

Global Change and Local Belonging

Over the past two centuries sociologists have frequently pronounced the end of local identities, and yet attachment to place remains remarkably obdurate. This obstinacy endures even though the terms of the sociological debate have changed radically in the past decade. The early social theorists Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Simmel argued that capitalist modernity shattered the personal bonds of face-to-face community (see generally, Kumar 1978) and their concern animated sociological reflection for much of the 20th Century. Yet, despite these prophetic accounts, many urban sociologists emphasised that community ties could be reconstructed even in a modern, complex world (see Gans 1962; Wellman 1979; Fischer 1982; Savage et al. 2002). Since the early 1990s, however, globalisation theorists have re-energised these old debates. These writers emphasise that in a world characterised by virtual communication, institutional deregulation, and the movement of capital, information, objects and people at great speed across large distances, social life cannot be seen as firmly located in particular places with clear boundaries. Identities are therefore diasporic, mobile and transient. The leading British sociologist John Urry (2000) has issued a manifesto for the 21st Century centred on a new sociology of flows to replace a sociology of 'territory', arguing that belonging 'almost always involve(s) diverse forms of mobility', so that people dwell 'in and through being at home and away, through the dialectic of roots and routes' (Urry 2000: 132–133).

Although these issues are widely discussed, they have rarely been subject to systematic empirical examination. Our book explores how far-reaching global changes are articulated locally through examining the cultural practices, lifestyles and identities of 182 residents in four locations around Manchester, England, in the late 1990s. Our study is timely. It is widely recognised that local case studies, if not conceived as studies of fixed and bounded communities, but as studies of sites from which forms of mobility as well as fixity can be empirically observed, are vitally necessary for elaborating the nature of contemporary social change. This is a point of agreement between those writing from within the community studies tradition, such as Graham Crow (2002) who claims that local studies have always been crucial for generating insights regarding social change, and Ulrich Beck (2002: 23), who insists that 'you cannot even think about globalisation without referring to specific locations and places'. The issue, however, is how to elaborate these programmatic statements into viable empirical

research. This first chapter lays out the theoretical and methodological basis for our study. Firstly, we show how globalisation theory conceives of the 'local'. Many globalisation theorists want to abolish the distinction between the global and the local, yet it is also clear that without some reference to the 'local', the meaning of the 'global' also becomes obscure. This unstable tension between the local and global goes to the core of globalisation theory. In the second section we explain how Pierre Bourdieu's social theory can be developed to provide a distinctive way through these uncertainties by offering a spatially sensitive, but non-reductive account of social practice. The third part of this chapter explains our research methodology, showing why Manchester is a telling site in which to study global change and local belonging, and justifying our use of qualitative methods. Finally, we explain why we chose our four locations within the Manchester area, and offer brief pen portraits of them which will serve as a foundation for the more detailed analyses in later chapters.

1.1 Globalisation and the problem of the local

Globalisation theory emerged from the later 1980s in response to new forms of capitalist hegemony (Robertson 1992). The collapse of most state socialist regimes, as well as the weakening power of labour movements and socialist politics within many capitalist nations removed the main political alternative to free-market capitalism (Bauman 1989). Economic restructuring, state deregulation, the power of large transnational corporations, and the proliferation of new technologies facilitating the mobility of goods, capital, people and symbols, led to a new sense of global connectivity. New kinds of consumerist post-modern aesthetic, and intensified forms of individualised identities, were heralded as indications of new social relations generated by global flows (see Harvey 1987; Lash and Urry 1987; Bauman 1989; Jameson 1991). By the early 1990s it was possible to conceive of one world organised around common capitalist parameters, for the first time since the First World War (see Fukuyama 1992).

Early globalisation theorists used these dramatic developments to repackage longer standing concerns regarding the fate of community (Nisbet 1953; Therborn 1970). For Giddens (1990, 1991) 'the concept of globalisation is best understood as expressing the fundamental aspects of time-space distanciation' (1991: 2). Communication was no longer confined to the boundaries of particular places as practices became increasingly detached from their local settings. Giddens relied on Heidegger's existential ontology which saw insecurity resulting from the loss of face-to-face certainty (Thrift 1993). New information and media technologies played a crucial role here. Giddens drew on Meyrowitz's (1985) arguments that new media generated 'no sense of place', with people defining their salient relationships not in terms of face-to-face contacts but in terms of media characters and celebrities. The geographer David Harvey, whose best-selling

