Dahl, Gudrun (with Ronald Stade) 2003 "Introduction: globalization, creolization and cultural complexity" i Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs vol 3 no 3 juli 2003 Temanummer (guest ed. Gudrun Dahl and Ronald Stade) "Globalization, Creolization and Cultural Complexity: Essays in Honour of Ulf Hannerz")

This special issue of *Global Networks* is devoted to the work of Ulf Hannerz, whose research in urban anthropology, media anthropology, and transnational cultural processes has established his international reputation.¹ Over the years, this reputation has earned him many distinctions – he is, for example, a member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, former Chair of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, and anthropology editor for the new *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Such honours, however, never led to complacency. There has been a steady stream of publications and a continuous series of research projects. Most recently, Hannerz not only completed a study of the work of news media foreign correspondents, which included field research that took him to four continents, he has already started a new research project about the cultural and political dimensions of cosmopolitanism. All this attests to some measure of curiosity and resolve.

In his native Sweden, an entire generation became aware of these qualities at a time when the country could still be conceived as a culturally homogeneous and socially integrated model of modernity. At the age of fourteen, Hannerz entered Swedish television's first major game show. This was in 1957, the same year Swedish television had begun its regular broadcasts. There were some 25,000 TV sets in all of Sweden, in front of which were packed on average twelve viewers. The game show in question was called *Tiotusen kronors frågan* (The 10,000 Crown Question) and was modelled on the American quiz show The 64,000 Dollar Question. Young Hannerz competed as an expert on aquarium fish and advanced from level to level, until he was to pick the only aquarium fish with eye lids from a list of seven. His reply was "dogfish," but both the quiz show host and the show's judge decided that the correct answer should have been "mudskipper." Fourteen-year-old Hannerz insisted, however, and, after a storm of protest from viewers (which brought about a closer investigation), it turned out that he had been right. He went on to become the first to win the big prize, which back then equalled an average annual income in Sweden. Hannerz had achieved overnight fame, and, to this day, many Swedes remember him as a child prodigy and TV celebrity.

Why bring up this anecdote? I believe that it contains a number of clues to Hannerz' intellectual development. The circumstance that he, in his home country, was one of the brand-new TV medium's first celebrities was probably not inconsequential upon his continuing interest in the media. Moreover, the fact that television as a popular medium, the game format of the Swedish quiz show, and the kind of fame he himself had gained as a TV star, all had predecessors in the United States was not lost on Hannerz. When travelling in the United States the same year he won the money prize, he witnessed how television was shaping everyday life in a manner that, at the time, would have seemed futuristic to most of his fellow countrymen. In those days, there were already some 35 million TV sets in America. TV was the country's largest medium for advertising, and in many homes the TV was on virtually all day (see Brian Moeran in this issue for a discussion of TV and advertising in Japan).

¹ I would like to thank

Observations like these eventually turned into research questions about the connection between new technologies, the way culture is diffused and mediated, how cultural meanings become socially organized, and how they, in turn, produce social patterns. It is hardly surprising, then, that one finds references to Marshall McLuhan in Hannerz' work (see more about McLuhan in Eriksen's contribution to this issue). One topic Hannerz has tried to address is to what extent, and in what possible manners, the medium can indeed be the message (see, for instance, his discussion about the social organization of cultural meanings in *Cultural Complexity*, 1992).

The story about Hannerz at age fourteen also reveals an early fascination with exotic lands and faraway places. This is what his interest in aquarium fish was about. And it was not simply another case of orientalist dreams about tropical paradises, which, for that matter, were firmly entrenched in 1950s Western popular culture. Rather, there was a telling combination of immediate experience and practice, involving living creatures, and taxonomic thinking, as in memorizing the genus and species of every kind of fish. On closer examination, one will find that this connection between participation and classification permeates the anthropological work of Hannerz.

Finally, there is yet another clue to be retrieved from the anecdote about Hannerz' early fame. To be able to travel the world as a young teenager – the fourteen-year-old not only went to the United States, but also travelled to Brazil and various parts of Africa – definitely made a deep impression. Anyone familiar with Hannerz' writings will recognize that "travel" may be a fitting metaphor for his various research interests, as well as his theoretical approach. An even better metaphor, however, may be "flânerie," the activity Georg Simmel's flâneur engages in. The flâneur walks the streets of the city and sits in cafés studying the passers-by. The urban setting as such provides the flâneur with "serendipity: you find things without specifically looking for them, because they are around you all the time" (Hannerz 1992: 203). The cultural swirl of the city (about which Gisela Welz writes in this issue) is a window to the world when it is most contemporary. Simmel, the original flâneur from Berlin, was a *Zeitzeuge*, someone who witnesses, and bears witness to, his time. In Hannerz' case (as in Simmel's), this also entails always staying abreast of change, sensing where historical developments are headed.

