interactive, or hybrid) landscapes prevail as the reference reality, glocal subjectivity often finds itself vulnerable to bubbles of fake news and similar symbolic factoids.

This subjectivity, along with the world subjectivation it animates, is culturally constituted, social-phenomenologically hypostasized, and historically resolves itself in glocal practices.

### **Glocal practices**

The epic of the globalization has significantly reconfigured the universe of social practices. Currently, most of these practices are in some way mediated by real-time communication technologies and networks. Similarly to the epochal type of subjectivity to which they attach, glocal practices (of political interaction and intervention, audience and entertainment, learning and aesthetic enjoyment, buying and selling, and acting in the financial market etc.) are those that historically corresponds to the needs of

social-historical perennialization of the glocal civilization. In the same vein, glocal practices are the praxeological-attitudinal core on which all modes of social-phenomenological appearance of the glocal are precipitated: both the glocal context of everyday experience and the glocal condition of current history find themselves sutured in them in invisible and irreversible dynamics, cemented, of course, by dromocratic demands.

In a generic sense in which empirical studies could cut out by specific sectors, glocal practices are equivalent to the renewed historical version of the social *habitus*, widely dissected by Pierre Bourdieu (1983, pp. 60-81, 71-73, 75-81, 2002, pp. 60-64, 2005, pp. 21-22), in the perspective of a critical sociology of praxeological processes. For the French sociologist, the *habitus* operates as a structured and structuring vortex, without a center, around which an entire epoch or social atmosphere revolves and with which and from which the world moves as such, a kind of decentered social axis in, with and through which a given society, reproduces itself in historical time by each specific field and the set of them. In one of Bourdieu's (1983) several thematizations on the subject, the *habitus* appears, within each individual, as a system of:

durable *dispositions* [emphasis added], structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as a generative and structuring principle of practices and representations that can be objectively "regulated" and "regular" without being the product of obedience to rules, objectively adapted to their purposes without presupposing the conscious intention of them, and the express mastery of the operations necessary to achieve them collectively orchestrated, without being the outcome of a conductor's organizing action. (pp. 60-61)

And further on:

a system of durable and *transposable* dispositions [emphasis added] which, integrating all past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions ... [a kind of] durably armed generating principle of regulated improvisations. (p. 65)

This characterization, whose scope and clarity should be retained along with the potential for openness and change (assumed in the last emphasis), shapes the axiomatic backstage of the sociomedia reconfiguration of *habitus*; and does so where it is materialized especially in compatibility with the alleged historical perpetuation of the socio-technological structures of the glocal

civilization and, with them, of the dynamics that enlarge and accumulate social inequalities (from the most classic to the most recent, referring to customized access, processes of speed and permanence in online participation spaces). The communicational reconfiguration of the *habitus*, in addition to signaling its mere mediatization, alerts to the deep bond between it and the glocalization process. The diversified and daily rooted development of the glocal has granted the *habitus* an almost compulsory setting, now expressed in the scene of a mobile in hand, in the subsequent trail to all sedentary glocal contexts. The *habitus*, thus interwoven by machines and/or “real time”, is supported by instruments for accelerating daily tasks to reproduce itself. Body, *habitus*, subjectivity, devices, glocal – all appears as a single pragmatic bubble: the media *habitus* inflates the conforming practices that make the communicational universe gravitate around the extended process of glocalization; and this, in turn, in the overall balance of practices and trends of conservation and contradiction, prolongs pluricapitalist relations in historical time – time, remember, suffocated in the immanence of a “real time” that blurs everything, converting becoming into a supposed agonistic presentism, i.e, exhausting at the same moment it is established. Nevertheless, glocal practices forge, from now on, in a randomly autopoietic and transpolitical way<sup>12</sup>, the multimedia becoming in the form-flow of a *telos*, rushing towards the diversified deepening of the glocal civilization.

<sup>12</sup>On transpolitics, see the topic “The Great Glocal: Glocalization as a Civilizing Process”.

## OTHER RELATIONS AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE GLOCAL PHENOMENON

From the preceding linkages, it is convenient to establish some multilateral social-phenomenological relations and extract important social-historical consequences. The glocalization process roots in the structural and functional basis of permitting and/or optimizing numerous (political *lato sensu*) *sine qua non* socio-anthropological phenomena in everyday life.

