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**Abstract**

Globalization has been associated with a range of cultural consequences. These can be analyzed by three thesis of globalization and culture: first, homogenization theses; second, hybridization; and third, polarization. The homogenization theses states that globalization makes culture standardized to western or American pattern. Despite of American culture growth, described as Mcdonaldization the appear of local culture like Batik also a new phenomenon that comes in globalization recently. I called this phenomenon as globatikzation (globatiksasi). By describing culture as identity, this paper concludes that the appearance of local culture into the global culture does not mean the appearance of cultural value and identity into global society. The globalization of local culture means that local culture becomes commercialized and converted into western globalization of economy.
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One of the rumors often talked about in international connection academic environment these days is rumors around globalization. Discussion related to globalization is then connected with globalization effect towards various strategic rumors that blooms in global constellation. One of the strategic topics talked about was effect of globalization and culture.

Globalization is often considered identical with social homogeneity in culture rank. Ritzer (1993: 19) called homogeneity as Mcdonaldisation. Group that is frequently identical globalization as" Mcdonaldisation" and also" cocacolanisation" assumed that global culture comes successive with global economy development (Holton 2000). Based on the assumption, progress in globalization is then identical with Americanization or westernization (Zakaria, 2008: 71).
So far globalization and culture topic discusses more about topic of western civilization homogeneity (see Said, 1978; Huntington, 1996; Barber, 1996; Friedman, 2005). Globalization obviously does not only bring spreading west and America values, but also bring local culture and come into global rank. One of the interesting examples is making global batik that is the Indonesian local culture then it can be global and be world trend. Batik is appointed by UNESCO as world culture inheritance (www.unesco.org 2009).

After deciding batik as world inheritance, Batik also gets world attention. Even pop culture symbols namely US movie world makes batik as clothing trend. Some Hollywood artists also wear batik in many events, although with pop design. Indonesia as the place where batik comes from also gets an positive effect from batik globalization. Indonesian Batik sale turnover increases 20% (www.tempointeraktif.com 29/10/2009). Based on the case mentioned, there is an opinion that globalization obviously also gives profit for local cultures like batik.

In a flash, the condition shows that in globalization, local culture exactly gets a chance to grow out from west-Americanization culture. However, the question then, does globalization really give a way for local cultures like batik to be everlasting and global, or exactly globalization gives negative impact as desakralisasi culture?

To answer the question, the discussion is aimed more in globalization study and culture. Culture, according to Said (1994: xiii), is defined as source from identity. Based on the definition, culture is not merely evaluated as a product, but also identity.

By using culture polarization approach proposed by Huntington (1993), Babrber (2002) and Said (1979), and culture industry concept (Adorno & Horkheimer 2002: 94), this article talks about the arguments that globalization really makes local culture get place in global space. However, culture local entrance into global space exactly appears culture commercialization causing desakralisasi of the culture value.

**Culture and identity**
Discussion around globalization and culture frequently evoke s long debate. This matter happens because each academician argues about different
culture concept. Thus, this article is necessary to formulate the culture concept meant.

Talking about culture, there are various definitions of it. Anthony d. king (2000: 1) defines culture as attribute defining a society. It means culture is the form of anti thesis from identical condition between one society group with another one. While Edward W. Said (1994: xiii) declares that culture is the source of identity. It is echoed by Wallerstein (1991) having a notion that culture is characteristics set distinguishing one group with the other one. Based on a number of culture concepts above, the culture is not merely a product. More precisely, culture is identity of a society. Furthermore, anthropologist like Clifford Geertz also defines culture as an identity. Even in his monumental work having a title the interpretation of culture, Clifford Geertz (1973: 4) defines culture as a way of life of a society group.

Defining culture as an identity will have a consequence in the culture polarization. Identity can be interpreted as a distinguishing thing between one individual and other individual (Maalouf, 2003: 10). In a broader rank, identity in communal area or society is distinguishing form between one society group with the other one. For example Java culture is the distinguishing thing between society group having Java identity with the other society group.

For a society group the entire products from society are the realization of the society culture that also functions as identity distinguishing one society with another society. For example Japanese culture cannot only be defined as samurai, or kimono. Samurai for example is the Japanese enthusiasm realization, as well as kimono. Thus, culture cannot only be defined as a symbol.