The sense of history that Hannerz shares with Simmel is one that is open-ended. The thinking of both turns on the interplay of form and substance as a type of dialectic that has no conciliation or closure. History does not end. In Hannerz' theory of social organization and cultural process, the world keeps on turning. Cultural diversity will not be absorbed in a single and uniform global order. Creolization is a never-ending process, and cultural innovation is inevitable.

How, then, did Hannerz find his way to the academic field of anthropology in the first place? After having finished upper-secondary education, he enrolled at the Department of Zoology in Stockholm. The introductory course, however, was not to start until later that year, and so he picked a course in Comparative and General Ethnography as a sort of time filler. It seems to have been love at first sight, because Hannerz never abandoned the department that subsequently, under his leadership, became the Department of Social Anthropology at Stockholm University.

If an early preoccupation with zoology may still be visible in a certain predilection for taxonomic analysis, another influence on Hannerz' theoretical perspective was a certain type

of sociology, which he came into contact with during his time as an exchange student in the USA. This type of sociology is often subsumed under the heading of “Chicago School.” It is a sociological tradition that emerged in the multicultural setting of Chicago – a place that within a few decades had gone from a frontier outpost to America’s second largest city. One of the Chicago School’s key components was urban ethnography – a research tradition with which Hannerz aligned himself from early on, and which, eventually, resulted in such studies as *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community* (1969) and *Exploring the City* (1980). It is in this context that one should appreciate the influence of sociologists like Simmel and Alfred Schutz on Hannerz’ work.

In Sweden, Hannerz turned the fusty, strictly artefact-oriented, and museum-based Department of Comparative and General Ethnography into a vanguard of international Social Anthropology. At a time, when most anthropologists still had difficulties dealing with complex societal settings (some anthropologists continue to have those difficulties), Hannerz made the conceptualization of cultural complexity the centrepiece of his research. Today, in a time of dystopias about clashing civilizations and coming anarchies, a cool-headed analysis of global processes that can provide tools for investigating cultural complexity may prove to be the best cure.

One way of honouring Hannerz’ work is by employing his conceptual tools for studying cultural complexity and transnational processes. This is exactly what the contributors to this special issue of *Global Networks* have done. The ethnographic and theoretical range of applications is astonishing. The contributions to this issue take us from the gay community of Tel Aviv to a Zambian on-line magazine, from the global Armenian diaspora to a pan-European Manc (person from Manchester), and from questions of cultural creativity to the issue of masculinity and sexuality among transmigrant Arab Muslims.

First out is Karin Fog Olwig, who uses Hannerz’ concept of delinking in her discussion of how Danes create an imagined world in which Denmark’s past as a colonial power – in this case in what is now the U.S. Virgin Islands – is reconciled with a national self-image of a progressive and socially conscious people that has a long tradition of egalitarian relations rooted in Danish peasant culture.

The following four contributions by Thomas Hylland Eriksen, Orvar Löfgren, Gisela Welz, and James Ferguson address the question of cultural creativity, which, as Welz notices, “is one of the threads most consistently woven into the fabric of [Hannerz’] theoretical thought.” In this context, Hannerz has repeatedly referred to Salman Rushdie, whose struggle against ideologies of (cultural, racial, social) purity also has been his. This is how Rushdie defines cultural creativity: “*Mélange*, hotchpotch, a bit of this and a bit of that is *how newness enters the world*.” (Rushdie 1991: 394) Thomas Hylland Eriksen quotes this passage and connects it to Hannerz’ concept of creolization. Eriksen makes the point that creolization – the newness of “a bit of this and a bit of that” – not only is something Hannerz conceptualizes in terms of creolization, but that it also characterizes his style as a researcher. Eriksen praises Hannerz’ work as being full of creole creativity. Rather than bringing to mind monotheism, it resembles intellectual Hinduism, is how Eriksen puts it.

Löfgren continues the discussion about cultural creativity by investigating how this kind of creativity surges in times of (imagined or real) economic transitions. Anytime new economies are being constructed and conceptualized, imagineering and culturalization become prevalent.

In the New Economy of the most recent turn of the century, more than anything this has been a matter of aestheticizing the economy in order to produce newness, argues Löfgren.

Rather than viewing the cultural production of newness in terms of ideological constructions, Welz tries to understand the social and historical context of cultural innovation. She asks whether anthropologists can identify circumstances and settings that facilitate consciously performed cultural creativity. Her conclusion is that what Hannerz refers to as the cultural swirl of the city may be a milieu that is conducive to innovation because it incorporates heterogeneous actors who are exposed to serendipitous encounters and exchanges.

