

The global inside the national

A research agenda for sociology

Saskia Sassen Columbia University, USA

abstract This article expands the analytic terrain within which to understand the global in ways that allow us to use sociological methods, concepts and data even when these were not designed to address the global. It examines three types of instances where the national is one of the terrains for the global. One is the endogenizing or the localizing of global dynamics inside the national. A second consists of formations which although global are articulated with particular actors, cultures, or projects, producing an object of study that requires negotiating a global and a local scale. A third is the denationalizing of what has historically been constructed as national and may still continue to be experienced and coded as national when it is in fact no longer such. A focus on such subnationally based processes and dynamics of globalization requires methodologies and theorizations that engage not only global scalings but also subnational scalings *as* components of *global* processes.

keywords denationalization ♦ globalization ♦ localization ♦ the nation ♦ nationalism

Writing about the research and theoretical contributions of sociology to the study of globalization is a triple-edged sword. First, as a discipline, sociology has thrived analytically on the closure provided by the nation-state, especially with the positivist turn that took off in the 1950s. One effect has been that international sociology basically compares nation-states. Second, the ethnographic strand, always strong in sociology, mostly has not considered the macro-level pertinent – and this became an in-built resistance to studying the global given common definitions of the global as beyond the local and the nation-state. Third, the main sociological strands focused on cross-border and inter-state processes, such as world-systems theory, colonialism studies and Marxist political economy (Amin, 1980; Palloix, 1975; Santos et al., 1994; Wallerstein, 1974), have tended to reject globalization as a useful category, though it has been crucial to some of the current work. The overall result of these three aspects is that a narrow definition of sociological studies of globalization leaves us with a very small, though rapidly growing body of research and theorization directly engaged with the global.

It seems to me that we should at least explore

whether each of these three major strands in sociology contains significant contributions to the study of globalization even if the authors did not have globalization in mind. But to capture this potential we need to expand the analytic terrain for the study of globalization. Further, this sociological scholarship contains important methodological, data and conceptual elements that can raise the level of complexity in the study of globalization. But, again, we need new kinds of conceptual architectures within which to situate these elements.

One way of opening up the subject of globalization to a discipline that has resisted the category of globalization is to posit that the global –whether an institution, a process, a discursive practice, an imaginary – both transcends the exclusive framing of national states and also partly emerges and operates within that framing. Seen this way, globalization is more than its more common representation as growing interdependence and formation of self-evidently global institutions. It includes subnational spaces, processes, actors. Further, if the global gets partly structured inside the national, then the methodological and theoretical challenges to state-centric social

sciences will be different from those posed by the common binary of the global vs the national. Sociology, with its strong state-centric methodological and conceptual foundations, has not been particularly active in the study of globalization. But I think it should be. One of the efforts in this article is to recover the contributions for a sociology of globalization that are present in a variety of sociological studies which, while not concerned with globalization per se, offer us methodological and conceptual tools to study structurations of the global inside the national. The effort is, then, to examine particular contributions of sociology through this larger lens. Given limited space, I confine this examination to a few select topics.

The first section addresses the question of how to understand the often loosely used term globalization. The aim here is to expand this meaning by including the national as one of the sites for the global. Here I also discuss some of the multiple research agendas that come out of this analytic opening of the field of study. The next sections select some key institutions and processes as lenses for understanding both sociology's recognized and not quite recognized theoretical, methodological and empirical contributions to the study of globalization. Thus the second section focuses on the state, one of the great sociological fields and a key institution to understand the particularity of the current phase of globalization. This phase has, after all, emerged at a time when states had become the dominant institutions articulating the foundational elements of the social order: territory, authority, rights, identity, security, legitimacy, imaginaries. The third section looks at a series of processes that are more central to studies addressing globalization and where sociology could make a larger theoretical and methodological contribution.

An expanded analytic terrain for studying the global

The most widely accepted definition of globalization emphasizes the growing interdependence of the world and the formation of global institutions; though they were a small minority in the discipline, sociologists across the world were among the early contributors to this research and theorization field (Arroyo et al., 1993; Beck, 1986; Castells, 1989; Chase-Dunn, 1984; Giddens, 1986; Portes and Walton, 1981; Potts, 1990; Robertson, 1992; Sassen, 1997 [1988]; Thomas et al., 1987; Van der Pijl, 1998). From the 1990s onwards there was rapid growth in this scholarship, even as the subject remained somewhat marginal to the core disciplines of globalization. One key, often implicit assumption

in this type of definition is that the global and the national are two mutually exclusive domains. Sociologists tend to focus on how global processes become embedded in national settings. But when this embedding in national settings is left out, a definition of globalization as interdependence easily leads to the notion that what the global gains, the national loses, and vice versa. This, in turn, implies a correspondence of national territory with the national: that is to say, if a process or condition is located in a national institution or in national territory, it must be national.

