

## “GLOBALIZATION AND SIMULATION IN JORDI GALCERÁN’S *EL MÉTODO GRÖNHOLM*”

(This pdf version contains no images. For the original article go to <http://web.calstatela.edu/misc/karpa/Karpa6.2/Site%20Folder/sosa1.html>)

**Manuel Sosa-Ramírez**

The University of Mississippi

**Abstract:** Globalization has been a polarizing topic throughout the world. For some, it has had positive effects, creating and spreading wealth; for others, it is tantamount to economic imperialism and increases poverty in underdeveloped nations. The Spanish/Catalonian playwright Jordi Galcerán explores these themes in his satiric play *El método Gronhölml* (2003). Galcerán’s play is set in an enclosed and luxurious office building in the middle of present-day Barcelona or Madrid. Four candidates for an executive position in a multinational corporation face each other in a final interview. There is no interviewer, however; they must eliminate each other by employing Darwinian-like tactics in which the strong will defeat the weak. In the analysis of the play, especially the portrayal of the dynamic “corporatization” of Spain and its implications for Spanish national culture, I employ Fredric Jameson’s theories of the late capitalist system, and the emergence of modern global cultures; and Jean Baudrillard’s theories on Simulacra/Simulation. Galcerán’s play can be seen as both a resistance to the cataclysm of globalization or as an acceptance of its inevitability.

**Keywords:** globalization, simulation, corporatization, postmodernism, liberalism, método Grönholm

Globalization has been a polarizing topic throughout the world.(1) From an economic perspective, those in favor of globalization have assumed that it has had positive effects, bringing unparalleled prosperity to everyone. For others, globalization is tantamount to cultural and economic imperialism and increases poverty in underdeveloped nations. As a concept, globalization refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole (Robertson 93). At the crossing point of subjective and objective, globalization has become both “a set of contending material practices and a bundle of epistemes, discourses, [and] conceptualizations” (Smith 1). Globalization has become the most significant characteristic of the postmodern era.(2) The Spanish/Catalonian playwright Jordi Galcerán explores some of these issues in his satiric play *El método Gronhölml* (2003). Galcerán’s play is set in an enclosed and luxurious office high-rise in the heart of present-day Barcelona or Madrid. Four candidates for an executive position in a multinational corporation face each other in a final interview. There is no interviewer, however; they must get rid of each other by employing Darwinian-like tactics in which the strong will overcome the weak. This paper will explore the play’s dialogue with Spain’s position in the world economy in the early 21st century, its portrayal of the corporatization of Spain, and its implications for Spanish national society and culture. I will also examine Galcerán’s portrayal of the global economy using Baudrillard’s theories of simulacra/simulation in postmodern culture. Galcerán’s play can be seen as both a resistance to globalization/neoliberalism or as an acceptance of its inevitability.

### Globalization and Postmodernism

In *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Fredric Jameson argues that the financial world of the last few decades is clearly defined by a multinational capitalism he refers to as “late capitalism.” He also argues that “every position on postmodernism in culture – whether apologia or stigmatization – is also at one and the same time, and necessarily, an implicitly or explicitly political stance on the nature of multinational capitalism today” (3). For Jameson, postmodernism is the direct result of the transformations that took place in capitalism during the second half of the twentieth century.(3) And, as Jameson claims in the title of his book, postmodernism is not just a significant part of this change of economic structures but it is its *cultural logic*. Douglas Kellner, however, is not entirely convinced “that during the past decades, the world has been undergoing the most significant period of technological innovation and global restructuring since the first decades of the twentieth century” (1). Part of the alleged “great transformation” to a new stage of technological capitalism, he argues, has involved an essential “restructuring and reorganization of the world economy, polity, and culture for which the notion of globalization serves as a code word” (1-2). Within this epistemological frame of economic transformation and self-reflective, parodic art of representation of multinational corporations, the primary agents of globalization, play a fundamental, though controversial, part in most of the accounts of globalization as a socio-economic phenomenon.(4)

This new vision of a global market, “*laissez-faire* capitalism” on a global scale, became well-known in policy-making circles following the election of conservative leaders such as Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan. The neoliberal economic policies, or simply called Neoliberalism, promised to take apart once and for all the welfare state, eliminate governmental restraints, cure social ills, and lead to general prosperity (Brennan 44). For “anti-globalization” movement, however, this messianic enterprise is nothing but a fraud.(5) They believe that most governments and free trade institutions guard the interest of multinational corporations by allocating them special privileges mostly denied to individuals, i.e., moving freely across borders, extracting desired natural resources, and taking advantage of a diversity of unprotected human resources (Anti-globalization 4).(6)