We therefore selected four contrasting residential areas in and around Manchester, whose residents had different combinations of economic and/or cultural capital and we deliberately did not seek to examine those in poor or working-class areas. This strategy allowed us to recognise the possible diversity within the city, yet without sacrificing detailed knowledge of the particularity of each area. In each area we took the electoral register as our sampling frame, took a one in three sample of particular streets, and arranged interviews by letter, telephone and through knocking on doors, finally achieving between 43 and 47 interviews in each place. In households with male and female members we alternated who we approached to obtain roughly similar numbers of men and women, though we actually ended up interviewing more women than men because men were more likely to refuse to be interviewed. Our overall response rate of 34% is in line with other research of this type. The interviews lasted between 45 minutes and 2 hours and covered the following topics: interaction and perception of neighbourhood and locality; leisure practices and household relationships; work and work histories; and social and cultural attitudes and values. Half the interviews were conducted by Gaynor, the project's Research Associate, with the remainder being carried out by Brian and Mike. We each interviewed in every area so that we could compare our thoughts on the four areas between ourselves. The Appendix lists all our interviewees (anonymised), including their occupation and income, and also indicates the pages of this book where we have quoted from or referred to them, so that readers can see how we have not 'cherry picked' but have drawn on the wide array of material from across most of the sample.

It is central to our concerns that, like Burawoy et al. (1991; 2000) and Layder (1993), we wanted to use qualitative research to address 'macro' issues of global change, and we did not conceive our research as committing us to a view that social relations are organised on a micro basis, as within the grounded theory and interactionist tradition (Glaser and Strauss 1967; Seale 1999; May 2001). This allowed us to do justice to Bourdieu's emphasis on a reflexive sociology that captures the intersection of structure and agency (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), society and the individual. In the absence of any obvious British exemplars for this kind of research (though see the parallel study of Butler and Robson 2003a, and to some extent Buck et al. 2002), we loosely drew on the evocative American models of Bellah et al. (1996) and Wolfe (1998), both of which used around 200 in-depth interviews to explore the values and culture of middle-class Americans in a period of major social change.

Central to our concerns was to explore people's own narratives of connectivity and global ties, rising out of their daily routines of work, residence and leisure. We are not persuaded that it is a useful exercise to ask people directly about global issues, their sense of global belonging, and so forth. Respondents who are asked questions about global issues will be able to answer with varying degrees of sophistication and clarity, but their replies

and its airport became a major international hub. This was all backed by the success of Manchester United Football Club, which dominated English soccer from the early 1990s, when it became the world's most profitable football club. Its popular culture enjoyed a glorious period from the late 1970s to the mid-1990s when its home grown musical talent, in the form of bands such as New Order, the Smiths, the Stone Roses and Oasis defined it as the 'happening' city, and a leading centre of the rave and dance culture. Young people flocked to the city. For much of the 1980s and 1990s Manchester University was one of the most popular universities in the UK, and the city saw the largest concentration of students in Western Europe in its four Universities. A particularly dramatic development in Manchester from the early 1990s was the attraction of affluent residents back into central urban locations through the conversion of warehouses and offices into apartments (see Wynne and O'Connor 1996), and the generation of a café bar, club and restaurant scene. Manchester's gay village became one of the world centres of gay consumer culture (Binnie and Skeggs 2004)

The recent history of Manchester, therefore, clearly exemplifies the tensions and ambivalences of globalisation itself. It witnessed the loss of its old role as centre to a regionally based industrial economy, but it pioneered new kinds of urban development drawing on global flows and post-industrial symbols (see Hills 2000 and Tyrer 2000; 2002). Most studies of the city have hitherto focused on central sites within it, taken to represent its extreme facets. At one extreme these include studies of its deprived neighbourhoods such as Hulme (Harding 1997 and more generally Griffiths 1998). There have been rather more studies of the dynamic city centre, including O'Connor and Wynne's (1996) ode to the cultural dynamism of the new city dwellers, and Skeggs's research on aspects of the gay village (e.g. Binnie and Skeggs 2004). While such research is invaluable, the challenge for understanding contemporary urban processes is to recognise the spatial extension of activities in what Castells defines as the metropolitan region:

These settlements blur the distinctions between cities and countryside, and between cities and suburbs. They include, in spatial discontinuity, built up areas of various density, open space, agricultural activities, natural areas, residential expanses and concentrations of services and manufacturing activities. (2002: 374)

Although leading global cities such as Los Angeles, with its diverse neighbourhoods, are the epitome for these metropolitan regions, our challenge is to investigate whether 'second tier' cities such as Manchester can also be seen to have such defined zones, and if so, how such zones relate to the habitus of different kinds of urban residents. Rather than attempting to understand the city 'as a whole', we can take a selection of different neighbourhoods to consider the degrees of commonality and difference within them. This allows us the potential to examine the interplay between global processes and the formation of distinct local milieux.