Conceiving of globalization not just in terms of interdependence and global institutions, but also as inhabiting and reshaping the national, opens up a vast agenda for research and politics. It means that research on globalization needs to include detailed studies, notably ethnographies, of multiple national conditions and dynamics that are likely to be engaged by the global and often are the global, but function inside the national (Hirst and Thompson, 1996; King, 1990; Nash and Fernández-Kelly, 1983; Ricca, 1990; Ritzer, 1995; Sayad, 1999; Sklair, 1995; Ward, 1990). What complicates matters and requires a kind of decoding is that such conditions and dynamics are often still represented and experienced as national. Examples are global cities, immobile or localized activists that are part of transnational networks, and even particular state institutions, such as ministries of finance and central banks, which have played a major role in implementing the new economic logics of the global corporate economy. This does not mean that everything about these cities, localized activists, or state institutions is global. It might be simply that they house or enable particular global dynamics and conditions. As for politics, such a broader understanding of globalization opens up the possibility of national actors (legislators, courts, citizens, local NGOs) doing global politics from inside the national; it also suggests that the immobile, those who do not or cannot cross borders, may nonetheless participate in global politics.

Mapping an analytic terrain for the study of globalization that captures this more complex understanding is at the heart of the specific contribution that sociology can make. Elsewhere (Sassen, 2007), I have examined a range of sociological studies that though not concerned with the global, make significant methodological, data and theoretical contributions to the study of globalization. Most recently, we have seen a type of sociological work that expressly addresses the global in ways that include, but also move beyond understandings of globalization as growing interdependence and self-evident global institutions (Alderson and Beckfield, 2004; Body-Gendrot et al., 2009; Dasgupta, 2004; Hagedorn,

2007; Pries, 2008; Robinson, 2004; Sennett, 2003; Smith and Favell, 2006; Touraine, 2006).

Thus part of the research work entails detecting the presence of such globalizing dynamics in thick social environments that mix national and non-national elements. We can use many of the existing research techniques and data sets developed with the national in mind. But the results need to be analyzed through new conceptual and interpretive frameworks – frameworks that recognize that the national can be one of the sites for the global. Surveys of factories that are part of global commodity chains; in-depth interviews that decipher individual imaginaries about globality; and ethnographies of national financial centers: all expand the analytic terrain for understanding global processes.

We need both a focus on interdependence and a focus on how the global gets constituted inside the national. Both are a necessary part of the larger effort to theorize and research globalization. The focus on the global as interdependence has dominated discussion and interpretation. This has been to the disadvantage of sociology as a discipline. The focus on the nation-state and analytic closure at that level tends to be present in just about all the social sciences, but it is the norm in most of sociology and in political science. In both disciplines some of the most influential data sets are at the national level and some of the most advanced methods and data sets require closure of the unit of analysis, i.e. the nation-state. Critical to many of sociology's methodological and theoretical developments has been the reliance on the nation-state and its (albeit relative) closure in order to establish elaborate data sets requiring closure for the most sophisticated technical methods. In the international field, sociology thrived through comparative sociology – comparisons of nation-states. In contrast, a discipline such as economic geography is more at home studying globalization given its focus on scaling and space, two more abstract entities than sociology's national/local and nation-state, and more capable to cross borders analytically speaking. Also anthropology's focus on subnational levels has positioned it strongly to do ethnographies of the global without the burden of analytical nation-state closure.

