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ABSTRACT
This paper examines the extent to which contemporary globalisation diminishes local culture to pose itself as a formidable threat to Southeast Asian cultural values. Southeast Asia is home to thousands of different ethnic peoples with their distinctive languages, cultures, mores and religious beliefs. These unique traits comprise their cultural heritage, which is passed down from generation to generation. However, the contemporary process of globalisation results in an intrusion into indigenous Southeast Asian cultures. In spite of the genuine fear of globalisation’s erosion of traditional lifestyles, cultural mores and religious beliefs, we argue that attempts to resist its negative implications have been inadequate with respect to Southeast Asian nations and peoples.
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Introduction
Globalisation is an overused if under-defined term. It is the process of increasing international activity in various dimensions, including the economy, politics and culture. An enhanced interdependence and connectedness, while forging greater opportunity in the socio-economic, socio-political, and socio-cultural domains, is the aspired aim of nations participating within globalisation.

In fact, the vicissitude witnessed today also owes itself to fundamental transformations in technology, trade, and population mobility. These rapid changes are underscored by the term “globalisation”, which entails corporate capitalism, liberalisation, and the free market. However, such profound changes have also instigated debates about the less
favourable impacts of globalisation, which is seen and experienced as a contentious phenomenon. Globalisation implies that national boundaries and distances do not matter as much in the interaction of economic, political, social and cultural processes. It suggests that political and economic interconnectedness has far-reaching consequences, bringing people across the world closer together.

In recent decades, globalisation has been viewed primarily as a tool for strengthening national power, rather than as a potential threat to local development and culture. One of the prevalent fears that accompany globalisation is the weakening of the nation-state system, as global corporations, among other global actors and factors, undermine the traditional authority of nation-states. In Asia, this view is reinforced by the governments’ beliefs that they can participate in the global economy without compromising domestic political structures and cultural practices. Certainly, this claim is a debatable assertion. For one, the dichotomous relationship posited may seem untenable. While development (in its economic and political senses) goes hand-in-hand with the strengthening of national power, globalisation as a development strategy that poses a threat to culture is an idea that has much longer provenance. The combination of rapidly growing populations in many developing nations, increasingly porous national borders, and disparities in economic growth rates have sparked a sharp increase in international migration, which has emerged as a source of tension in Southeast Asia. Within such debates, two contending blocs have taken diametrically opposed positions on the topic of globalisation.

Considering recent complexities and an ever-changing geopolitical international situation after the 9/11 attacks of 2001, globalisation has arguably begun to impinge on local cultures within Southeast Asia.

Analysing globalisation at this micro level is a daunting task, primarily because of the widespread assumptions about globalisation as a strictly economic-political phenomenon on a macro scale. For instance, Wallerstein’s theory posits that globalisation is mainly
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14Wallerstein suggests there is a world economic system in which some countries benefit while others are exploited. See: I. Wallerstein, The modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century (New York: Academic Press, 1974).
mono-causal and economic in its interpretations. Scholars, such as Beck, have offered a critique of Wallerstein’s view of globalisation as the institutionalisation of the world market. Globalisation is thus often studied from economic and developmental perspectives rather than as an assessment of the way that individuals and cultures are affected. In order to examine globalisation more comprehensively, it is vital that we move beyond the established ways of studying the phenomenon, to incorporate a better understanding of the world’s ethnic and racial diversity, linguistic range and other manifestations of cultural heterogeneity.

Historically, globalisation can be said to have existed since European imperial and colonial expansion projects began in the nineteenth century. Occurring on a global scale, the Westernising missions by European colonisers not only perpetuated Western interests and their discourses of the East but also prioritised Western subjects. Today, globalisation has become less mono-pronged and mono-centered with an increasing acknowledgement of multiple directional flows of socio-cultural exchanges between the West and the East.