After the meaning of culture meant is defined in this article, next globalization influence towards culture is discussed. The discussion will be aimed in answer mapping of academicians related to globalization influence towards culture. The mapping is the same as culture related to culture and identity; so it is necessary to define first the globalization meant in this article.

Globalization and Imperialism Reincarnation
Hilbourne a. watson in his article with the title *globalization as capitalism in the age of electronics* (Watson, 2002), states that globalization is not other than capitalism in technology progress era. Equally Watson belongs to academician believing that globalization is not new matter. Globalization is the form of capitalism appearing in technology progress era, called by Watson "the Electronic Age".

Same with Watson, Robert o. Keohane Joseph s. Nye Jr (2000) states that existing globalization term in this time, especially appearing in decade 1990s is a term referring to globalization increase. Koehane and Nye argue that globalization has lasted for a long time and according to them rumors necessary lifted not how long this globalization has lasted but more on how thick the globalization. Furthermore, both authors explains that contemporary globalization inclines thicker than past globalization. It means that recent globalization – refer to Thomas Friedman term "Farther, Faster, Deeper, and Cheaper". It means the practice is the same. The difference is the intensity, volume, and space used.

Two arguments above is correct when put beside Immanuel Wallerstein work (2000) stating that globalization is a transition form from what was going on in the past. According to Wallerstein, globalization does not bring content which is substantially new, but only bring transition from that happening in the past. If formerly goods and human transfer did not yet go on quickly and massively, globalization era in this time brings a transition where the transfer can go on so fast and massively. Technology is one of the answers to the possible transition.

An interesting example to explain globalization phenomenon as a transition is now goods import export is known vastly intercontinental, since years ago goods transfer like now had also happened. Transfer intercontinental happens through what is called *sutra stripe*, a stripe that connects China, Asia, Persia, west Asia, and Europe at 19th century (Rossabi, 2007). Something distinguishing is moveable goods, speed, total moved goods.

From the explanation of several academicians, it can be said that globalization is a transition era where the similar phenomenon happened several centuries ago. If in some articles above there is a phenomenon of intercontinental goods transfer, some transitions also happen in international economy mechanism. If in 18th century, free market begins popular in the world with *Leisze Faire* opinion of Adam Smith's in *the wealth of nations*
up to now the assumptions of free market also still happen (Skousen, 2001); even now it can go on (using Koehane’s and Nye’s term) thicker. The progress of information technology makes free trade go on intercontinental. The difference now is that technology progress makes non-real transaction go on bigger and faster. Thus, it is right if Wallerstein (2000) called globalization as age of transition.

Then the question is: if globalization is really a form of transition happening in the past, what phase preceding globalization? From arguments observation above, the thinkers believing that globalization is transition - like Wallerstein (2000) say that capitalism is the beginning of a globalization. The assumption is that capitalism makes globalization happen. Without globalization, capitalism will not be created. Only capitalism makes global market transaction as one of the globalization forms. Only capitalism can transfer massively a culture from one continent and civilization to another continent and its custom (Wallerstein, 2000).

An interesting opinion is stated by Mansour Fakih (2004) that believes globalization existence as one of the phases of liberal capitalism development. Fakih said that globalization is the continuation from colonialism and developmentalism after world war II. Even Fakih (2004) suspected globalization as new package from imperialism and colonialism.

Fakih’s opinion is the same as what stated by Samir Amin (2001). In his lecture in meeting world social forum in Porto Alegre - January 2001, Amin argued that there was a relation between globalization and imperialism. However, something interesting is Amin preceded the argument by saying that imperialism was not level, not also the highest level of capitalism (Amin 2001). According to Amin (2001) imperialism naturally adheres to capitalism extension.