The Condition of Postmodernity (1987) emphasised how global flows were related to cultural change, was himself influenced by Raymond Williams's concern about the instability and fragmentation of the face-to-face community in contemporary life (Harvey 1993). Harvey's own work engaged with the humanist argument that social life is most secure in face-to-face, communal situations, and his criticisms of post-modern culture was in large part related to his fears about its evisceration of communities, especially industrial, working-class communities (Harvey and Layter 1993). Harvey's arguments were paralleled by Jameson's (1991) lament on the emergence of a new depthless post-modern culture, anchored neither in the co-ordinates of time and place, and dependent on a superficial pastiche of signs. Other work in this vein pointed to the transient spaces of shopping malls, fast food joints, and airport terminals to emphasise the rise of new kinds of 'non-places' (Auge 1995). The culmination of this early work came with Robertson (1992), who developed the first major account of globalisation as the rise of a 'global awareness',¹ and Albrow's (1996) account of the Global Age as marking the end of modernity.

This early period of globalisation theory was, however, short lived. By the early 1990s any simple sense that a new world order might be generated was dissipated behind growing national and cultural conflicts. It became clear that major global tensions, between religious blocs and between national and ethnic groups, only served to highlight entrenched divisions around the globe. A subtly different approach to globalisation and spatial change emerged by the mid-1990s, represented in the later work of Robertson (1995), in the writings of Lash and Urry (1994), Massey (1993; 1994), and Castells (1996a and b, 1997). These writers did not emphasise the erosion of place but rather focused on new forms of connection and mobility, and their potential to rework social relationships and to re-construct localism. A key point made by these writers was that the local is not transcended by globalisation, but rather that the local is to be understood through the lens of global relationships. Globalisation, therefore, produces new forms of localisation in a dialectical relationship that Robertson (1995) popularised as 'glocalisation', where 'globalisation has involved the reconstruction of "home", "community" and "locality"' (Robertson 1995: 30). This argument is indebted to Lefebvre's claim that 'the worldwide does not abolish the local' (cited in Brenner 2000: 369). Versions of this account are now standard fare in globalisation and urban theory. For Ulrich Beck (2002: 17) 'Globalisation is a non-linear, dialectic process in which the global and the local do not exist as cultural polarities but as combined and mutually implicating principles'. For Michael Smith (2001: 182) 'the global and local are not separate containers but mutually constitutive social processes'. For John Urry, 'the global and local are inextricably and irreversibly bound together through a dynamic relationship' (2002: 84).

This attempt to recover the 'local' as an intrinsic aspect of globalisation raises a host of problems. If we do not rely on the outmoded view that the local is defined in terms of face-to-face community, it is unclear what the

local is supposed to be. Its scale is also uncertain. The urban is often identified as the local site for global processes (for instance Sassen 1991; Smith 2001), but as Brenner (2000) indicates, there is no theoretical warrant for this. Is the local not also the nation, the neighbourhood, the house, the bedroom? Lurking behind this, it is often unclear what global and local 'principles' (Beck) or 'processes' (Smith) are. What exactly is at stake in understanding the local from within the terms of globalisation theory? There are in fact five distinct ways of construing the 'local' which need to be unpacked: firstly the local as context, secondly the local as the 'particular' in opposition to the global 'universal'; thirdly the local as historical residue, fourthly the local as hub in a network and fifthly the locality as bounded construction.

Firstly, the familiar idea of context offers what might seem a straightforward way of conceptualising the local. John Urry (2002: 137) for instance, argues that cosmopolitanism involves 'comprehending the specificity of one's local context'. However, it is not clear what this means when globalisation theory argues that social relationships are stretched over space and are organised through flows and forms of movement. Insofar as this is true, it is not clear how contexts are local, as some anthropologists have noted. Appadurai (1996) thus argues that localities are not contexts, but that contexts define the boundaries of localities. Franklin et al. (2000) argue further that globalisation alters the historically significant way that 'nature' serves as a horizon against which human life (or culture) can be defined. Rather than nature being a 'given', it is itself produced by culture, allowing a proliferation of meanings and values. This is possible in large part because the global becomes its own context (there are no boundaries other than its own). Instead of seeing agency as linked to the contexts of everyday life routines, 'emergent global networks offer the chosen – or rather, choice itself – as the origin of the imagined community of global citizenship' (Franklin et al. 2000: 75). It therefore seems difficult to appeal to the idea of local context within the terms of globalisation theory.