Ferguson does not discuss the topic of cultural creativity as such, but it is part of his ethnography. He bases his contribution on Hannerz' key thematic of the social organization of meaning. The ethnographic case is a Zambian on-line magazine. The issue of cultural creativity enters the picture as the participants in the magazine's on-line discussion debate how to invent a new Zambian culture that is more in tune with the demands of the global economy. With the help of the ethnographic example, Ferguson addresses the more general issue of "the problematic relation between 'the nation' conceived in cultural and historical terms and the allegiances of transnational elites with increasingly 'global' affiliations" – a topic Hannerz, over the years, has written about in several places.

Like Ferguson, Paula Uimonen focuses on the Internet as a machinery of meaning (which is how Hannerz defines the media) with which to construct images of the nation. In her case, the ethnographic case concerns the process of Malaysian nation building that is being conducted on-line. The next contributor, Roger Sanjek, employs Hannerz' concepts of network and global flow (and, implicitly, of creolization) in a discussion of historical forms of migration. He contrasts the concepts of network, flow, and cultural interaction with viewpoints that are presentist and that foreground divergence and cultural singularities.

Sanjek mentions diaspora as one of seven historically emergent, and still ongoing, processes of migration. In his contribution, Ulf Björklund compares different Armenian diaspora communities. Social actors within these communities possess what Hannerz (1992:43) refers to as a metacultural sensibility, which gives them the ability to create out of the diversity of historically separated diasporas something of a diasporic Armenian civil society, and even a diasporic nation.

Brian Moeran discusses three analytical concepts in a study of business organization. The three concepts are fields (in Bourdieu's sense), networks (in Hannerz' sense), and frames (in Goffman's sense). Moeran applies these concepts to the ethnographic case of a major Tokyo-based advertising company. Rather than, as is usually done, seeing the analytical concepts of fields, networks, and frames as mutually exclusive, Moeran thinks of them as complementary because they extend from macro- to micro-analysis (and therefore cover different levels of analysis), and because they are mutually constitutive, interacting processes.

Moshe Shokeid writes about the global ecumene of gay life seen from the perspective of gay people in Tel Aviv, whom Shokeid, with a wink to Hannerz, calls "closeted cosmopolitans." Shokeid's contribution contains a postscript that reveals that what may be understood in terms of cultural difference at one point in time may, eventually, turn into a phenomenon that is better researched in terms of cultural diffusion.

Like Shokeid, Lena Gerholm addresses the issue of how sexuality is socially organized and culturally encoded. Her study focuses on notions of masculinity and sexuality among

transmigrant Arab Muslims in contemporary Stockholm – a place Hannerz has described in terms of “double creolization,” i.e., a process in which migration to the city and its suburbs creates local creolizations, while Stockholm, at the same time, dresses itself up as a metropolitan center of the New York and Los Angeles kind. (One of the more visible expressions of double creolization is the adoption of East L.A. gang identities by suburban juveniles whose parents migrated to Sweden.) Double creolization, more than anything, is a complex interplay between ideas about center and periphery relationships. Gerholm takes up this theme and arrives at the conclusion that for Arab Muslim transmigrants, Stockholm may very well be a center when it comes to public life (work, politics, democracy, and technology), but remains a periphery in the sphere of private life (in particular the organization of sexuality and relations between the sexes). On the other hand, the encounter between Arab Muslim men and Swedish women, and their raising children in a Swedish environment, will inevitably create novel cultural forms, with creolization as an unintended outcome.

The concluding contribution is by Keith Hart. It is an autobiographically organized narration, which may seem odd in an issue that is supposed to honor someone else. On the other hand, Hart’s autobiographical account creates a prism through which we may view Hannerz’ (actual and intellectual) movements across the globe. Analogous to Hannerz, Hart conducted fieldwork in the Caribbean (where he and Hannerz met) and in West Africa – “pursuing the African diaspora around the Atlantic world,” as Hart puts it. Both spent a few years in the United States and came away with a case of New World fever, that is, a lasting curiosity about this society that is so full of contradictions. In the end, however, it is the motif of moving from place to place as a form of being in the world and inner journey that may be the strongest connection between Hart’s story and Hannerz’ oeuvre. Walter Benjamin (1984:592) wrote: “Being a dialectical thinker means having the winds of history in the sails. The sails are the concepts. However, the possession of mere sails is not enough. What matters is the art of setting them skilfully.” As someone who was invited to share in Ulf Hannerz’ intellectual voyage, I can testify that this is an art he excels in.

References

Benjamin, Walter. 1984. *Gesammelte Schriften, Volume 5*, edited by Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Hannerz, Ulf. 1969. *Soulside: Inquiries Into Ghetto Culture and Community*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.

--. 1980. *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward an Urban Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press.

--. 1992. *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press.