The result is a tendency to examine and to interpret issues from the perspective of the nation-state and/or the national state, as has been extensively critiqued by scholars such as Beck (2006) and Taylor (2000), who name this 'methodological nationalism'. I add a twist to the discussion about methodological nationalism through my insistence that the national – whether as national territory or national institutions – can become partly denationalized (Sassen, 2008: Chs 1, 8–9). Crucial to the critique of methodological nationalism is that the 'nation as

container' category is inadequate given the proliferation of transnational dynamics and formations. I share this view, but I add another element: the nation-state as 'container' is also undermined by the multiple structurations of the global inside the national, which I see as a process that denationalizes what was historically constructed as national. This allows me to use many of the data sets, methods and concepts of sociology, albeit by positioning them in a different conceptual architecture. Further, I posit that because the national is thick and highly institutionalized, it is not always easy to detect these often partial or highly specialized denationalizations. Mine is, then, a critique of methodological nationalism with a starting point not exclusively predicated on the fact of transnationalism, but rather on the possibility of internal denationalization.

When we consider the global as partly structured inside the national, we open up analytic terrain for the sociological study of globalization. A key proposition is, then, that existing sociological studies which may not have been concerned with globalization at all, can in fact contribute to the sociological study of globalization. This helps in overriding a key assumption in the social sciences: the implied correspondence of national territory and national institutions with the national, i.e. if a process or condition is located in a national institution or in national territory, it must be national. This assumption describes conditions that have held, albeit never fully, throughout much of the history of the modern state, especially since the First World War, and to some extent continue to do so. But today these conditions are partly but actively being unbundled. Different also is the scope of this unbundling.

We might reformulate this proposition as a research project. The fact that a process or entity is located within the territory of a sovereign state does not necessarily mean it is a national process or entity; it might be a localization of the global. Today, it is an empirical question. While most such entities and processes are likely to be national, there is a growing need for empirical research to establish this for what is in turn a growing range of localizations of the global. Much of what we continue to code as national today may in fact be such a localization. Developing the theoretical and empirical specifications that allow us to accommodate such conditions is a difficult and collective effort.

The in-between space of the state

Given the effort in this article to expand the analytic terrain within which to map the question of globalization, the larger research and theorization agenda

needs to address aspects of globalization and the state which are lost in dualized accounts. While there are indeed many components of each the national and the global that are mutually exclusive, there is a growing, often specific set of components that are not. We see this, for instance, in critical aspects of the work of ministries of finance, central banks and specialized technical regulatory agencies, such as those concerned with telecommunications, competition policy and the war on terror.

As a discipline, sociology is well positioned to develop this in-between domain as part of the research and theorization agenda about globalization. There is research on various dimensions of the state's participation in global processes (e.g. Dezalay and Garth, 1996; Evans, 1997; Fligstein, 2001; Smith et al., 1999). In many ways, today's era continues a long history of changes that have not altered the fundamental fact of state primacy (Mann, 1986, 1993). Both the 'strong' and the 'weak' versions of neo-Weberian state theory (Evans et al., 1985) share certain aspects of this view. While acknowledging that the primacy of the state may vary given different structural conditions between state and society, these authors tend to understand state power as basically denoting the same conditions throughout history: the ability successfully to implement explicitly formulated policies. Even when sociologists such as these do not focus much on globalization and the state, much in their work can help illuminate critical aspects of this subject. For instance, if we find that the state is one of the strategic institutional domains where critical work for developing globalization takes place, then we can posit that globalization does not necessarily produce the decline of the state as a whole but neither does it keep the state going as usual, or produce merely adaptations to the new conditions. The state becomes the site for foundational transformations in the relation between the private and the public domains, in the state's internal balance of power, and in the larger field of both national and global forces within the which the state now has to function (Sassen, 2008: Chs 4 and 5). This type of approach begins to bring the conceptual space of globalization into the parameters of conventional sociology.

Tilly's distinction of the national state from 'the state' as such is helpful in this regard. While states are 'coercion-wielding organizations that are distinct from households and kinship groups and exercise clear priority in some respects over all other organizations within substantial territories', national states are distinguished by 'governing multiple contiguous regions and their cities by means of centralized, differentiated, and autonomous structures' (Tilly, 1990:

1–2). The centralized national state acts as an interface between national and supranational forces, and acts as a 'container' for the former (Brenner, 2004; O'Riain, 2000). Delimiting the national state as one particular form of state allows more analytic freedom in conceptualizing these processes.