1. The glocal phenomenon engenders *multimedia visibility* (mass, interactive or hybrid), here understood as the set of signaling and expressive projections of all kinds of interests (class or group, collective or individual, governmental or corporate, political, economic, solidarity etc.), as well as these projections are made perceptible at the tip of communicational terminals in general, in real time or not (printed newspapers and magazines, radio speakers, television screens, digital ones etc.).
2. The glocal determines the possibility of *real time existence*, the communicational practice of presence at a distance and interaction with others



(human, machine or network), *hic et nunc*, under the mediation of network capable technologies. In this horizon, the glocal context, for example, remains occluded in the infrastructure of home office work, a professional arrangement that self-protective desertion (total or partial) in relation to city spaces overvalues in periods of scattered threat, as under pandemic, war or terror, weather conditions and natural catastrophe etc.

3. The glocal underpins surveillance, real-time electronic vigilance of any kind (ranging from a circumscribed scope, such as the systems deployed in companies, subway stations and public squares, to the national and global scale, with automatic verification of online access and traffic by banking and financial systems, and the control of network trails by algorithmic browsers and platforms based on artificial intelligence). Glocal is the cornerstone of possibility for the algorithmization of processes.
4. Glocal is at the origin of the systemic excess of information and images, in *ad infinitum* dynamics of fragmentary, tautological and self-recycling propagation. In this segment, glocalization is also a decentered conditioning beam of multiple appropriations of digital resources and networks with the purpose of dissuasion, through the irradiation (or *viralization*) of fake news and the production of radical fluctuation of meaning<sup>13</sup>.
5. The glocal is the technocultural foundation common to all so-called “social networks”. In the prodigal interactive arm, it is subsumed in the various modalities of smart mob and flash mob (and even of mob action), from the online motions and cybercultural activisms to the great globalization protests of the beginning of the 21st century, especially in the trail of the G7, G8 or G20 meetings, as they have been known since the 1970s, the transnational groupings with staggered agendas according to the priority focus of interests.
6. Among the social processes or practices mentioned above, there is not a single one that is not carried out in, with, through or from the structural thread of instantaneity, the social-historical configuration of communicational speed. The glocal is the prodigious *factory* of the immediate. An invisible sculpture fomented by political, economic and/or cultural interests in socio-technological speed (in general, as an operational emblem of *serious and consequent* productivism), in all fields of human activity, the glocal is the precondition for the acceleration of production, dissemination and/or irradiation of daily news, to the catastrophe of cascading decapitalization in stock

<sup>13</sup>The subject, which mass journalism has come to know as *post-truth* only in recent years, was extensively treated by Jean Baudrillard in works from the late 1970s and the following decade.

# D

## What Is Glocal?

exchanges around the world, to the *immaterial* workings of capitalism in banking and financial operations, in the negotiations of buying and selling, in providing services, in stock portfolio investment, in notarial registration of contracts, and so on.

7. At the same time, the glocal, in all its technological versions, delivers identical speed and functionality to solidarity campaigns for individuals, entities and causes, as well as to actions to rescue people in vulnerable situations, to free workers from slavery, to help and assist the sick, victims of violence, people with special needs, and similar initiatives.
8. For more than a century, this extensive *empeiria*, which is exclusively allowed by “real time”, has been increasingly optimized by the diversified military apparatus of national states, as demonstrated from the planning of repressive actions, effectiveness of public security programs and efficiency of the secret service, to the instrumental sophistication of information warfare, blackmail and deterrence strategies (guided missiles, satellite robotics, unmanned aircraft, drones, online viruses for destabilizing the enemy before air strikes and ground invasion etc.).

In the *a priori* presupposition of this technocultural scenario, the glocal is responsible for each and every fundamental trend of advanced media civilization.

### THE GREAT GLOCAL: GLOCALIZATION AS A CIVILIZATION PROCESS

The glocal phenomenon, by rereading the coordinates of time and space on a social-historical scale in favor of their permanent mixture in practical life – i.e., by temporalizing and liquefying space in “real time” and, simultaneously, spatializing ordinary time in technological instantaneity – also performs a social-phenomenological re-reading of the relationship with the city, the alterity, the body and the self, the materiality of existence and its objects, production and consumption, access to knowledge, education, culture, entertainment, and so on. The glocal rewrites human life and its epic in history: before, for millennia, exclusively in the geographical territory, in local redoubts; and presently, in this same stratum *and* in the telegeographic universe of communication networks.

In the trail of these markers, the process of glocalization, in turn, contains a macro-symptom: the main structural social tendencies, valid for everything and everyone, permeate each glocal context of access/reception/transmission/radiation, are encoded in it and, therefore, can be found in them. This injunction resets and redefines the old equation according to which what

belongs to the order of the macrostructure can be apprehended in the order of the microstructure and vice versa. In each glocal context, force relations are gathered and/or manifested rushing to define the distant tomorrow, without it being possible to precisely foresee or predict the contours of such future in the excessive spiral of information, images and data, as well as in the normal compulsion regarding them.