Nonetheless, the global spread of values, norms, and culture tends to promote Western ideals of capitalism. In addition, technology has facilitated global culture by blurring domestic and regional cultural boundaries. In this perspective, scholars ask whether local culture is an inevitable victim of a global “consumer” culture. Thus, there is great hesitance in believing that a common culture will prevail to forge greater shared values and political unity. In another instance, scholars have linked global consumerism with “the concept of lifestyle”. Cultural globalisation, therefore, redefines the relationship between social structures that arise from the technological dimensions of globalisation. The drivers of global consumer culture are consumer behaviour, societal dynamics and relevant organisational aspects. Concepts related to the consumer, consumption society and leisure time have become more prevalent. Consumption is a social and cultural process involving cultural signs. Globalisation involves the diffusion of different signs, forms and styles around the world.

Viewed in this perspective, globalisation creates a global culture in which identity is amalgamated. This tends to reinforce cultural homogenisation throughout the world. Cultural homogeneity undermines local cultural values. Instead of cultural diversity that distinguishes one group of people from another, the technological processes of globalisation blur cultural identities. In our view, the world’s diverse expressions of self-determination in cultural identity articulated within language, art, dress, food, and religion
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are merged into an integrated unit, often at little cost to Western identity and cultures, but at a higher cost to Eastern identity and cultures.

It is through this logic that we argue that the embrace of globalisation in Southeast Asia harms local culture. However, using a less negative lens, a claim for a transformation of local culture through globalisation’s ambivalent effects can also be made, wherein one sub-group benefits and other sub-groups are seen to be disadvantaged. Even as this transformation denotes a somewhat more positive view of globalisation’s effects, we argue that globalisation’s fully negative connotations surpass this transformation as it is derived from a standpoint of a preconceived idea of culture as it ought to be. To investigate this, we interviewed social science academics about specific cultural elements from Southeast Asia. In this study, interviewees comprising social sciences academics in Thailand, Brunei, Malaysia and Indonesia were selected on a snowball basis, as they share their perspectives on globalisation’s encroachment into their own culture. We used a snowball technique because a probability sampling method could not be applied in this case (because of impracticalities finding a sample frame).

We chose to do a qualitative study on globalisation and culture by using interviewing as the mode of gathering information and reflections. We were more interested in getting close to individuals’ perspectives, something that can only happen when given the time and space afforded in qualitative research. We tended to increase the “depth” rather than the “scale”. Depth denotes the degree to which research meaningfully and systematically informs decisions about practice and scale denotes the size and representation of the population. "Increasing the number of cases serves only to reduce proportionately the attention that can be given to any one of them". We found it more rewarding to concentrate on a few interviews with the same people rather than attempting many interviews alongside an in-depth,broad study of culture and globalisation.

In-depth fieldwork is designed to shed light on a phenomenon; fieldwork is an inefficient means of conducting surveys. The perceptive fieldworker must be able to discern pattern, range, and variation, but “distributions are best ascertained in ways other than encouraging qualitative researchers to dabble in comparison or to confuse casual comparisons with controlled ones”. Despite the indecisiveness (in terms of making quick and assertive decision about choosing the mode of interviews and the selection of respondents due to time constraints and logistical issues) in the conduction of the interviews, we have gleaned some insights. Interview subjects for our research were chosen based on their knowledge of globalisation and its impact on culture in their respective countries. In choosing the [next] respondents we made sure that they have sufficient knowledge about the issues we were going to ask. With their consent, we scanned their research, fieldwork experiences and publications from their institutional profiles. We conducted face-to-face interview. Their opinions have been used to substantiate, support and validate our opinions and scholars’ reflections.

The framing of globalisation’s harm to local cultures assumes that local culture is static, which entails a fixed entity that is impinged by foreign influences. Even as the anthropological notion of culture as a whole, stable and determinant of behaviour or mentality has
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given way to the conceptualisation of culture as dynamic, contested and co-constitutive of human thoughts and behaviour, the old idea of a pure or truly local culture has remained alive. The latter conceptualisation of local culture has been usurped for nation-building and other political purposes by governmental leaders, when threatened by globalisation.\(^{29}\)

This study recognises that several so-called local cultures in post-colonial Southeast Asian societies have ceased to be truly local since centuries ago.\(^{30}\) However, for the purpose of this paper, we report on the interviewees’ fixed perception of local culture and their relatively established views about its “contamination” by Western influences due to their globalising powers.

