GUEST EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Huimin Jin[*]

It is widely received, if it is not running the risk of becoming a cliché as David Held et al. suspect (Held, 1999: 1), that globalization is not only what we are nowadays but also a theory or perspective with which to look at and deal with such a what-we-are-nowadays. However, to the questions of what globalization is by definition, and what we are experiencing from it, and therefore what theory or perspective it may be, none of the answers is cogent and convincing to date, they are but one argument after/against another. There are two existing approaches to globalization: the modernity and postmodernity. The former holds that globalization is an extension or a diffusion of the modern Western universal values and systems to the East. As suggested by Marxist critics such as Wallerstein, Harvey or Amin, globalization is no more than a global expansion of (Western) capitalism, a flow of (Western) capital and ideology without boundaries. The latter argues that globalization does not signify a triumph of modernity across the world but quite the opposite. A failure of this modernity project, when it meets other cultures or civilizations as perceived by Huntington, Giddens, and the like, and at its best, in the terminology of Roland Robertson (Robertson, 1992: 173-174), it finally becomes a "glocalization." The theory of Global dialogism is neither the model of modernity nor that of postmodernity, but rather an alternative, which tries to integrate and therefore transcend the previous two approaches. Globalization is simultaneously Westernization or Americanization, de-Western-nization or de-Americanization, process and counter-process. Globalization is a dynamic dialogue between the West and the East, between the North and the South. More concisely, globalization is a dialogue.

The concept of dialogue is no simpler than the question of globalization, about which arguments are as varied as those concerning globalization. There are two existing paradigms of dialogue studies: the modernist one and postmodernist

[*]Dr. HUIMIN JIN, Qujiang Chair Professor of Cultural Theory & Aesthetics at Shaanxi Normal University, Xi-an, and Chair Professor of Literary Theory at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, China. Email: jhmyxm@126.com.

one. The modernist paradigm believes in the correspondence between word and thing, or the intention and the intended, according to which a dialogue should be a rational imperative that one must and is capable of following. The postmodernist counterpart is skeptical that a successful dialogue may be made, as dialogue primarily belongs to discourse, conception, and text. Thereby it is inter-discourse or inter-text, always looping around signifiers, with no reference to thing or intention. Developing from both of them, my dialogism further contends: First, dialogue has two dimensions: the discursive, which can be shared and communicated, and the real, which cannot be known and represented. Second, a dialogue on a discursive level does not imply a consensus which is reached via discourse. Rather it is a dynamic link or relation among all the people involved in the dialogue. What makes a dialogue ever changing and unpredictable is the interlocutor's material existence, which is ceaselessly self-driven in its own right. Third, difference is not ontological but conceptual, and in this respect, any claim to difference or to being recognized as different is intended to join a dialogue and thus have a better position in this dialogue. Therefore, difference, at the level of discourse, is part of dialogue. In an increasingly connected as well as conflicted world, we need discursive dialogue, upon which we could even expect a world law for all countries. However, we need to respect those entities (*otherness*, the *unconscious,* or whatever you wish to name) which cannot be put into dialogue. We should realize that discursive dialogue will never fully represent the existence of the interlocutors - whether they are the stronger or the weaker side.

"Intercultural dialogue has emerged in the first decade of the twenty first century as a major means for managing diversity and strengthening democracy." (Besley and Peters, 2012: 2) As the world becomes increasingly globalized, the need for different countries' governments and systems to cooperate to achieve global objectives through dialogue has become irreversible. "In recent years the world has experienced remarkable contrast between strong adverse economic, social, and environmental trends, and the weakness of the international system of governance to manage them. These adverse trends include, among others, the global effects of the North-Atlantic financial crisis, the threats generated by climate change, and the growing income inequality that affects a large number of countries. In the face of these challenges, the response of the international communities has been weak." (Ocampo, 2016: 3) Clashes and wars among civilizations, states and even stateless people are as old as the humanity itself. "…the international relations (IR) concern the relationships among the world's

governments. However, these relationships cannot be understood in isolation. They are closely connected with other actors (such as international organizations, multinational corporations, and individuals), with other social structures and processes (including economics, culture, and domestic politics), and with geographical and historical influences. These elements together power the central trend in IR today—globalization." (Pevehouse and Goldstein, 2016: 3) One of the most important purposes of global dialogism is to reduce the tensions, manage the conflicts between different civilizations, socio-political systems and international relations, and enhance mutual understanding and cooperation.

This special edition of *JET* will discuss "Global Dialogism & International Relations." In this issue, Huimin Jin's article categorizes cultural studies into two modes: the "modernity" cultural studies and the "post-modernity" cultural studies. It analyses their advantages and disadvantages respectively, suggesting as the third mode that "globality" cultural studies transcend the previous two: the tenet of which is a philosophy of global dialogism that sublates (*aufheben*) both modernity and postmodernity at one time. Sanjay Lal reveals that notions of individual sovereignty, universal rights, and the duty to follow one's own conscience are central to the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi. He argues that an underlying harmony in Gandhi's philosophy is evident among such classic liberal and communitarian values given his overall views on self-realization. This demonstrates the value of Gandhi's insights for contemporary philosophical debates between liberals and communitarians. According to Davis Florick and Maorong Jiang's article, the Korean Peninsula has been polarized for nearly a century. Offering North Korea a package, which recognizes the North's nuclear program and addresses some of its other strategic concerns, while bringing the "Hermit Kingdom" into the international community, presents the best, feasible option to change the course of the region. Such a shift from Washington, deeply rooted in its reengagement with China, can be achieved through courageous and decisive leadership, coupled with an appropriate planning construct. The purpose of Saito Hajime's article is to examine John Hersey's book *Hiroshima* and the occupational policy of General Headquarters (GHQ). For the author, a controversy over the use of this work as a textbook arose among Japanese university teachers of English: Rintaro Fukuhara and Takashi Nozaki exemplified these opinions. Their contrasting views on the text suggest the ways in which intellectuals or academics can or cannot cope under the pressure of a hegemonic cultural power.

References

Besley, Tina, and Peters, Michael A. (Ed.). 2012. *Interculturalism, Education and Dialogue*. Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Held, David. 1999. *Global Transformations*: *Politics, Economics, and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.

Ocampo, Jose Antonio (Ed.). 2016. *Global Governance and Development* (Initiative for Policy Dialogue). Oxford University Press.

Pevehouse, Jon C.W. and Goldstein, Joshua S. 2016. *International Relations*. 11th edition. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Press.

Robertson, Roland. 1992. *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.