In his explanation, Amin (2001) said that there were three phases of capitalism extension or equally imperialism practice. First, capitalism extension phase with imperialism practice in America continent. This phase is mercantilist phase. Second, industry revolution phase where imperialism extension happened with colonialism practice in Asia and Africa. Third, a phase when imperialism extension happened after perang dingin. Practice and aim existing in this third phase is not so different from previous phases, namely: controlling market extension, dredging land product, and exploitation labors on a large scale in Periphery (Amin, 2001).
In every phase, if it is studied furthermore, the existence of every phase is always followed by remarkable damage. First phase is followed by damage and annihilation of Indian tribe in America continent. Second phase is marked by suffering and destruction of Asian African society. The question is: how about the third phase? The third phase does not far differ from the first phase and second. There is damage and repression done by developed countries. Even the consequence of technology progress, the damage is also bigger.

Referring to two phenomenal book series of John Perkins, in the foreword of the second book" The Secret History of American Empire" (2007) P erkins explained the empire meaning. Empire is defined as the countries that dominate the other countries and shows one or more next characteristics: first, doing resource exploitation from countries dominated; second, draining resource which is not proportional compared with the total citizen; third, having great military strenght and being used if non military efforts fail; fourth, doing practice of the civilization spread in all influenced areas; fifth, taking tax not only from the citizen in the country but also those from other countries; sixth, pushing the currency use at the nations under controlled.

From the definition above, everything also happens in this contemporary globalization era. It also happened in the past globalization era. If referring to the opinion of Samir Amin, imperialism practice happens in every phase of the three imperialism phases, and every globalization phase comes into associate in it.

It is correct what Karl Marx stated several centuries ago: "This is the abolition of the capitalist fashion of production within the capitalist mode of production , and hence a self-abolishing contradiction, which presents  prima facie as a mere point of transition to a new form of production. " (Karl Marx in Hardt&Negri, 2000)

Globalization is alive witness in which the capitalism "transition" from one model to another one happens. Capitalism in every transition is the various efforts including concepts come up. Formerly it was known as silk stripe (jalan sutra), now it is known as global trade block, formerly known as colonialism, now known as international agreement, formerly known as imperialism, now known as globalization.
Thus, if some people like Wallerstein (2000) and Watson (2002) say that capitalism is as the beginning phase of globalization, globalization, the same as imperialism, is not a stage, and also not a highest stage of capitalism but globalization has attached together with capitalism and also imperialism. In other words, globalization is the reincarnation of the imperialism.

Three thesis globalization and culture
If globalization is another form of imperialism, the next question is related to globalization and culture. The discussion around globalization influence towards the culture self at least can be classified into three big groups. First group is homogeneity group assuming that global culture becomes homogeneous and standardized by west or Americanization model (Friedman, 2005; Ritzer, 2003). Second group is an opinion assuming that globalization creates culture hybridization, or culture syncretism (see Ulf Hannerz, 1992; Pieterse, 2004). Third group is polarization group assuming that globalization also brings local cultures doing opposition and forming its own pole out of west or America pole (see Said, 1993; Huntington, 1996; and Benjamin Barber, 1996).

First group or homogeneity group is also called as Mcdonaldization group. Ritzer (2003) explains that Mcdonaldization is the symbol of homogeneity of wide social environment because of multinational existence consequence. Mcdonaldization is a term aimed to the spread of fast food restaurant American principles in American environment and society out of America (Ritzer, 1993). The principles meant are efficiency (fast service), as according to calculation (fast and not expensive), predicted (there is no surprise), with controlling towards official and customers. Globalization is then identical with globalizing principles of Mcdonaldization. The existence of Mcdonald as fast food restaurant then becomes a globalization icon. By Mcdonald globalization, it is in fact followed by global values of American fast-food.

In harmony with Ritzer, Holton (2000) explains that thesis of homogeneity group is identical with value and culture uniformity spread. Holton (2000) adds now globalization existence begins to get new icons. If formerly Mcdonaldization was a symbol of uniformity in globalization, now it is replaced with interactive internet culture like yahoo!, facebook, and various social websites. However, homogenization group either McDonaldization or interactive internet culture explains that globalization exactly brings to culture homogenization. With globalization existence, it is happening spread
of west values expressed in McDonald culture or interactive internet and crushing local cultures.