**Southeast Asia: richly diverse cultures and local languages**

Southeast Asia (SEA) is characterised by fascinating social, cultural and linguistic variations and is also diverse demographically and geographically. Its heterogeneity lies across the areas of religion, governance and finance. Although they may share similar values, Southeast Asian people differ in their forms of cultural expressions that comprise their rich diversity. Such multiplicity of cultural expressions is manifested in their literatures, music and art.\(^{31}\) Different ethnic groups inhabiting the Southeast Asian region generally have distinct local languages or dialects. The region boasts around a thousand languages, spoken by different people who have inhabited Southeast Asia for millennia.\(^{32}\)

While culture can be defined in many different ways, we highlight only two broad categories in this paper primarily because these two best represent and explain our objectives. It is a way of life for a people sharing common ideologies, art and linguistic forms as well as learnt principles. Significantly, it thus provides members with their ethics, manners, rituals, and self-survival strategies rooted within morals, folklore and legends.\(^{33}\) Also, culture denotes the way that world logic is derived from gestures, words, tone, sounds, colours, smells, and physical contact experienced since birth.\(^ {34}\) This cultural worldview continues to be familiarised and sustained at a familial, social and national level.

Consequently, culture is central to the way people identify themselves within the family, larger community and nation. Cultural anthropologists typically resort to examining culture through a set of social practices, behaviours and artifacts.\(^ {35}\) In this respect, it builds positive identity, self-determination and wellness. Increasingly, culture is used to refer to more material phenomena, from sports, clothing, movies, music, and food. The
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combination of intangible and tangible ways of evaluating culture reflects the movement from indigenous values and traditional principles to a global materialism.

With globalisation occupying a significant position in both public and private discourses, local culture in Southeast Asia has suffered. Cultural changes have affected Southeast Asia from around two thousand years ago. However, during the last decade of the twentieth century, the process of transculturation has been worryingly rapid and prominent. As a result, the term “globalisation” came into frequent use in the early 1990s. This terminology was coined to mark the shift away from a colonial cultural imperialism, previously experienced through the European colonial powers who ruled over large Eastern territories, including Southeast Asia. In this way, cultural contact that began with Western colonial cultures and continues in today’s globalised era has long been established within Southeast Asia. Nonetheless, globalisation that supersedes colonisation has failed to eradicate cultural imperialism, considering that the process currently favours and perpetuates Western political, economic, and cultural powers.

Since globalisation is viewed as a challenge to national culture and sovereignty, Southeast Asian nation states have also responded to globalisation by endorsing regionalisation. The latter process is, in fact, a logical outcome of fractured globalisation. Globalisation exerts external pressures on domestic cultures and value systems, even though it remains enduring for political and economic integration. Regionalisation as a counter-response to globalisation serves to consolidate regional politics, socioeconomic, cultural and institutional values. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) is symptomatic of a concerted effort at regionalisation, which is aimed to strengthen ties amongst its member nations with shared values and goals to preserve their Eastern cultures by learning from one another via a multilateral platform. The annual ASEAN Cultural festival and the Arts and Cultural Programme at the ASEAN Foundation are notable examples of concerted efforts at forging people-to-people ties along the line of cultivating each other’s national traditions and local languages.

ASEAN, made up of mostly small powers (comprised of Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam) and developing nations, has taken the opportunity to shape the incipient regionalism. ASEAN’s most important principles are enshrined in the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) of 1976. Southeast Asia divides into Mainland
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Southeast Asia, that encompasses Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Myanmar and West Malaysia, and Maritime Southeast Asia that includes Indonesia, East Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, East Timor, Brunei, Cocos (Keeling) Islands, and Christmas Island.