A first step in a sociological analysis based on these types of distinctions is to recover the ways in which the state participates in governing the global economy in a context increasingly dominated by deregulation, privatization and the growing authority of non-state actors. The global economy is a good instance to use for illustrating empirical and theoretical issues, but, clearly, the debate regarding globalization and state participation includes a broad range of formations. Importantly, a number of sociologists have examined the possibility of a global civil society (e.g. Albrow et al., 2008; Alexander, 2006; Beck, 2006) and transnationalized forms of the social (Itzigsohn et al., 1999; Komlosy et al., 1997; Parnreiter, 1995; Pries, 2008; *Revista Internacional de Filosofia*, 2006). One effort in this new literature is to examine and theorize potential advantages of transcending nationally oriented state authority and instituting world-level institutional orders.

Like Tilly, nearly all sociological definitions of the state from Weber on emphasize a territorial dimension of state power. Even Mann (1986: 26–7), who is otherwise enormously sensitive to the multiple spatialities of the exercise of power in social life, defines the state largely as an organization exercising political power and enforcing cooperation within a bounded territory. This territorial dimension means that as states participate in the implementation of the global economic system they have, in many cases, undergone significant transformations (Sassen, 2008: Parts 2 and 3). The accommodation of the interests of foreign firms and investors entails a negotiation. At the heart of this negotiation is the development inside national states – through legislative acts, court rulings, executive orders – of the mechanisms necessary for the reconstitution of certain components of national capital into 'global capital', and necessary to accommodate new types of rights/entitlements for foreign capital in what are still national territories in principle under the exclusive authority of their states. The state here can be conceived of as representing a technical administrative capacity enabling the implementation of a corporate global economy. It is a capacity which cannot be replicated at this time by any other institutional arrangement. The background condition is that the state remains as the ultimate guarantor of the 'rights' of global capital, i.e. the protection of contracts and property rights, and, more generally, a major

legitimater of claims. The effect is to denationalize particular, often highly specialized institutional orders inside the state.

Such an approach is one way of expanding the analytic terrain for mapping globalization – it extends that terrain deep into highly specialized components of the national state. These particular transformations inside the state are partial and incipient but strategic. For instance, such transformations can weaken or alter the organizational architecture for the implementation of international law insofar as the latter depends on the institutional apparatus of national states. Further, they have also created the conditions whereby some parts of national states actually gain relative power (Sassen, 2008: Ch. 4) as a result of that participation in the development of a global economy. Some state agencies become more powerful due to their functional importance for the global economy. This must be distinguished from Skocpol's emphasis on the structural independence of state agencies and their internal rationalization (Evans et al., 1985); it also differs from a world-system perspective which would treat 'state power' as monolithic, determined by placement in the world-system.

These trends toward greater interactions of national and global dynamics are not unidirectional. There have been times when they may have been as strong in some aspects as they are today, e.g. the global capital market at the turn of the 20th century (Hirst and Thompson, 1996). Further, state sovereignty was never absolute but rather always subject to significant fluctuations. Thus Arrighi and Silver (cited in Davis, 1999) argue that historically 'each reaffirmation and expansion of legal sovereignty was nonetheless accompanied by a curtailment of the factual sovereignty that rested on the balance of power' (p. 93). 'The crisis of national sovereignty is no novelty of our time. Rather, it is an aspect of the stepwise destruction of the balance of power that originally guaranteed the sovereign equality of the members of the Westphalian system of states' (p. 94).

A second articulation of the state and globalization pivots on unequal power among states. The world-system scholarship has made some of the most important contributions here, as has a strong Marxist and neo-Marxist scholarship (Amin, 1980; Robinson, 2004; see also *Globalizations*, 2010). It is in fact some states, particularly the US and the UK, which are producing the design for the new standards and legalities needed to ensure protections and guarantees for global firms and markets.

But often overlooked in analyses of the unequal power of states is the fact that legislative items, executive orders, adherence to new technical standards,

and so on, will have to be produced through the particular institutional and political structures of each state. The often imposed consensus in the community of states to further globalization is not merely a political decision: it entails specific types of work by a large number of distinct state institutions in each country (Sassen, 2008: Chs 4 and 5). In terms of research and theorization this is a vast uncharted terrain: it would mean examining how that production takes place and gets legitimated in different countries. This signals the possibility of cross-national variations (which then would need to be established, measured and interpreted). To some extent, we may describe this as the production of instances of 'institutional isomorphism' (see the essays in Powell and DiMaggio, 1991). While this book analyzes the structural causes for the emergence of formal similarities among organizations across widely separated areas, and the mechanisms of power and legitimation underlying these causes, it tends to assume that organizations already exist within a shared structural field. Once these organizations are mutually relevant, structural forces can act on each to shape them to a common mold. In the situations under analysis here, it is not immediately clear that the various relevant organizations exist within the same organizational fields, and much of the work performed is oriented specifically toward making them co-present with a common (global) field/space.