### **Spanish Postmodernity**

This controversial western free market paradigm has captivated Spain’s imaginary as well, especially since Francisco Franco’s death in 1975 and the end of his long dictatorship. In a rapidly consolidating democracy, Spain transformed itself from an extremely conservative Catholic society into an almost self-consciously tolerant modern state.(7) Social and political change went hand in hand with economic progress. Since Franco’s era the ratio of Spanish exports and imports soared to close on 60 percent of GDP – compared to the 24 percent of the 1920s and 1930s – above the ratio of countries such as France and Italy (De la Dehesa 3). In 1986 Spain fulfilled its long dream of joining the European Union Community, which meant, a substantial flooding of foreign direct investment into the local economy. In 2006 Spain was “the world’s ninth-largest economy measured at market exchange rates and the twelfth largest at purchasing-power parity,” and in 2009 Spain was “the sixth-biggest net investor abroad” (The Economist 3). Over the past fifteen years, a powerful group of multinationals corporations has emerged on Spanish soil; from 2000 to 2008 the number of Spanish corporations listed in the Financial Times list of the world’s 500 largest firms increased from 8 to 14 (*The Economist* 3).

### **El método Grönholm**

Spain’s quick financial success and spread of unregulated markets, however, encouraged quite a few excesses; one of them, as Galcerán demonstrates in his play, has to do with the des-

humanizing hiring practices of personnel by multinational corporations. In *El método Grönholm*, four candidates for an executive position – Fernando, Enrique, Carlos and Mercedes, all in their late thirties or early forties – are gathered in an isolated room with no contact with the outside world but through a mid-size glass window. There are “Tres hombres y una mujer. Como siempre,” says Mercedes; “El veinticinco por ciento. Políticamente correcto,” Carlos declares sarcastically to her referring to the presence of women in the hiring process (Galcerán 6). Throughout the interview, they all will engage in game-like situations involving issues related with machismo, sexism, homophobia, defamation, and other high-pressure topics. Galcerán divides his play into five different theatre-within-theatre game situations.

In the first situation the candidates are given an envelope with a message and a chronometer. The message asserts that this is the last stage of the hiring process for the position of Commercial director of DEKIA – a clear reference to the Sweden transnational corporation IKEA – and that each applicant should feel free to quit the test at any time they feel under pressure. They are also told that “Solo hay tres auténticos aspirantes. Uno de ustedes es miembro de nuestro departamento de selección de personal,” and that they have “diez minutos para averiguar quién de ustedes no es el auténtico candidato” (7-8). Everybody looks at each other with suspicion. In an exhausting interrogation-like game everyone will search for hints, waiting for the others to do or say something helpful to be used against them. Mercedes believes the aim of the game is to assess the ability of each applicant in solving puzzles. By the same twisted logic of the contest, Fernando rightly points out

**Fernando:** Coño, que estamos compitiendo entre nosotros. No te darán ninguna información que no les interese dar. No, en realidad, la cosa tiene su qué. No se trata sólo de averiguar quién está fingiendo, sino también de hacer que los demás se equivoquen, porque si los tres adivinamos quién es el falso ya me dirás tú de qué sirve la prueba. Todo el mundo gana, y entonces ¿qué? Enrique: El papel dice que hemos de averiguar quién es el falso. No dice que tengamos que competir entre nosotros.

**Fernando:** Hombre, esto está claro. No hace falta decirlo. Somos tres y sólo hay un puesto. Estamos compitiendo (9).

Fernando’s statement suggests that in the world of finances and marketing the Manichean win-lose mentality is relative and could be easily misleading. Mercedes’ posture instead is more appeasing. She thinks the goal of the test, more than anything, is to weigh the capability of the contenders in working as a team: “Lo que debemos hacer es colaborar” (9). Carlos and Fernando are positive sure that it is impossible to work side by side. Fernando emphatically says: “...No podemos trabajar juntos. No nos podemos fiar los unos a los otros” (10).