Beck (2000)43 in his work brought theoretical controversy concerning globalisation and the contradictory meanings associated with it. He divided the theoretical controversy into two major categories: those who point to one dominant logic of globalisation and those suggesting a phenomenon with a complex set of causes.44 Globalisation has been facilitated by the advent of the Internet, which brought about the concept of the cyberspace.45 Mass media effects have permeated every corner of society so much that it is now difficult to challenge the theoretical postulations of Marshall McLuhan in his work on technological determinism, which envisaged a world of media revolution in which the new electronic media have formed unified media groups, radically altered the way people think, feel and act.46 Markets, media, law, corporations, labour, research and advocacy groups have turned international, multinational, and multicultural in today’s world.

**Impinging on local cultures: globalization’s damaging effects**

Globalisation is manifested in many domains, including the political economy and culture.47 Viewed strictly in economic terms, richer countries would usually demand that poorer countries break down their trade barriers even while the former maintain a tight level of protectionism over their own trade boundaries.48 Unable to stand out to the hegemonic nature of globalisation, less powerful countries form their own economic alliances with the aim of negotiating fairer deals. An economic tug of war between diplomacy and threats results.49 In this way, smaller economies lose out because of their pursuit to be accepted by the economic hegemony. Their participation in the free global market inevitably entails a compromise of their own economic standards. From a cultural perspective, globalisation further disadvantages poorer countries without a means to withstand the unmitigated takeover of their traditional cultures by dazzling, well-packaged and branded cultures marketed through a global media.50
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As argued by Beck, the globalisation of the world economy of trans-national markets has created a generation of hamburger eating, Coca-Cola drinking, Ipad & cell phone kids, thus leading to an upsurge in obesity because of diet choices coupled with minimal physical activity. Many assume that the threat to local cultures and the disappearance of cultural and ethnic diversity seems inevitable. Beck notes that the basic insight is that globalisation does not unilaterally mean globalisation, which is one of the endless sources of misunderstanding in this debate. Globalisation is developing its own local cultural traits and dimensions, which Robertson calls “glocalization”. According to this scholarship, the “localization” of the global, or “de-location” and/or “relocation” of globalisation, is an evolving process.

Increased globalisation is associated with increased [de]-locational concentration of particular economic activities. Globalisation involves economic integration as well as changes in the social and cultural landscapes. While Wani (2011) argues that globalisation is more akin to a monoculture of ideas, politics, and economic models, King (1997) highlights that globalisation transmogrifies the traditional belief systems; disintegrates the traditional social fabrics and norms by consumerism, which leads to deculturization.

The effects of deculturation due to globalisation over the long term erode cultural identity such that identity crisis may occur. The juggling between Western cultural hegemony and the Eastern local cultures positions Southeast Asian subjects in a quandary, such as that typified within Singaporeans. The forces of globalisation invade by intruding into the traditional domains in Southeast Asia, whose local cultures, values and distinctiveness are threatened by the booming cultural reproduction of globalisation. An interview respondent from Indonesia who grew up in a conservative Muslim family bemoans the crisis that he sees happening in his younger children who do not hesitate to consume Western products of globalisation. On their consumption of Western food and MTV music, he comments that the “cultural contradictions” and “cultural collapse” will lead to the way that “our own culture will die to Western culture” (Respondent A, Jakarta, 20 March 2019). By replacing local traditions with a universal uniformity, globalisation weakens indigenous values that are subdued by the dominance of a commanding culture through the formidable power of international media. Also, more indirect and impersonal forms of communication substitute social interaction at a personal level. Along this line, face-to-face communication becomes less preferred over more mediated means that are quicker and more convenient. In all these ways, local languages as well as intimate traditions are on the verge of disappearance due to globalisation that reduces social attachments and eschews local knowledge, which leads to an identity crisis.

crisis. An interview respondent asks, “I sometimes wonder, are we western?” (Respondent B, Bangkok, 04 February 2019). Here, he encapsulates the identity crisis resulting from Western culture’s infiltrating into his local Southeast Asian culture.