The destabilizing of older hierarchies of scale

Where the state is an ambiguous space for the structuring of global processes, the domains I briefly describe next are more easily recognized as global. Unlike the sociological scholarship on the state, research and theorization on these three domains mostly constitutes a new generation of scholarship far more centrally placed in one or another globalization framing. One organizing proposition that encompasses the diversity of these domains is that each represents a distinct type of multiscale dynamics.

Global dynamics can destabilize older hierarchies of scale constituted through the practices and power projects of past eras, with the national scale eventually the preeminent scale. Today, we see what resembles a return to older imperial spatialities for the economic operations of the most powerful actors: the formation of a global market for capital, a global trade regime and the internationalization of manufacturing production. It is, of course, not simply a return to older forms; it is crucial to recognize the

specificity of today's practices and the capabilities enabling these practices. This specificity partly consists of the fact that today's transboundary spatialities had to be produced in a context where most territory is encased in a thick and highly formalized national framework marked by the exclusive authority of the national state. This is, in my reading (Sassen, 2008: Chs 1,4 and 5), one of the key features that differentiates the current from older phases of globalization.

The global project of powerful firms, the new technical capabilities associated with information and communication technologies, and some components of the work of states have together constituted strategic scales other than the national scale (Castells, 1996; Gereffi et al., 2005; Robinson, 2004; Sassen, 2008; Van der Pijl, 1998; see generally Applebaum and Robinson, 2004). Most especially among these are subnational scales such as the global city and supranational scales such as global markets (Badie and Vidal, 2009; Chen, 2005). But there is also a multiplication of horizontal civic global networks and projects (Benayoun and Schnapper, 2006; Jacobson and Ruffer, 2006; Moghadam, 2005; Naples and Desai, 2002). These processes and practices – economic, political, civic – destabilize the scale hierarchies that expressed the power relations and political economy of an earlier period (Aneesh, 2006; Bonilla et al., 1998; Calhoun et al., 2002; Silver, 2003). These were, and to a good extent continue to be, organized in terms of institutional size and territorial scope: from the international down to the national, the regional, the urban and the local, with the national functioning as the articulator of this particular configuration. Notwithstanding multiple different temporal frames, the history of the modern state can be read as the work of rendering national just about all crucial features of society: authority, identity, territory, security, law and capital accumulation.

These instances serve to illustrate some of the conceptual, methodological and empirical issues in this type of research and theorization. One concerns the role of place in a global world. A focus on places helps disaggregate globalization in terms of the multiple specialized cross-border circuits on which different types of places are located. Among the most complex spaces are global cities. These are subnational places where multiple global circuits intersect and thereby position these cities on diverse structured cross-border geographies, each typically with distinct scopes and constituted in terms of distinct practices and actors. For instance, at least some of the circuits connecting São Paulo to global dynamics are different from those of Frankfurt, Johannesburg, or Bombay. Further, distinct sets of overlapping cir-

cuits assemble into distinctly structured cross-border geographies. This multiplication of cities and circuits has also intensified older hegemonic geographies: for instance, Madrid has partly reactivated an older geography that reconnects it to Latin America now largely via investment and immigration.

The new interactive technologies reposition the local, and invite us to a critical reconceptualizing of the local. Through these new technologies a financial services firm becomes a microenvironment with continuous global span. But so do resource-poor organizations or households that are part of global activist networks. This begins to destabilize the notion of context, typically associated with locality, and of physical proximity as a necessary trait of locality. In brief, local scales are not inevitably part of nested scalar hierarchies running from the local to the regional, the national and the international.

Scaling takes on specific contents when the practices and dynamics involved are global but take place at what has been historically constructed as the scale of the national or the local. With few exceptions, most prominent among which is a growing scholarship in geography, the social sciences have not had critical distance (i.e. historicized) from the scale of the national. The consequence has been a tendency to take it as a fixed scale, reifying it and, more generally, to neutralize the question of scaling, or at best to reduce scaling to a hierarchy of size. This brings with it the often uncritical assumption that these scales are mutually exclusive, including the scales of the national and the global.