A second possibility defines the local as a 'particular' in opposition to the global 'universal'. This idea is related to conceptions of globalisation as an overarching, social process related to epochal social change. Construing the local as concrete in opposition to an abstract universal makes it difficult to avoid an infinite regress in which the local becomes the empirical, so that any concrete instance of anything is 'local'. It provides no warrant for seeing the local as 'small scale'. It entails a view that different particulars can at best be seen as contingently inter-related, with the universal standing above and outside such interactions. The idea of the 'local' does no analytical work in this account, and could therefore easily be dropped from the analysis (if not the description) of globalisation. This is an account which appears to give the local some significance, but in reality the power of the overarching, universal processes is reaffirmed through the architecture of the conceptual framework. It is not clear that the local matters other than as an instantiation of such global powers.

Table 2.3) marks it as the seventh largest conurbation in Europe in 2000. There are only two other non-capital cities in Europe greater in size (Essen in Germany and Barcelona in Spain).

Manchester is also a highly pertinent case study because of its history as the first industrial city. For Peter Hall (1998: 347) 'Manchester in 1770 was the first true innovative milieu', with its unique combination of technical skill, transport networks, and capital availability allowing the rapid growth of the cotton textile industry which was the most dynamic sector in Britain's industrial revolution. For much of the 19th Century, Manchester was seen by observers as diverse as Alexis de Tocqueville, Frederic Engels, and Mary Gaskell as the epitome of the new capitalist industrial order. Manchester retained this dynamic momentum even after the textile industry began to contract from the early 20th Century. It built one of the widest canals in England to allow ocean-going ships to use neighbouring Salford docks in the 1890s and became a major port until the 1960s. The Trafford Park Industrial Estate pioneered a new form of industrial development, with large factories being leased out to multi-national companies from the first decade of the 20th Century. This was the site of Ford motor company's first British plant and many other American firms, such as Colgate and Kellogg invested in the area. Its scientific expertise was considerable. It was the original home of Rolls Royce engine makers, and was a pace maker in the development of computer technology until the early 1950s, through the expertise of electronic engineering firms such as Ferranti and the close links they established with scientists at Manchester University.

This innovative industrial tradition, however, began to fail in the 1950s, and collapsed with remarkable speed from the 1970s (see generally Peck and Ward 2002). The textile industry virtually disappeared, with marked employment decline in engineering and other manufacturing sectors. In the Greater Manchester region as a whole, male full-time employment declined by 32% between 1971 and 1997, and all forms of employment by 11% (compared to a 5% rise in England as a whole, see Giordano and Twomey 2002). Unemployment levels reached over 20% in the 1980s, and although they declined thereafter, this was largely due to the unemployed ceasing to look for work as they left the labour market through disability, sickness or early retirement. Giordano and Twomey (2002: 68) calculate a real unemployment rate of 29% in 1997. Parts of the inner city saw deteriorating housing and high levels of poverty and deprivation.

However, amidst this industrial decline, a new mode of urban regeneration programme was championed from the mid-1980s (see Taylor et al. 1996; Peck and Ward 2002). This involved re-branding the city as an attractive site for capital, well-qualified professionals and visitors, redeveloping its urban core through service led provision, and modernising its transport and retail infrastructure (see Devine et al. 2000; Robson 2002, Mellor 2002; and Peck and Tickell 1995). Manchester sought to define itself as a major European city, second only to London in England. It made a respectable bid for the Olympic Games in 2000, it hosted the Commonwealth Games in 2002,

belonging to which one may aspire. Probyn's formulation of 'outside belonging' usefully indicates some of the tensions around this term:

the desire that individuals have to belong, a tenacious and fragile desire that is ... increasingly performed in the knowledge of the impossibility of ever really and truly belonging, along with the fear that the stability of belonging and the sanctity of belonging are forever past. (Probyn 1996: 8)

Belonging should be seen neither in existential terms (as primordial attachment to some kind of face-to-face community), nor as discursively constructed, but as a socially constructed, embedded process in which people reflexively judge the suitability of a given site as appropriate given their social trajectory and their position in other fields. There is thus a kind of paradox which is that residential space remains relatively fixed yet also the subject of increasing temporal instability as people reflect on its ability to act as marker of their home. Residential place continues to matter since people feel some sense of 'being at home' in an increasingly turbulent world. Thus, even though continuing to be relatively fixed, housing is also thoroughly the subject of reflexivity. It follows that in a mobile, global environment, location in fixed physical space may be of increasing relative significance in the generation of social distinction.

1.3 Researching Manchester neighbourhoods

Much attention has focused on the role of 'global cities', such as New York, Los Angeles, and London (e.g. Sassen 1991; Buck et al. 2002). There are differences of view here as to whether such cities can be seen as increasingly distinct global cities differentiated from 'second tier' cities. Hannerz (1996) insists on the cultural significance of only a few global cities, and this argument is supported by the claims of Friedmann and Wolff (1982), Castells (1996) and Sassen (1991) that global cities are becoming increasingly important sites for global mobility. These claims have been disputed theoretically by Smith (2001), and empirically through Buck et al.'s (2002) argument that the development of London in the past 20 years owes more to its regional and national role than to its global position.