The threat to local cultures and extinction of cultural and ethnic diversity seems inevitable to us. Globalisation has been decried routinely for its disruptive effects on local culture and community enterprises.59 The threat of cultural uniformity is often referred to as McDonaldization, named after the global rise of the American fast food chain McDonalds. The role played by Western fast food transcends mere eating tastes. A frequent preference for its consumption also denotes a rise in health problems associated in the West. A Thai interview respondent states, “South East Asian people are generally slim. They rarely had health issues. Governments of our countries are these days worried about the obesity problems. I am sure this is the contribution of [Western] fast food” (Respondent C, Bangkok, 07 February 2019). Social systems are also disrupted, as the consumption of fast food is a highly individual experience borne out of Western ideas of individualism. Sitting over a McDonald’s value meal for long hours and socialising while consuming it does not happen. The meals are designed to be eaten quickly before consumers promptly tidy after themselves to make way for arriving customers. The fast food trend has been picked up by the younger generations, who are more inclined to purchase fast food than their parents who prefer traditional cuisine.60 A Thai interviewee with children discloses that a couple of years ago, eating together with family members was the part of our culture in Southeast Asia. These days, we wait for our sons or daughters to eat together but they return home later and say they have eaten outside with their friends. (Respondent C, Ayutthaya, 8 February 2019)

Even while culture through the lens of globalisation should be understood and practised as a process of the cultivation of an intricate life that takes on its form in social action.61 Contemporary McDonaldization tells a different story of prized individualism and an attenuation of intergenerational links on which Southeast Asian cultures are built.

Globalisation does not necessarily mean homogeneity. Indeed, in some respects globalisation fosters and allows for differences. The process of globalisation disrupts fragile societies and disrupts traditional identities.62 Cultural diversity is now a fact of life in today’s “global village”.63 Cultural differences are central to a number of debates associated with multiculturalism. People belong to many different cultures and the cultural differences are as likely to be within states (i.e. between regions, classes, ethnic groups, the urban and rural) as well as between states.64 It is natural that in the contemporary world many local settings are increasingly characterised by cultural diversity.

The perils of globalisation are real, as they are being recognised socially. In fact, when asked in an interview, respondents have stated their uninhibited anxiety about the impact of globalisation. An interviewee explains, “globalisation affects people in a negative way because it makes people forget about their own countries” culture. Just go to a shopping mall in Bangkok or in Jakarta or Kula Lumpur, you won’t be able to recognise which country you are in’ (Respondent D, Kuala Lumpur, 27 May 2019). Another respondent puts it bluntly,

globalisation changes everything in the world. If you visit Thailand, [you will see that there are] a lot of brand names in shopping stores, such as Louis Vuitton, Channel, and Hermes. Do these products in the shops represent Thai culture? No. Do the customers think about our culture? No, because they have lots of choices. (Respondent E, Bangkok, 12 February 2019)

He poses a lament about the encroachment of Western corporate goods at the expense of local cultural products that potentially serves a similar practical purpose as their branded counterparts. Also, a frustration with a lack of thought about usurping local industries when patronising global Western brand houses becomes palpable. The cultural options of the less dominant cultural group seem limited, since Western-originated brands are sold in Eastern parts of the world but the same cannot be said about Eastern-originated products. Even as the latter are sold in niche markets by the local diaspora to the West, their numbers cannot compare to those of Western brands that are assigned with superior value.