Today's rescaling dynamics cut across institutional size and across the institutional encasements of territory produced by the formation of national states. This does not mean that the old hierarchies disappear but rather that rescalings emerge alongside the old ones, and that the former can often trump the latter. Existing theory is not enough to map today's multiplication of practices and actors constitutive of these rescalings.

Conclusion

This article has focused especially on how the global can get structured inside the national. This type of perspective expands the analytic terrain within which to understand the global in ways that allow us to use sociological methods, concepts and data even when these were not designed to address the global.

I identified at least three ways in which we can design objects of study that make the national one of the terrains for the global. One consists of the endogenizing or the localizing of global dynamics in the national. A second consists of formations which

although global are articulated with particular actors, cultures, or projects, producing an object of study that requires negotiating a global and a local scale, such as global markets and global networks. A third consists of the denationalizing of what had historically been constructed as national and may still continue to be experienced, represented and coded as such; this produces an object of study that is contained within national frames but needs to be decoded, such as state institutions that are key producers of instruments needed by global economic actors. These three types of instances capture distinct social entities and have diverse origins. However, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. They may well come together in some of the conditions or processes we might want to construct as objects of study.

A focus on such subnationally based processes and dynamics of globalization requires methodologies and theorizations that engage not only global scalings but also subnational scalings as components of *global* processes. Studying global processes and conditions that get constituted subnationally has some advantages over studies of globally scaled dynamics, but it also poses specific challenges. It does make possible the use of long-standing research techniques, from quantitative to qualitative, in the study of globalization. It also gives us a bridge for using the wealth of national and subnational data sets as well as specialized scholarships such as area studies. Both types of studies, however, need to be situated in conceptual architectures that are not quite those held by the researchers who generated these research techniques and data sets, as their efforts mostly had little to do with globalization

Annotated further reading

- Albrow M (1997) *The Global Age: State and Society beyond Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
This book writes the history of the present as a new epoch. It breaks with the narratives of modernity to show the coherence of new, non-modern global phenomena and the global as a transformative force in history.
- Arrighi G (1994) *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. London: Verso. Arrighi embeds the expansion of finance in the global economy since the 1970s into a longer term history of systemic cycles of accumulation, and posits that this expansion signals, once again, a change of the current hegemonic order.
- Arroyo M, Santos M, De Souza MAA, and Capuano Scarlato F (eds) (1993) *Fim de seculo e globalizacao*. São Paulo: Hucitet.
Milton Santos and his colleagues have developed some of the most critical and important concepts for understanding globalization. They began to observe these transformations in the 1980s. This is just one of the many volumes they have produced, always combining theory and empirical research.
- Beck U (1986) *Risikogesellschaft Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
The limitlessness of global types of modern technological risk are making modern institutions increasingly unable to exclude risk. The result is the emergence of a world risk society.
- Castells M (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
Castells argues that the structural challenges imposed by the Information Age on macrostructures, such as the nation-state, generate regional decoupling on the one hand and speculative overheating on the other.
- Ehrenreich B, Hochschild A (eds) (2003) *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan.
This book documents the global redistribution of care work to female economic migrants, replicating women's exploitation on a global scale. It makes visible what remains largely an invisible trend – the dependencies of the rich on poor countries.
- Giddens A (1986) *The Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Giddens offers the kind of sociological theorizing that gives us key tools for examining and interpreting some of the major realignments and emergent formations in the current era. The book helps raise the level of complexity in analyses of globalization.
- Lucas L (ed.) (2005) *Unpacking Globalisation: Markets, Gender and Work*. Kampala: Makerere University Press.
Lucas brings together women activists and researchers, mostly from Africa and Asia, focused on capturing changing economic and work structures in the Global South.
- Robertson R (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Globalization develops the concept of the global field, consisting of national societies, individuals, international relations, humankind and their relations. It helps us understand globalization as a contested process grounded in these cultural forms.
- Touraine A (2006) *Un nouveau paradigme: Pour comprendre le monde d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Fayard.
The central proposition here is that each major era is captured through some key concepts. Today's era cannot be captured through those of the preceding time – social classes, wealth, inequality. Today, the new paradigm is cultural, with key concepts such as minorities, sexualities, religions.
- Wallerstein I (1974) *The Modern World-System I. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
This work analyzes and develops the concept of world-system through an examination of the world

economy from the 16th century on. Wallerstein embeds an understanding of modern globalization phenomena in this multi-century process.