This postulate has an expressive octave on a social-historical scale: the current civilization, as it plays out in the daily glocal condition, at the time period of the last century, sets itself entirely in every peculiar body, perception, and consciousness glocal redoubt, in the space where they meet. The ascertainment of this immediate hypostasis shows nothing more than that the glocal, an invention with gigantic potential for socio-technical flora – a brick, a metropolis – founds, as said before, a civilizing process in its own image, according to the nature and stage of the technological infrastructure implied in each epoch. A way of regrouping humanity into *immaterialized* regional, national, and/or international territories (such as language, cultural life history, beliefs etc.); so, beyond the atomicity of lived redoubts, glocalization is this ongoing civilizing process.

It is worth remembering that the current glocal civilization is equivalent to a social-historical epoch in which several types of glocal contexts accumulate and coexist (from conventional fixed telephone to interactive mobile, interspersed by radio, television and computer). From the point of view of the articulatory scheme subsumed in the glocal phenomenon, the types of technology and network involved do not depend on the technological materiality of the ballast. There may be others in the future, as well as the forms of connection; however, the basic scheme, the inextricable hybridization between local and global, is always fundamentally valid.

As complexity reserves itself inscrutable factors, the aforementioned part-all macro-symptom, as far as one can grasp it, is social-phenomenologically teleological in its self-unfolding nature directly *hic et nunc*. The process of multi-glocalization expands – it seems – towards the Great Glocal, to reach it first in a perimeter of materially privileged countries, which often stipulate trends to drag the whole world afterwards, no matter how long the process takes. Electronic communication in real time brings the totalitarian glocalization of human life.

The Great Glocal constitutes a modality of heterodox utopia daily carried out in a praxeological, jointly random manner, i.e., with the decentralized pragmatic-utilitarian effort of millions of people around the world. Far from the classic teleological scheme of value transfer from the ideal world to a

# D

## What Is Glocal?

future place in historical time, the utopia of the Great Glocal is hypostatized right now, by the current glocal practices, under the decentered and collaborative cadence of everyone, as exclusively receptive audience and/or segmentation of acting public, in real time or not. (The social-functional prolegomena of this hypostasis correspond to the insertion of a network capable machine at home, at work, in the car, close to the body etc.) The teleology of the Great Glocal is nourished by each access to technological networks, especially the majority ones (mass, interactive or hybrid), with each decision or choice in real time, with each button press, virtual click and consumption and/or interaction path, per day or week. It is a typical social-historical trap that involves everything and everyone without allowing many alternatives to escape<sup>14</sup>, the Great Glocal is enhanced with and from each individual endorsement. This technoutopia involves the desire to exist in the glocal condition, to express oneself in and from glocal contexts, *to be glocal*, living in “real time” and in real time, as well as letting oneself be articulated in a network, with the network and/or for the sake of the network. This predisposition is equivalent to assuming, within the scope of either mass or interactive media, a conductive imaginary, a connective subjectivity, a behavior belonging, in short, a life that can be shared in the entanglement, through the mediation of mercantile-financial factors or in parallel with them. Strictly speaking, this propensity is forged outside conventional political frameworks; independent, for example, of political-party positions. Even the agreement to use the glocal context to tension the networked world – to mobilize it instrumentally to play against the glocal condition of present life – contributes to the unfolding of the Great Glocal.

This praxeological-immediatist utopia corresponds to a dynamic of social interactions in which and from which all possible everyday objects are capable of being networked (from personal items such as a wristwatch and eyeglasses to household appliances) or at least giving access to some kind of network. This social dynamic configures a socio-technical condition of greater exponential growth in the number of individuals, machines and collective instances (groups, governments, companies etc.) entangled and/or synchronized in real time or whose productive and informal life gravitates around it. This trend predicts that electromagnetic spectra from everywhere will be drained into the vortex of regular flows from all over the world and/or from the national territory<sup>15</sup>. The utopia of the Great Glocal is the entire planet literally glocalized, especially for communicational nomadism (stationary movement in networks) of economically favored social categories.