Globalisation contributes to simultaneous tensions that are shaping the current era of international politics. For one, cultural homogenisation refers to the reduction in cultural diversity. A “soulless consumer capitalism” generated by globalisation has been linked to “Americanization” and “Westernization”. This tendency towards incorporating American and Western ideas, values and products that are disseminated broadly via the global platform result in Eastern cultural desertification, especially when the assimilation into Western culture is steadily done. This is the sentiment in an interviewee’s comments on the way “colleagues tell us [that] you do not look as good as westerners. This means that the more we look like westerns the better is our dress up. Why should we look like them?” (Respondent F, Kuala Lumpur, 5 May 2019). The pressure to measure local dress against a standard of Western dressing reflects the dilemma brought on by globalisation, which currently favours the West. The further rhetorical questions resonate with both the individual and collective betrayal at having sold out Eastern values through striving to achieve Western physical appearance and dress. In Southeast Asia, there are concerted efforts presently made to counteract this proclivity to buy into Western global brands and their looks. For instance, Singapore has begun to promote the arts through policy changes to push for its status as a global city for arts. As the financial centre of Southeast Asia, this city–state leads in the field of globalisation as evident in its open policy towards foreign investors and visitors. However, an erosion of cultural sovereignty
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is being recognised, which explains its consistent defensive measures to push for arts and cultural maintenance.

The split in identity that results in combining the social demands for globalisation, on one hand, and cultural preservation, on the other hand, is accompanied by despondence. These sentiments are suggested in the explanation:

We are not Western or American. Why [do] we have [an] urge to become like them? Who or what is responsible for that? Shouldn’t we be happy being ourselves? I feel extremely undermined when I am being pushed toward westernized culture. (Respondent G, Jakarta, 18 March 2019)

Considering that culture is an integral part of identity and imprinted on the individual as a pattern of perceptions that expected by others in a society the binary posed by the East–West juxtaposition results in a fracturing of an inherent identity, which destabilises and weakens the cohesive unit of identity. Furthermore, this psychological self-division when pressed to choose Western attendant values over Eastern traditions in the shift towards globalisation subsumes the damaging cultural manifestations of globalisation.

**Discussions**

Globalisation presents the risk of homogenising the world, which erases cultural diversity by obscuring the uniqueness and distinctness of traditions. The globalisation process robs leisure and relaxation time by enslaving consumers to branded products and other material properties. The age of consumerism heralded by globalisation drives people to strive for the tangible products of success, rather than preserve the intangible values embedded within culture. This danger is epitomised in the case of Singapore, where a prevalent shopping culture is fast replacing each citizen’s celebration of his or her unique Asian cultures. Singapore’s known obsession with the 5C’s, that are the car, country club, condominium, credit card and cash, illuminates the dilemma of the nation that has aggressively embraced globalisation. A consequence of this shift towards a global culture is the way younger generations begin to define themselves according to their consumables and, thus, vis-à-vis the standards of a corporate world set by others. The loss of identity resulting from this attempt to fit into a global trend, instead of becoming trendsetters themselves, is lamentable.

Firat (et al, 2013) argue that the concept of consumer society has gained a global perspective prominently in recent times. Globalisation, as we argue, has facilitated the expansion of consumerism. Furthermore, cultural appropriation arising from a global
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exposure of a specific culture is done at the expense of cultural authenticity and rightful ownership. Cultural imitation coupled with a lack of cultural knowledge means that the performance of a culture by global actors, particularly celebrities, may descend into a farce. For instance, a cultural dance may start to lose its unique meaning and poignancy when enacted for its entertainment and amusement qualities to garner show stoppers and rake in audience ratings. Misrepresentations of a culture strip it of its significance and tarnish its heritage. An example is Black American singer Nicki Minaj’s Saturday Night Live performance of her song “Chun Li” with dancers dressed in vaguely ethnic Chinese costumes. An embroidered serpent is embellished on the singer’s costume, which presents a stereotypical Asian image that fails to honour the culture but rather defiles it.