References

- Albrow M, Anheier HK, Glasius M, Price ME, and Kaldor M (2008) *Global Civil Society 2007/8: Communicative Power and Democracy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alderson AS, Beckfield J. (2004) Power and position in the world city system. *American Journal of Sociology* 109(5): 811–51.
- Alexander JC (2006) *The Civil Sphere*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Amin S (1980) *Class and Nation, Historically and in the Current Crisis*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Aneesh A (2006) *Virtual Migration: The Programming of Globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Appelbaum RP, Robinson WI (eds) (2004) *Critical Globalization Studies*. Oxford: Taylor and Francis.
- Arroyo M, Santos M, De Souza MAA, and Capuano Scarlato F (eds) (1993) *Fim de seculo e globalizacão*. São Paulo: Hucitex.
- Badie B, Vidal D (eds) (2009) *L'Etat du monde 2010*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Beck U (1986) *Risikogesellschaft Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Beck U (2006) *Cosmopolitan Visions*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Benayoun C, Schnapper D (2006) *Diasporas et nations*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
- Body-Gendrot S, Garcia M, and Mingione E (2009) Comparative social transformations in urban regimes'. In: Sales A (ed.) *Sociology Today: Social Transformations in a Globalizing World*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bonilla F, Melendez E, Morales R, and Torres de los Angeles M (1998) *Bordeless Borders*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Brenner N (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calhoun CJ, Price P, and Timmer AS (2002) *Understanding September 11*. New York: New Press.
- Castells M (1989) *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban Regional Process*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Castells M (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chase-Dunn C (1984) Urbanization in the world system: New directions for research. In: Smith MP (ed.) *Cities in Transformation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 41–6.
- Chen X (2005) *As Borders Bend: Transnational Spaces on the Pacific Rim*. Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Dasgupta S (2004) *The Changing Force of Globalization*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Davis DE (ed.) (1999) Chaos and governance. In: *Political Power and Social Theory*, Vol. 13 (Part IV: Scholarly Controversy). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Dezalay Y, Garth BG (1996) *Dealing in Virtue*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Evans P (1997) The eclipse of the state? Reflections on stateness in an era of globalization. *World Politics* 50(1): 62–87.
- Evans P, Rueschemeyer D, and Skocpol T (eds) (1985) *Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fligstein N (2001) *The Architecture of Markets*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Gereffi G, Humphrey J, and Sturgeon T (2005) The governance of global value chains. *Review of International Political Economy* 12(1): 78–104.
- Giddens A (1986) *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Globalizations (2010) Special Issue on 'Globalization and the Financial Crisis', Vols 1 and 2 (April).
- Hagedorn J (ed.) (2007) *Gangs in the Global City: Exploring Alternatives to Traditional Criminology*. Chicago: University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Hirst P, Thompson G (1996) *Globalization in Question*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Itzigsohn J, Dore Cabral C, Hernandez Medina E, and Vazquez O (1999) Mapping Dominican transnationalism: Narrow and broad transnational practices. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22(2): 2316–40.
- Jacobson D, Ruffer GB (2006) Scope: global or national?: Social relations on a global scale. In: Giugni M, Passy F (ed.) *Dialogues on Migration Policies*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 25–44.
- King AD (1990) *Urbanism, Colonialism, and the World Economy: Culture and Spatial Foundations of the World Urban System*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Komlosy A, Parnreiter C, Stacher I, and Zimmermann S (eds) (1997) *Ungeregelt und Unterbezahlt: Der Informelle Sektor in der Weltwirtschaft*. Frankfurt: Brandes und Apsel/Sudwind.
- Mann M (1986, 1993) *The Sources of Social Power*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moghadam VM (2005) *Globalizing Women: Transnational Feminist Networks*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Naples NA, Desai M (eds) (2002) *Women's Activism and Globalization: Linking Local Struggles and Transnational Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Nash J, Fernández-Kelly MP (eds) (1983) *Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- O'Riain S (2000) States and markets in an era of globalization. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 187–213.
- Palloix C (1975) *L'Internationalisation du capital: e?le?ments critiques*. Paris: F Maspero.
- Parnreiter C (1995) Uprooting, globalization, and migration: Selected questions. *Journal für Entwicklungspolitik* 11(3): 245–60.
- Portes A, Walton J (1981) *Labor, Class and the International System*. New York: Academic Press.
- Potts L (1990) *The World Labor Market: A History of Migration*. London: Zed Books.