In all this work, there is a danger that debates about globalisation become conflated with studies of a few 'global cities', and that we lose sight of the numerically more significant middle ranking urban spaces. During the 1980s numerous studies of industrial cities portrayed a bleak picture of de-industrialisation and redundancy (Smith and Feagin 1996), with such cities being seen in relative decline. However, just as the prime role of global cities has been questioned in recent years, so there has been greater interest in the global role of 'second tier' cities. Castells (2002: 372) argues that 'all large metropolitan areas in the developed world, and all of the largest in the developing world, are thus global to some extent'. In this context, Manchester is a very revealing case study. It remains a leading European city: its population of nearly four million people (Le Gales 2002:

This is a problem with all epochal, generalising conceptions of globalisation, such as is evident in the work of Beck (2000), Bauman (1998) and Albrow (1996). The work of Manuel Castells is perhaps the most interesting, and bears some attention here. Castells is careful to situate globalisation geo-politically, and he distances himself from 'simplistic versions' of the globalisation thesis (Castells 1996: 97) by defining globalisation in terms of information flows made possible by technological developments, especially as linked to global financial markets. He sees global information flows existing in tension with other kinds of more localised processes, paying particular importance to the distinction between economic globalisation and political regionalisation. 'Historically rooted political institutions' seek to restrict global economic forces, with the result that:

while dominant segments of all national economies are linked into the global web, segments of countries, regions, economic sectors and local societies are disconnected from the processes of accumulation and consumption that characterize the informational/global economy. (Castells 1996a: 102–103)

For all Castells's sophistication he thereby upholds a unilinear view of globalisation in which local societies can somehow be disconnected from global processes, and are defined as a historical residue, not themselves motors of change, the sources of which are held to come from elsewhere. These he sees as 'globalisation and informationalisation, enacted by networks of wealth, technology and power, (which) are transforming our world' (Castells 1997a: 68), which appear to operate outside any particular 'locality'.

This formulation leads him to view local identities ultimately as a response to globalisation, and this account of the local as defensive historical reaction is a third way of rendering the significance of the local. The tension between the local and global means that 'reflexive life planning becomes impossible. ... Under such conditions, civil societies shrink and disarticulate ... (and) the search for meaning takes place then in the reconstruction of defensive identities around communal principles' (Castells 1997a: 11). There is thus a new concern to establish community, in which globalising social relations accentuate localised communal identities. This is a kind of change and response model, whereby the motor of change is global informational capitalism, while invoking the local is a reaction to this (see further, Smith 2001).²

The problem here is that the global is thereby removed from any particular local instance, working through an abstract space of flows (see also Allen 2003). For all his careful empirical detail, Castells is thereby still subject to the same kinds of problems found in the work of Albrow, Beck and Giddens, which have been most powerfully exposed by Walter Benjamin's critique of historicism:

It is very easy to establish oppositions ... within the various 'fields' of any epoch, such that on one side lies the 'productive', 'forward-looking', 'lively', 'positive' part of the epoch, and on the other side the abortive, retrograde and obsolescent. The very contours of the positive element will appear only insofar as this element is set off against the negative. (1999: 459)

Benjamin's point is that in such accounts the present is defined with respect to a past constructed in its shadow. This 'present' becomes a product which the powerful use as a means of denying truths they would rather not face. It thus becomes part of a moral project in which globalisation constructs its own truths, rendering the local as a repository of the defensive past. Using Benjamin's insights, we can recognise that globalisation is a means for particular people, with specific interests and identities, to proclaim universal rights and powers. Faced with the implications of Benjamin's insights, we see it as morally essential to champion the local. Rather than seeing the local as an instance of global social change, in which case it has no analytical importance and functions mainly as a cipher within globalisation theory, it is important to champion the idea of the local as an 'irritant' to the epochal and speculative character of much contemporary social theory. We can do this by building on two further renderings of the local in recent social theory.