Cultural appropriation (CA) is notoriously difficult to conceptualise. According to Ziff & Pratima (1997), CA is “the taking – from a culture that is not one’s own – of intellectual property, cultural expressions, history and way of knowledge … and profiting at the expense of the people of that culture”. Denise Cuthbert (1998) notes that it is an idea that erupted as a reaction against the illicit “theft” of tangible cultural artefacts for exclusive or even shared usage by the “appropriator” and owners. Although she recognises that cultural infusions by definition are multidimensional, she nevertheless ascribes “appropriation” to that which occurs when dominant culture take from “marginal, minority and colonized cultures”, whereas, the reverse becomes “assimilation”. CA, according to Sharma (2017) is what happens when a dominant culture adapts elements from a marginalised culture and uses it outside the original culture’s context – often without credit or against the wishes of the said culture.

On the topic of the media, its role in homogenising culture cannot be underplayed. Using the term coined by Arjun Appadurai, the world’s mediascape creates and beams images for audiences to watch, as well as edits and relays news segments for readers and listeners. Its selective brand of culture presents a reductionist version of art, entertainment and news that are geared towards promoting sales. Blurring the distinctions between different cultures and promoting mostly stereotypical representations of a nation, the media tends to perpetrate cultural homogenisation. For instance, the images of the West that are depicted in films are not representative of the entire population living in the West. In fact, Hollywood films promote female and male stereotypes of the West that are easily disproved by visiting the West to experience first-hand its diverse people, accents and cultures. Similarly, although Southeast Asia and its people are poorly and scarcely represented in feature films controlled by the Western media, they are often cast as feminine (sexually available) and exoticized when they do make an appearance. Filipino actor Nico Santos in NBC’s Superstore is a case in hand. To add, Malaysian actress, 
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Michelle Yeoh, broke into Hollywood as a Bond girl in *Tomorrow Never Dies* (1997), thus consolidating the secondary and sexualised position of the mysterious Asian / Southeast Asian figure who fits into the Western frame of cultural discourse.

Furthermore, essentialist and biased views are no stranger to the art of the media, including pervasive social media that potentially corrodes cultural sensitivities. While the immediacy and spontaneity of media consumption enable quick communication between global parties by facilitating conference calls, live reporting and other prompt means of dissemination; its speediness is also its drawback. Such haste provides little chance for careful value analysis that takes time. With the click of a button, the swift reception of news, music, and even pornography through personal gadgets leaves very little time to weigh out the benefit or harm of the content that assails the viewer. Done ideally before deciding on whether to consume a disseminated item, this evaluation is omitted because of scarce time. This scarcity of time is attributed to the fast mechanisms of global media that make it challenging for a sensible evaluation of the media provider and thorough contemplation of the media content before it is consumed.

**Conclusions**

Globalisation is far from a fair game. With mediascapes responsible for the “distribution of the electronic capabilities to produce and disseminate information [newspapers, magazines, TV stations, film production studios, etc.],” also mean that giant economies receive a lion’s share of the collective decision-making when selecting the images to be produced and reproduced by the global media for the public consumption. Ineluctably, media outlets that enjoy bigger funding and promote a global dominant outlook tend to be more influential. As a result, smaller countries with less funding and a local or regional emphasis in news promotion become lost as they struggle with negotiating a better economic standing while serving a duty to maintain local cultural identity through their coverage of indigenous stories highlighting their own people across generations.

Southeast Asian cultures, traditions and values are compromised in the pursuit of economic advancement and political influence offered by globalisation. Since the postcolonial nations of Southeast Asia do not set the rules of globalisation, it is critical for these countries to maintain a critical stance while also participating within the process. The Western imperial powers that currently dominate the global cultural platform have resulted in the fear of “Westernization” or “Western-centrism.” Such an anxiety is reflected in Singapore, which is regarded as the most developed nation. In Southeast Asia, its “Asian values” national ideology serves as a foil to counterbalance its free marker policies that have helped to establish it as a first world economy. Taking its cue from Singapore, other developing Southeast Asian nations have adopted similar defensive approaches with a centrality on preserving the local cultural domain. Brunei Darussalam’s
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Malay Islamic Monarchic national ethos (MIB) is another exemplification of the guarding of local culture that constitutes the nation’s “spiritual domain.” To balance the “material domain” pursued through today’s endeavours of globalisation, these nations have sought to check the destructive effects of modernisation through the global cultural economy by actively integrating a local identity and preserving provincial values in their national consciousness. In this way, universality is rejected as an absolute value. By detecting the potential threat to local cultures and taking such preemptive action, Southeast Asian nations are safeguarding the values and traditions of their local people. However, a focus on opposing and criticising globalisation indirectly through these ideological refrains lend the risk of neglecting the social fractures within the local communities within each nation, which is neither removed nor resolved through a critical opposition to globalisation.