A second situation concerns distortion and manipulation of facts. Enrique presents the others with a set of tragic personal events that could jeopardize his current job, but must prevent the others, who will be his judges, from ‘firing’ him from the race. He admits that he broke up with his wife, his apartment was mugged, his credit cards were stolen, and a romantic relationship went sour. His personal issues have had interfered with his professional judgment resulting in a financial harm to his company. Based on this data, the others will decide if he stays or leaves. When Enrique is absolved, he acknowledges his arguments were a bit misleading but his aim was to continue in the contest: “Ha sido más fácil de lo que pensaba. Debía lograr que no me despidierais. La prueba era esta. Era para mí” (19). He affirms that some aspects are real but he twisted them, i.e., the burglary did not happen, neither the romantic relationship. He says: “me ha parecido que serviría para ablandaros un poco” (19). Enrique asserts that this kind of interviewing

that encourages deception over telling the truth is normal in the hiring practices of the multinationals in the US:

En los Estados Unidos, este tipo de pruebas son habituales en los procesos de selección. Aquí, de lo que se trata es de que todos creamos que el problema es que hay un candidato falso, que alguien de los que estamos aquí está engañando a los demás cuando, en realidad, los que nos han engañado, de entrada, son ellos (12).

He applauds DEKIA's selection method and provides an example of an American corporation: "[reunieron a] los aspirantes en una sala, igual que a nosotros, esperando para pasar una entrevista y, de repente empezaron a sonar las alarmas de incendio. Ellos lo filmaban todo y analizaban las reacciones de la gente" (19-20). The outcome of these tests, according to Enrique, is to identify qualities of leadership in the individuals, given the chaotic circumstances in which quick decision has to be taken. The scene described by Enrique embodies the typical situation the anti-globalization movement regards as the negative impact of the "Americanization of culture and labor practices," the alleged "globalization abuse" perpetrated by neoliberal policies all over the world.

In a third situation employing a meta-theatrical masquerade, the applicants must pretend to be four iconic figures: a bishop, a politician, a bullfighter and a clown. Each character will try to convince the others of the importance of saving his life in a fast-falling plane with one parachute. The others will have to accept the decision and die in the crash. After an arduous discussion they all agree that all arguments are condemned to fail because, as Fernando points out, the only way of getting what you want is by imposing your will upon the others. Then, in a lampoon to the Spanish Catholic Church's legacy of authoritarianism, Fernando, wearing the bishop's hat, says that given his significance in the scale of power and moral order he is compelled to save his life and take the parachute. He warns the other over the outcome of disobeying the commands of the holy institution: "No intentéis oponeros a la voluntad de la Iglesia. Tenemos más fuerza de la que parece. Si no me obligáis a utilizar la violencia..." (24). Fernando's contempt entails that the Church's *modus operandi* has not changed much in modern times, despite the secular movement Spain has been undergoing during the last 30 years.(8)

In the fourth situation, Carlos is given an envelope through a hidden door. He is instructed to disclose that he has "iniciado un tratamiento hormonal que ha de desembocar en una operación de cambio de sexo" (25). The other applicants must decide, given Carlos's "anomalous condition," "si es el tipo de candidato para entrar a trabajar en nuestra empresa. Si ustedes llegan a la conclusión de que no es el perfil adecuado al cargo, Carlos Bueno deberá abandonar el proceso de selección" (25). Carlos' 'exposure' inspires all sort of negative responses: "Mercedes no puede evitar reírse" (26); Fernando, the most homophobic of all, makes some sarcastic remarks:

O sea que de aquí a cuatro días te comenzarán a salir los pechos, se te pondrá la voz de canario y te acabarán cortando el pito [...] Si eres travestí o transsexual o transatlántico es cosa tuya, pero aquí estás optando a un cargo ejecutivo de alto nivel. Si no tienes claro si eres macho o hembra, quiere decir que en tu cerebro hay un lío de hostia, y ahora que además has empezado a chutarte hormonas en vena, tus pobres neuronas pueden acabar bailando una jota. Perdona, pero tú debes estar más sonado que el pito de un árbitro. (27)

In Fernando's opinion, a gay person suffers a "mental confusion" which deprives him/her of clear judgment and making serious decisions, therefore, this individual does not belong in the business world. Carlos fails his test by not being able to convince the other of his "marketability" and he eventually has no choice but to leave the room. The absurdity of the course of action is that Carlos is being honest but all what he gets is disapproval. Enrique, on the other hand, recognized that his story was a hoax but he passed the test and is allowed to stay. Galcerán's play suggests that in the cynical world of business, telling the truth is not as important as presenting a statement as it were truth.