A fourth way of construing the local adopts network approaches.³ Network approaches vary immensely, but both in the form of social network analysis, as well as in actor network theory they insist that global processes do not work at a general level, but operate through specific proximate ties and connections. The global thus does not stand above the local, but are a particular set of network ties, with the result that there is no 'one' global, but an infinite multiplicity of global relationships, all constituted in various forms through particular local configurations.⁴ The power of network thinking is that it construes the local as hubs in networks connecting other locals, and thereby the local is not seen as a concrete particular in opposition to a general, but as articulated with other local particulars through its networks with them. It is not the purpose of our book to use formal network analysis, as elaborated by Wellman (1979) or Wasserman and Faust (1994), though we are interested in how places can more generally be understood in network terms. Similarly, although our book is not an application of actor network theory, we are certainly sympathetic to its stance which insists on the provisional and contingent nature of ties, its emphasis on fluidity, and its scepticism towards macro-epochal claims (see for instance Latour 1993 on modernity).

Rather, in developing this general approach, we are indebted to the powerful arguments of Doreen Massey regarding a 'progressive sense of place' (Massey 1993, 1994). Massey (1994) shows that people move into and out of places, both on a regular and an irregular basis, and this coming and going is crucial to understanding how people come to perceive their relationship to place. Similarly Amin and Thrift's (2002: 7) application of actor network theory to the understanding of cities as 'a place of mobility, flow and everyday practice' is useful. This leads them to develop an account of the city that is based on the 'instituted, transhuman and distanced nature of urban life', which allows them to recognise the importance of mobility and flows without invoking a theory of globalisation.

concern to preserve particular, unique locations as 'natural' for specific practices. Global processes involve the 'overlaying' of territorially based fields with fields which are less territorially organised (see Brenner 2000). There is increasing differentiation between those fields – often organised through mass communication – that are relatively spatially indifferent, and those that remain very largely rooted in place. The friction, or disjuncture, between these fields is of crucial importance. Those cultural fields that are still dependent on fixed spaces are likely to remain as significant as ever in generating cultural distinction.

Appadurai's (1993, 1996) arguments regarding the organisation of the imagination are pertinent here. He argues that we live in a world with a global imaginary, where our imaginations roam far over space and time. 'Electronic mediation and mass migration mark the world of the present not as technically new forces but as ones that seem to impel (and sometimes compel) the work of the imagination' (Appadurai 1996: 4). The social organisation of imagination is linked to five separate kinds of global cultural flows based around the movement of people (ethnoscapes), media technologies and images (mediascapes), technologies (technoscapes), finance and investment flows (financescapes), and political ideologies and narratives (ideoscapes). Appadurai insists that these five flows are in disjuncture from one another, and that the tensions between these flows account for the complexities of globalising processes. Appadurai's focus on flows has been highly influential, and has been developed by later writers who have sought to develop further kinds of flows held to be characteristic of globalisation (e.g. Urry 2000). However, his emphasis on imagination has been less extensively developed (see Abercrombie and Longhurst 1998); a limitation which we seek to redress in the main body of this book.

Disjunctures between fields, as well as the emergence of new more mobile fields, generates a somewhat different dynamic from the struggles for distinction analysed by Bourdieu. 'Ordinariness' becomes a key arena around which people seek to establish the commonality of their shared position with various others (Devine 1992; Erickson 1996; Black 2001; Longhurst et al. 2001; Savage et al. 2001). People claim ordinariness in order to 'opt into' a range of shared practices and activities in a situation where the multiplicity of fields may pull them into separate practices. This ordinariness codes new kinds of distinctions and hierarchies, though these may be implicit rather than stated overtly. We are interested in this book in exploring how residential location is related to different cultural fields, and the spatial organisation of these fields.

Our book is therefore a study of the contemporary significance of local belonging. This encapsulates Bourdieu's interest in how people may feel comfortable or not in any one place, relating this to the habitus and capital of its residents. This allows us to explore local belonging as fluid and contingent, in a manner consistent with Probyn's (1996) and Fortier's (2000) insistence that belonging is not a given but is itself unstable, positing both states (of unbelonging) from which one comes, and possible future states of

Various fields differ in the ways they articulate with physical space. Capitalist modernity involves fields becoming more differentiated, separated from each other (Fowler 1997). This involves the diversification of the audiences for various kinds of cultural practices. Thus Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998) argue, contemporary capitalist societies are increasingly characterised by the interaction between simple (e.g. theatre), mass (e.g. television) and diffused audiences (of everyday life). Extant paradigms for the study of audiences are unable to cope with the varied empirical and conceptual demands of the understanding of these relations. This diversification means that we use an increasing variety of spaces in our lives as we move between fields, such as those of work, different leisure pursuits, and so on. There is thus no one space where we feel at home all the time. A secretary may feel at ease working alongside a senior executive in neighbouring offices, but ill at ease if she is invited to her home for a meal. There are disjunctures between fields, and the spaces associated with them. This has numerous implications.