The assumption of homogenization group actually can be said overoptimistic towards homogeneous culture idea. Now the world is watching cultures appearance out of McDonald-America culture. It is necessary to differ the concept of modernity and West. In a few decades in the future, three of the four biggest economics in the world are not exactly from West (Japan, China and Indian). Japanese case gives an interesting description related to the difference between modernity and west culture. Japan is known as a very modern country. It means in a progress of super fast train technology, cellular telephone, and robotic-Japan can be said much more sophisticated and modern than West. However, in the case of Japanese society attitude towards outsider, especially visitors from West society, majority Japanese society still consider them as foreigners and not part of them (Zakaria, 2008: 73-77). Even in Europe, American culture is still considered as strange "cowboy" culture. In Japanese and European case, although globalization brings American culture in economy globalization and technology, it permanently gets high enough culture resistance.

Arguments of homogenization group then get many opponents from second group, namely hybridization group. Hybridization group assumes globalization as hybridization culture. Pieterse (2009: 54) explains that globalization impact towards culture is showing hybridization or culture mixing. Hybridization can also be interpreted as syncretism, chreolization, and crossover. In the case of globalizing local culture then entering global culture scheme, the author calls this phenomenon as globatiksasi.

This globatiksasi phenomenon for some people can be assumed to strengthen arguments of hybridization followers. It means batik has experienced hybridization and then gets up and can mix with global trend culture. If formerly batik is identical with Javanese local life style like jarit, kebaya and kemben, now batik appears with various clothing creation, and even update with life style of "modern" pop culture. No wonder then if now it can be found Hollywood actresses pose proudly wearing batik with parang, special motive from Central Java matched with mini skirt and high boot as knee. For the future, it is also possible we can see tank top and bikini by using batik as the motive. All of them are the forms of hybridization or sincretization batik with culture pop that is being mainstream in globalization.
However, this hybridization approach is really correct if culture is only meant as product or symbol. When culture is meant as identity as what has been stated before, the arguments that globalization makes culture experience hybridization is less correct.

Defining culture as identity then adopted by third group. Pieterse calls this third group as a "clash of civilization" group. The arguments of this group begins from thesis of Huntingtonian related to impact idea inter civilization (Pieterse, 2009: 43-44). According to this group, exactly with globalization, it creates impact inter civilization.

Consequence of the impact existence inter civilization means civilization is not homogeneous. Or in other words, globalization existence makes new polar appear then being new conflict epicenter after the end of cold war. " …with the end of the cold war, international politics moves out of its Western phase, and its centerpiece becomes the interaction between the West and non-Western civilizations and among non-Western civilizations. " (Huntington, 1993).

Globalization which is also identical information technology progress actually can easily be used as tool to show locality spirit, either in ethnic rank, nation, and culture. The existence of information technology globalization is exactly used by ethnic group being diaspora as tool to do long distance nationalism (Anderson 1998: 58-74). It means that although in globalization human and goods transfer happens in economy globalization but culture is obviously more difficult to experience globalization or like arguments delivered by homogenization group (Holton, 2000).

Culture polarization thesis in globalization actually has long root when Edward Said dating with his magnum opus Orientalism (1979) and defines culture dichotomy concept into two entrenchments, West and East. Said (1979) explains that culture dichotomy opinion causes the appearance of Orientalism perceiving approach "we "and " the others". Through orientalism, Edward Said (1979: 8) wants to illustrate how to represent Europe towards East culture as the colony area has been institutionalization at least since 18th century as manifestation from West cultural domination towards East. According to Said through study of orientalism can be traced to how various institution, discipline academic, investigation processes from assorted thinking system grows and increases
in Europe intellectual public space as part of Europe defining politic to detect about east oriental and the academic project closely related to Europe imperialism consolidation that achieves the top in 19th century. West concept for example, in looking at Middle East Islam as stagnation oriental does not change, it is erotic even inclines authoritative with western civilization depiction as dynamic, innovator, rational and tolerant culture has took root for a long time in the West mind (Said, 1979: 49). Based on orientalism approach, it can be concluded that actually culture homogenization is difficult to happen because in fact culture differentiation always happens. On the other side, existence of orientalism concept also disputes culture hybridization opinion because the culture here is interpreted as identity which is special and becomes differentiation with other identity group.