- Powell W, DiMaggio P (eds) (1991) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Pries L (2008) *Dies Transnationalisierung der sozialen Welt*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Revista Internacional de Filosofía* (2006) Inmigración, estado y ciudadanía, Simposio, 27 July.
- Ricca S (1990) *Migrations internationales en Afrique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Ritzer G (1995) *The MacDonaldisation of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robertson R (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robinson W (2004) *A Theory of Global Capitalism: Transnational Production, Transnational Capitalists, and the Transnational State*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Santos M, De Souza MAA, and Silveira ML (1994) *Território: globalização e fragmentação*. São Paulo: Editora Hucitec.
- Sassen S (1997 [1988]) *The Mobility of Labor and Capital: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sassen S (2007) *A Sociology of Globalization*. New York: WW Norton.
- Sassen S (2008) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sayad A (1999) *La Double Absence. Des illusions de l'émigré aux souffrances de l'immigré*. Paris: Seuil.
- Sennett R (2003) *Respect in an Age of Inequality*. New York: WW Norton
- Silver BJ (2003) *Forces of Labor: Workers Movements and Globalization since 1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sklair L (1995) *Sociology of the Global System*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith DA, Solinger DJ, and Topik SC (eds) (1999) *States and Sovereignty in the Global Economy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Smith MP, Favell A (2006) The human face of global mobility: International highly skilled migration in Europe, North America and the Asian Pacific. *Comparative Urban and Community Research* 8 (Special Issue).
- Taylor P (2000) World cities and territorial states under conditions of contemporary globalization. *Political Geography* 19(5): 5–32.
- Thomas MG, Meyer JW, Ramirez FO, and Boli J (1987) *Institutional Structure: Constituting State, Society and Individual*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tilly C (1990) *Coercion, Capital, and European States*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Touraine A (2006) *Un nouveau paradigme: Pour comprendre le monde d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Fayard.
- Van der Pijl K (1998) *Transnational Classes and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- Wallerstein I (1974) *The Modern World-System*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ward KB (1990) *Women Workers and Global Restructuring*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Saskia Sassen is the Robert S Lynd Professor of Sociology and member of the Committee on Global Thought, Columbia University, New York (www.saskiasassen.com). Her latest books are *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages* (Princeton University Press, 2008) and *A Sociology of Globalization* (WW Norton, 2007). [email: sjs2@columbia.edu]

résumé Cet article étend notre terrain d'analyse du global, en incorporant méthodes, concepts et données sociologiques qui n'étaient pas par essence destinées à appréhender le global. Il met en lumière trois types d'instances où le national est un des terrains du global. Le premier type est l'endogenisation, ou l'inclusion de dynamiques globales au sein du national. Le second type se compose de formations qui, bien que globales, s'articulent autour d'acteurs, de cultures, de projets spécifiques, produisant un objet d'étude qui nécessite une négociation entre échelles locale et globale. Le troisième type représente la dénationalisation de ce qui fut historiquement construit comme national, et qui parfois est encore ressenti et codé comme tel, alors même qu'il ne l'est plus. L'analyse de ces processus subnationaux et de ces dynamiques de globalisation requiert l'utilisation de méthodologies et de théories qui engagent l'échelle subnationale du global entendue comme une composante de processus globaux.

mots-clés dénationalisation ♦ globalisation ♦ localisation la nation ♦ nationalisme

resumen Este artículo busca expandir el terreno analítico para el estudio de lo global con metodologías, conceptos, y datos sociológicos que en su origen no se diseñaron para este objetivo. Se

examinan tres casos en los que el terreno nacional forma parte del espacio global. Uno de ellos aborda la localización de dinámicas globales en el espacio nacional. El segundo consiste en la articulación de dinámicas globales a partir de actores, culturas, o proyectos locales, produciendo un objeto de estudio que requiere la negociación entre el espacio global y lo local. El tercero es la desnacionalización de lo que históricamente se ha construido a escala nacional, y sigue representado o codificado como lo nacional cuando en realidad ya no lo es. El estudio de estos tipos de procesos y dinámicas globales que se dan a niveles sub-nacionales requiere metodologías y teorías que puedan acomodar las escalas sub-nacionales de lo global, no solo la escala global.

palabras clave desnacionalización ♦ globalización ♦ localización ♦ la nación ♦ nacionalismo