As each field becomes clearly demarcated from others, so it becomes the object for specific strategising and discursive awareness (see generally McNay 1999). Discursive consciousness, and reflexivity in general, is amplified through the multiplication of fields. Residential fields become subject to more strategic reflection, and are less interpreted as 'where one happens to live', or 'where one was brought up'. In addition, fields vary in the extent to which they depend on spatially situated practices. At one extreme, some fields, notably those which are strongly characterised by struggles over distinction, depend on stakes located uniquely in space. Thus cultural capital involves the separation of the territory of high culture (theatres, museums, cultivated homes, etc.) from that of low or popular culture (pubs, music halls, etc.). However, this is not to say that all fields are organised in this way. When cultural production and reception become more detached from specific sites, when in the arguments of Walter Benjamin (1973), they are more subject to mechanical reproducibility, they are less likely to generate distinction. Thus, recent American research demonstrating that increasing numbers of Americans are 'cultural omnivores' who participate in both 'high' and 'low' culture (e.g. Peterson and Kern 1996) draws frequently on examples from music. As listening to music becomes less dependent on live performance, and is possible in a wider range of spaces (from one's bedroom to the car stereo and the personal hi-fi), so it becomes less a marker for distinction. Precisely because it is a relatively easy matter to put different CDs on inside your home, musical taste becomes more mobile and less organised around fixed hierarchical tastes.

Furthermore, within any field, those practices that continue to rely on spatial fixity are most likely to be tied up with claims to distinction than those that do not. The audience at the 'premier' of a film, which is fixed at one point in space and time, is necessarily more exclusive than the audiences in later performances which are shown multiply in a variety of locations. Claims to social and cultural distinction continue to rely on an auratic

Arjun Appadurai (1996) offers probably the most developed and subtle alternative to that of the epochalists, and his account of the construction of contemporary neighbourhoods marks a fifth perspective. He argues that localities are not 'given' primordially but are socially produced through processes of boundary definition. 'Neighbourhoods are inherently what they are because they are opposed to something else and derive from other, already produced neighbourhoods' (Appadurai 1996: 183). Thus, global flows allow neighbourhoods to be reproduced as people's imagination is used to differentiate their neighbourhood from the outside. Appadurai thereby insists that neighbourhoods are not to be seen as passive, static products, with the implication that the dynamic of change comes from outside. As residents go about their daily life they encounter images, people and technologies from outside their neighbourhood which provide the potential for neighbourhood itself to be redefined. Appadurai's approach squares with important anthropological work on the construction of symbolic boundaries (e.g. Cohen 1985) and emphasises how global flows thereby allows the proliferation of rich imaginary and symbolic resources to allow people to construct their 'local' in a range of ways. He is thus able to see globalisation not as an epochal change but in a more nuanced way. 'The production of locality – always, I have argued, a fragile and difficult achievement – is more than ever shot through with contradictions, destabilised by human motion, and displaced by the formation of new kinds of virtual neighbourhoods' (Appadurai 1996: 198).

We have seen how globalisation theory reaches an impasse in its understanding of the local. Early globalisation theorists continued to expound long standing sociological concerns regarding the eclipse of community, seeing globalisation as the culmination of such processes. In its more recent formulations, however, globalisation is seen to involve the construction of the local, but we have pointed to the problematic conceptions of this within epochal globalisation theory. It is necessary to invoke the local to sustain the claims of globalisation, but there is no obvious theoretical foundation for it. Insofar as space is a matter of indifference, it is not clear how 'local' spatial units can be a 'principle', or a 'process', with the result that the local can only be defined as a result of globalisation (where it becomes a particular), or as a kind of weakly theorised 'residue'. By contrast we have drawn upon network and relational conceptions to suggest the need for an account of the local which is not contrasted with the global, but which situates the local against other locals in an environment where comparisons and references are multiple and complex. In the next section, we develop this approach through reference to the work of Pierre Bourdieu.

1.2 Capital, habitus and field

It remains important, we argue, to recognise the ongoing significance of territoriality for social relationships. If we abandon the view that the local is

the privileged site of face-to-face community, then we need an alternative way of understanding the stakes that fixed sites bring. Two necessary elements are a theory of embodiment and a theory of property. A theory of embodiment, which focuses on the relative immobility of humans vis-à-vis flows of goods and symbols, allows us to recognise the relative significance of territory for people.⁵ A theory of property, as found in Marxist perspectives, importantly sees that territory defines landed property and capital (Lefebvre 1991; Harvey 1983). In the work of Harvey this perspective has been elaborated through the idea of a spatial fix (Harvey 1985).⁶ These two points can then be connected with a third, which is that global flows do not eclipse embodiment and property, but overlay them, so that the social world becomes more complex but does involve a simple transition from one dominant form of organisation to another.