While knowledge creation in various languages is made possible through both the global movement of people and pervasiveness of technology, it remains that English is touted as the global language. With ethnoscapes constituting the “landscape of persons who constitute the shifting world in which we live: tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guestworkers and other moving groups and persons” and technoscapes that describing the “global configuration […] of technology, […] high and low, both mechanical and informational, now mov[ing] at high speeds across various kinds of previously impervious boundaries”, ethnic languages are carried to all four corners of the world as they are disseminated by native immigrants and technological tools. It is relatively easy to learn a new language through the diaspora communities or learning aids facilitated by technological mobility. However, with its historical associations to British colonial power and present links to U.S. imperial power, English serves as the “global language” that continues to jeopardise, devalue and erode local languages in non-Western parts of the world.

Recognising the danger posed to Southeast Asian culture, ASEAN has taken a decisive step to promote the fundamental freedoms of indigenous Southeast Asians with a claim to their unique cultures and diverse languages. In a call initiated by ASEAN, the basic human right to celebrate a distinct identity comprising a native cultural background and indigenous orientation is championed. At the 13th ASEAN Summit in Singapore, national leaders of member states arrived at an agreement to develop a Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint (ASCC). ASCC’s primary goal is to establish a people-centred community with high social and moral responsibility. In other words, this collective effort “promote[s] human and social development, respect for fundamental freedoms [and] gender equality”, while also forges “a culture of regional resilience, adherence to agreed principles, spirit of cooperation [and] collective responsibility” amongst Southeast Asian nations.

Cultural homogenisation is, thus, an aspect of globalisation that presents the danger of a decline in local culture. According to Arjun Appadurai, the “five dimensions of global cultural flow” in the areas of finance, ideology, media, people and technology result in deterritorialised spaces enabled by porous national boundaries. However, this global
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cultural economy risks the blurring and, in the worst-case scenario, elimination of unique differences that results in the emergence of a singular global culture. Instead of the celebration of diverse cultures, the global platform can result in a nation’s citizens holding of a myopic view where they have desensitised themselves to their local cultures and espouse a one-mind, one-voice and one-world perspective. Cultural homogenisation, consequently, entails ascribing to a single mode of conduct that precludes the wonder of arriving at their own conclusions, which are founded upon their unique and individual experiences. Ultimately, an agreement is reached every time as the same ideas are held. Agreeing with one another on everything eliminates the capacity for vision, revision, and innovative ways of viewing and presenting the world. With an availability of a rich coexistence offered by the world’s different cultures, squandering the unique capacities and distinct cultural identities leads to a destructive pattern. The repetition of history when missionaries and conquerors imposed their beliefs on those they conquered, who were subjects coerced into compliance, seems to be happening with globalisation’s cultural homogenisation. As a counterpoint, upholding indigenous cultures will serve to benefit local and global communities as it presents a greater scope for arriving at solutions to universal problems from multiple lenses and through diverse perspectives.

To sum up, the pronounced threats to native culture are real and increasingly obvious. As discussed above, globalisation has been shown to diminish and, in a few cases, also destroy local cultures, ethnic traditions, and indigenous enterprises. It is an accepted reality that globalisation presents tremendous opportunities for cultural diversity. This is, however, remains a crucial fact that some developing countries do not view their opportune entries into the global market as a replacement of their participation in their own cultures. In the age of border dissolution, cultural homogenisation might appear as a risk in some regions because forming an identity through an original culture preserves a semblance of self, society and the nation.
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