<sup>14</sup>This characteristic, due to its transpolitical nature (in the terms of the next item), suggests that the glocal condition is equated with the procedural *empeiria* of a *dispositive* in the perspective of biopolitics inaugurated by Foucault (1982, chapters “Genesis and Structure of the Religious Field” and “Field of Power, Intellectual Field and Class Habitus”, 1987, 2005, chapter “Social Space and Symbolic Space”, 2008a, 2008b) and explored by Deleuze (1991, 1996, 1999), Agamben (2005, 2006, 2009) and Žižek (2003). In the wake of these sources, the sequence of the argument, centered on the interaction between individual, technology and society, illustrates the tricky social-historical nature of the glocal as a dispositive, which remains as a thematic signpost for possible further deepening, since the matter is here only suggested.

<sup>15</sup>This record critically contextualizes the positivist nonsense called the *internet of things*, integrated into common sense journalistic jargon and acclaimed by the market.

### **Transpolitics of the glocal and of glocalization**

The current social-historical stage of glocal and glocalization subordinates them to the self-referential social-phenomenological logic that characterizes transpolitics. This framework is arranged in a specific sense, linked to joint coordinates of social rootedness and historical irreversibility: the epic of glocal and glocalization is beyond the capacity of control, management, and/or modulation by any political-regulatory instances bequeathed by the modernity of the 19th and 20th centuries. A phenomenon, process or trend is part of the transpolitics arc when, once unleashed, it can no longer be elided from the social-historical scope, i.e., it can no longer cease to exist, due to the fact that this social destination of life inexorably subordinates it to an apparently shielded randomness, far from any abolishing or even remodeling interference, in an extinguishing direction. The independent force of a transpolitical phenomenon, process and/or tendency resembles a self-regulated fetish, referenced in itself, spreading socially as if to find itself and develop its own potentials to the ultimate consequences. It is, therefore, subject to an autopoietic and indefinite duration, in slow or fast growth, depending on the material conditions at stake. The transpolitics of the glocal and the glocalization makes up the integral image of the social-phenomenological trap of a dispositive<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>16</sup>See note 14.

### **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

For all the above reasons, the rooting of the glocal phenomenon in daily life, combined with its transpolitical irreversibility supports, at least from the social-historical perception of the present and unless there is better judgment to the contrary, the postulate that tomorrow's societies will either be glocal or not. The overwhelming way in which such irreversibility and its reverberations take place in the world allows us to glimpse, with the same caveat and risks that the current political regimes and their economic-financial modes of production will hardly disappear without the glocal remaining as a legacy<sup>17</sup>.

The glocal civilization, in the daily articulatory zeal of the autopoietic teleology that grounds it, labors, from now on, the permanent self-defense against its own entropy. Thus, it fulfills – in its own tortuous and cartoonish way – the political-cybernetic idealization of Norbert Wiener (1948, 1996): the communication should be in force as a utopian parameter against the ideologies of barbarism, which led humanity to the Second World War (cf. Breton, s.d; Breton & Proulx, 1991). Although not supported by free flows of information (i.e., free from any kind of censorship) and not unlinked

<sup>17</sup>The periods of international combat against pandemic threats, through the procedure of mass physical isolation in glocal bunkers, plus social distancing compensated with multimedia processes, are, in this respect, beyond the overvaluation given to the glocal (as a functional balm), taken by the sociomedia status quo as important historical moments for the realization of macro-structural corrections and/or optimization adjustments in the technical fabric of glocalization as a civilizing process.

to warlike processes (for example, informational and deterrence wars), as the North American anarchist mathematician and anti-nuclear militant wished, the transpolitical utopia of planetary glocalization poses itself, with its potential to make social and international tensions more flexible, as an axiological prototype capable of avoiding or, at least, postponing the end of humanity. This prospective feat confronts what liberalism (representing Western capitalism), Marxism-Stalinism (equivalent to the *actually existing socialism* of the former Soviet bureaucracy and satellite countries) and Nazism (in the name of the Third Reich) did in technological conflagration, and how their derivatives can do it again. In the face of all effects of the social disaggregation in the universe of a fatal network integration (for good and/or bad), the transpolitical process of glocalization contributes to preserving modes of minimal social-functional aggregation modes, even under intense physical confinement of individuals (as in the case of widespread disease, curfews, alarms of dangerous situations, in addition to war and terror etc.). In this direction, glocalization would correspond, at the social-historical level, to the viability of a long delay in the transit toward the capitalist demise of the human vis-à-vis the concession of more breath for the performance of this model of life in time, in the form of a stopgap solution in the immanence of the ongoing historical dynamics. The glocal, a technocultural invention of industrial capitalism at the end of the 19th century, insinuates itself supposedly as the possible socio-technical salvation of tomorrow's world, in large satellitized societary blocs that can be either national or transnational, and capitalist or not. ■

## REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (2005). O que é um dispositivo? *Outra Travessia*, (5), 9-16. <https://bit.ly/35P8jdN>
- Agamben, G. (2006). *Che cosè un dispositivo?* Nottetempo.
- Agamben, G. (2009). *O que é o contemporâneo? E outros ensaios*. Argos.
- Bergson, H. (2006). *Duração e simultaneidade*. Martins Fontes.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *A economia das trocas simbólicas*. Perspectiva.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). *Pierre Bourdieu: Sociologia* (R. Ortiz, Org.). Ática.
- Bourdieu, P. (2002). *O poder simbólico* (pp. 59-73). Bertrand Brasil.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). *Razões práticas: Sobre a teoria da ação* (7th ed.). Papyrus.
- Breton, P. (s.d.). *A utopia da comunicação*. Instituto Piaget.
- Breton, P., & Proulx, S. (1991). *L'explosion de la communication : La naissance d'une nouvelle idéologie* (Col. Sciences et Société). La Découverte; Boréal.
- Deleuze, G. (1991). *Foucault*. Brasiliense.

- Deleuze, G. (1996). *O mistério de Ariana*. Veja; Passagens.
- Deleuze, G. (1999). Que és un dispositivo? In E. Balibar, H. Dreyfus, G. Deleuze, R. Machado, G. Lebrun, J.-A. Miller, F. Wahl, M. Frank, M. Morey, D. Hollier, W. Seitter, R. Bellour, F. Ewald, P. Macherey, B. Barret-Kriegel, M. Donnelly, A. Pizzorno, J. Rajchman, P. Hadot, C. Jambet, ... P. Veyne, *Michel Foucault, filósofo* (pp. 155-163). Gedisa.
- Ferrara, L. A. (2007). *Espaços comunicantes*. Annablume.
- Ferrara, L. A. (2008). *Comunicação espaço cultura*. Annablume.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *Microfísica do poder* (3rd ed.). Graal.
- Foucault, M. (1987). *Vigiar e punir*. Vozes.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *A hermenêutica do sujeito*. Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *História da sexualidade I: A vontade de saber* (16th ed.). Graal.
- Foucault, M. (2008a). *Segurança, território e população: Curso no Collège de France (1977-1978)*. Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2008b). *Nascimento da biopolítica: Curso no Collège de France (1978-1979)*. Martins Fontes.
- Foucault, M. (2016). *Subjetividade e verdade*. Martins Fontes.
- Kosik, K. (1976). *Dialética do concreto* (2nd ed.). Paz e Terra.
- Marx, K. (1983). *O capital: Crítica da economia política* (Col. Os economistas). Abril Cultural.
- Marx, K. (2005). *Manifesto comunista*. Boitempo.
- Robertson, R. (1994). Globalisation or glocalisation? *Journal of International Communication*, 1(1), 33-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13216597.2012.709925>
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25-44). Sage.
- Robertson, R. (2002). Le dimensioni della cultura globale. In E. Batini & R. Ragonieri (Eds.), *Culture e conflitti nella globalizzazione* (pp. 17-30). Leo S. Olschki.
- Robertson, R., & White, K. E. (2003). Globalization: An overview. In R. Robertson & K. E. White (Eds.), *Globalization: Critical concepts in sociology* (v. 1, pp. 1-44). Routledge.
- Sartre, J.-P. (2015). *O que é a subjetividade?* Nova Fronteira.
- Sedda, F. (Org.). (2004). *Glocal: Sul presente a venire*. Luca Sossella.
- Trivinho, E. (2007). *A dromocracia cibercultural: Lógica da vida humana na civilização mediática avançada* (Col. Comunicação). Paulus.
- Trivinho, E. (2012). *Glocal: Visibilidade mediática, imaginário bunker e existência em tempo real*. Annablume.

# D

## What Is Glocal?

- Trivinho, E. (2014). *A condição glocal: Reconfigurações tecnoculturais, sociopolíticas e econômico-financeiras na civilização mediática avançada*. Annablume; Fapesp.
- Virilio, P. (1984). *L'horizon négatif: Essai de dromoscopie*. Galilée.
- Virilio, P. (1993a). *O espaço crítico*. Ed. 34.
- Virilio, P. (1993b). *A inércia polar*. Dom Quixote.
- Virilio, P. (1995). *La vitesse de libération*. Galilée.
- Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics*. MIT Press.
- Wiener, N. (1996). *Cibernética e sociedade: O uso humano de seres humanos* (15th ed.). Cultrix.
- Žižek, S. (2003). *Bem-vindo ao deserto do real*. Boitempo.

---

Article received in March, 22, 2021 and approved in October, 7, 2021.