We do not need to develop an account along these lines from scratch, since Pierre Bourdieu has already elaborated a sophisticated social theory which recognises both the salience of embodiment and the power of property, or in his terms, capital. However, Bourdieu himself has rarely talked much about globalisation, and where he has, his comments are naïve and unreflexive.⁷ In addition his sociology of space is strikingly underdeveloped, although his perspective is strongly indebted to spatial metaphors, such as the 'field' (Lopez and Scott 2000).⁸ In this section we show how Bourdieu's conceptual armoury can be used to elaborate an analytically powerful account of the local and the global.

Early interpretations of Bourdieu's work defined it as either neo-Marxist or as hybrid Marxist/Weberian which relied on a predominantly instrumental theory of cultural capital. Those who were socialised by family and upbringing into the appropriate cultural resources were better able to advance their interests, especially through being able to perform well in the educational system (see Jenkins 1992). Such interpretations fit works such as Bourdieu and Passeron (1973), but in the past decade, and perhaps especially since the appearance of *Pascalian Meditations* (Bourdieu 1999a) it has become clear that Bourdieu's theoretical framework marks a fundamental break from such instrumental thinking, through his re-working of phenomenological philosophy (see generally Swartz 1997, Dreyfus and Rabinow 1999; Crossley 2001) in which everyday life is at the bedrock of social existence. In this context, Bourdieu's concept of capital can be placed in broader context where its interplay with 'habitus' and 'field' is crucial.

The starting point for this interpretation of Bourdieu is his notion of habitus which insists that people's dispositions are embodied, and thereby necessarily territorially located. Rather than see self-interest as the main mechanism for action, Bourdieu's embodied sociology leads him to focus more on feelings of 'comfort' in place. In some cases there seems no break between the actor and the world around. This is due to the 'practical sense of a habitus', in which

'the agent engaged in practice knows the world but with knowledge which ... is not set up in the relation of externality of a knowing consciousness. He [sic]

knows it, in a sense, too well ... takes it for granted, *precisely because he is caught up in it, bound up with it; he inhabits it like a garment or a familiar habitat.* (Bourdieu 1999a: 142/3: italics ours)

There are echoes here of the existentialist concern with physical proximity as the bedrock of human existence. However, there is nothing intrinsic about what places one feels comfortable in, and in this respect Bourdieu departs from existential assumptions that view the 'home', or 'nature' as being inherently more conducive to feeling at one with one's surrounds. Instead, it is important to understand how different kinds of places are incorporated into fields, so that, as Lefebvre (1991) observes, space is not just an arena for conflict but forms part of the stakes over which conflict takes place. Fields define hierarchical spaces of social and spatial positions, specifying the stakes involved in such positions. In this respect, Bourdieu's account is consistent with network approaches, and echoes the well-known arguments of Massey (1984).

'the capital city is ... the site of capital, that is, the site in physical space where the positive poles of all the fields are concentrated along with most of the agents occupying these dominant positions; which means that the capital cannot be adequately analysed except in relation to the provinces (and 'provincialness'), which is nothing other than being deprived (in entirely relative terms) of the capital and capital. (Bourdieu 1999b: 125)

The mechanism which links habitus and field, or 'the feel for the game, and the game itself' (Bourdieu 1999a: 151), is the sense of bodily comfort and ease which people experience in different social situations – *which are also physical situations.*

Just as physical space ... is defined by the reciprocal externality of positions ... the social space is defined by the mutual exclusion, or distinction, of the positions which constitute it. ... Social agents, and also things insofar as they are appropriated by them and therefore constituted as properties, are situated in a place in social space, a distinct and distinctive place which can be characterized by the position it occupies relative to other places (...) and the distance (...) that separates it from them. (Bourdieu 1999a: 134)

Thus, fields require spatial separation so that different kinds of stakes involve various kinds of location.

The dispositions occupied involve an adjustment to the position – what Erving Goffman calls the 'the sense of one's place'. It is this sense of one's place which in a situation of interaction, prompts those whom we call in French *les gens humbles*, literally, 'humble people' – perhaps 'common folks' in English – to remain humbly in their place, and which prompts others to 'keep their distance' or to 'keep their station in life'. (Bourdieu 1987: 5)

People are comfortable when there is a correspondence between habitus and field, but otherwise people feel ill at ease and seek to move – socially and spatially – so that their discomfort is relieved. For Bourdieu this is crucial to the 'dialectic of positions and dispositions'. Mobility is driven as people, with their relatively fixed habitus, both move between fields (places of work, leisure, residence, etc.), and move to places within fields where they feel more comfortable. Mobility and stability are hence reciprocally inter-related through the linkage between fields and habitus.