Furthermore culture polarization in globalization is described by Benjamin R. Barber with term Jihad VS McWorld (1996). The term reflects the conflict between consumerism in global capitalism and fundamentalism fighting justice and tribalism (Barber, 1996: xviii-xvix). Once more, this condition shows even if globalization produces technology spread, goods current, and market economic, in fact homogenization and hybridization culture is difficult to be created.

Globatiksasi VS McDonaldization: culture commercialization and batik value descralization

Globatiksasi phenomenon defined as globalizing local cultures is taken from batik cloth case that is the Javanese local culture and it can be global in the world. However, is this equal to the concept of McDonaldization representing to fast food restaurant values likes McDonald to be internationalized?

McDonaldization concept describes globalizing instant culture, efficiency, and tight control towards product. McDonaldization concept is not merely McDonald restaurants existence but more important is globalizing McDonald as an Americanization product followed with values spread that reflects culture identity of pop America that is completely instant, completely fast, completely calculative, with tight control towards product. After increasing McDonald, then various food sale identical with McDonald concept increase in the world.
On the contrary, in globatikzation case, globalizing local cultures is not followed with value export with identity in local culture. If we refer to the definition of culture which is not merely symbol or product, globatiksasi is exactly the direct form of culture desacralization in globalization.

There are two reasons of globatiksasi as the desakralisasi culture form: first, entrance of local culture product to global area will not happen when culture globalization is not in line with economy globalization. In other words, globalizing a culture must be followed with commercialization of culture symbol. In other words, globalization exactly creates culture industry or cultural industry (Adorno, 2001; 2002). Through culture industry, requirement of a culture to be acceptable globally must be marketable. It means it is impossible for batik as local culture to be global when batik cannot be absorbed by market globally. The consequence will positively increase market demand toward batik cloth; it means that it supports Indonesian economy. However, it is actually only batik commercialization form, or in other words putting batik into global capitalism net that means batik is only evaluated as a commodity. Unfortunately, batik commodity is not followed with export and batik preservation as a value and identity.

Second, culture commercialization only reduces value of the culture. A culture should be an identity, even life point of view then demoted only a matter. Globatiksasi in batik case for example, in this time exactly reflects batik desakralisasi because there is batik value reduction namely only as a matter. In fact, batik contains deep value related to Javanese society life. Mothers in Java usually carry their new born children with batik cloth, which is soft with cheerful motive. This means they hope the children can grow cheerfully and full of affection. The couple getting married also wear cloth jarik with sido mukti and truntum motives. Sido mukti means they are able to be happy and live in abundance, while truntum that means to guide, parents are hoped to be able to guide the children to manage their new household. In other words, batik is not merely thing as culture result, but culture is even an identity and a way of life.

**Conclusion**

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that in phenomenon globalization, the local culture entrance into global domain or what the author conceives as globatiksasi may really happen. However, this matter does not mean to reflect culture hybridization. The entrance of local culture cannot be released from culture commercialism in globalization.
Culture that is identified as an identity, in practice, globalization exactly does not come along to globalize. Local identity is exactly uprooted from culture root. The culture is then empty and only falls into the term of commodity or product.

Uprooted local identity in globalizing culture is exactly the form of desakralisasi from the culture. Different from McDonaldisasi, globatiksasi case is frequently not followed with value spread and identity of the culture.

It is possible that in the future globalization gives space for local cultures growth to be constellation in global rank. However, globalization which is the reincarnation of imperialism also provides global culture package. In other words, next globatiksasi likely happen, but on condition that culture reduction only as product and commodities.

Value which must be taken is that the reality we are watching globatiksasi phenomenon, but don't be overoptimistic, and forget that culture is value. We must learn from west how to be able to export McDonald and coca cola successfully to all over the world. West, through Mcdonaldization and coca colanization do not merely export fried chicken product, burger or cola drink but value and instant way of life a la America.

Batik comes from combination of 2 words in Javanese, amba and nitik. From parable name even batik contains of Javanese view of life, which is patient, careful, and harmony to go to perfection. The question then can we bring globatiksasi to be McDonaldization volume two, or even allow globatiksasi comes to batik desakralisasi?
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