In an event developing simultaneously to Carlos's inquisitorial trial, Mercedes receives a phone call informing her of the sudden passing away of her mother at the hospital. Despite the shocking news, Mercedes refuses to abandon the race arguing that there is nothing she can do to reverse her mother's death. She knows that leaving the room will put her automatically out of the contest, and this is something she cannot afford: "Para mi, conseguir este trabajo es muy importante. Mi madre no resucitará porque yo ahora corra hacia el hospital" (33). The other contestants heartlessly ply with her emotions so her guilty conscience forces her to leave

**Fernando:** Se nota que entre tu madre y tú había cariño.

**Mercedes:** Di lo que quieras. A mí no me pondrás nerviosa.

**Carlos:** Mercedes, vamos. No seas tonta. No merece la pena.

**Fernando:** Cojones, qué familia. (33)

Carlos, contrary to Mercedes, has had enough and decides to quit. For him the whole mind-game-hiring procedure is stupid and degrading: "Estáis todos locos. Y yo no sé como he aguantado tanto rato esta mierda de selección. Es vergonzoso que nos hagan hacer... Si tuviésemos un poco de dignidad, ya hace rato que deberíamos haberlos enviado a tomar por el saco" (33). After Carlos's departure, Enrique acknowledges that in fact he works for the hiring corporation – "Tenéis razón. Mi nombre es Esteban Ripoll. Soy psicólogo del departamento de personal de DEKIA" (34) – and declares that there will be one last test between the remaining two contestants. Both Fernando and Mercedes are given an envelope with instructions to follow. Fernando's task is to make Mercedes cry; Mercedes task is persuade Fernando to leave the room. In order to fulfill his goal, Fernando tackles Mercedes' guilty conscience by accusing her of pitilessness before her mother's death. Mercedes cannot stop crying.

The play ends by admitting that all along there has been only one candidate, Fernando; the other three are psychologists working for the hiring corporation. They identify themselves and explain to Fernando that he has been going through a new testing technique introduced by Isaías Grönholm, the director of DEKIA's Human Resources department from the main headquarters located in Sweden. The procedure is called "creative intelligence" and its aim is to confront candidates with situations closely familiar to them and analyze their responses. The psychologists are impressed with Fernando's lack of sympathy in three of the situations he has been exposed even though they are part of his own personal history. Mercedes tells him "Con sinceridad, lo que más nos ha sorprendido de su actitud es que no ha demostrado empatía en ninguno de los tres casos" (43). The psychologists disclose to Fernando information the company has about him. They say it was he who experienced a severe depression when his mother died and his wife abandoned him. As a result, his own personal crisis caused him to make poor decisions that jeopardized the integrity of the whole company, but he was not fired. When Enrique presented a similar situation, Fernando was the most in favor of firing him, and argued that he was not the most suitable person for a business job. Fernando's homophobic rhetoric and cruel discrimination were crucial in Carlos dismissal. This comes as a surprise when we learn that Fernando's own

brother is homosexual and who is going through a hormonal treatment. Fernando's discrimination of women, especially toward professional women like Mercedes, is also on display. For an emblematic "macho ibérico" like Fernando, who believes that women are nothing but "un culo y dos tetas, como todas las tías" (17), is unconceivable to him that Mercedes not only is considered a legitimate aspirant for the executive position, but that she already works for the company. When provoking Mercedes' tears, Fernando does not hesitate in using all kind of derogatory remarks in order to crush her. Fernando is the most suitable subject for the position, since, from a free-market perspective, as Kasparov points out, competition is brutal, and "when survival is at stake, there is no room for morality" (7).

The three psychologists concur that Fernando showed a strong aggressive character. He certainly showed "the traits of character most rewarded by free market: entrepreneurial boldness, the willingness to speculate and gamble, and the ability to seize or create new opportunities" (Gray 4). However, the three professionals find Fernando's bold impulses false in nature, pure simulated posturing: "Le hemos presentado tres situaciones semejantes y [en usted] no ha habido ni una sombra de compasión" (43). Mercedes is categorical when she states to Fernando: "Quizás el ademán de hombre duro le dé algún buen resultado en su mierda de laboratorio, pero aquí es totalmente inadecuado. Sus decisiones han sido correctas, no lo niego, pero las formas... Hay que ser malparido pero que no se note tanto" (44). They agree that Fernando is not the bold individual he pretends to be, and thus it is impossible to know what he would do, as a representative of the corporation, when facing similar but real situations. In this sense, Fernando is a "simulator" of the "Iberian macho" rather than a "dissimulator;" he is, someone who feigns to have what he does not have to such a degree that his true nature is impossible to decipher. (9) He fails to be the cold-hearted businessman tug who would "break the ordinary rules of decent conduct and then to produce good reasons for doing so" (Walzer 10). In official terms, the psychologist argue, Fernando is a victim of what they call a "boomerang effect" and inform him: "Hay que tener cuidado con la agresividad porque se puede volver en contra de uno, y sobre todo en su caso. ¿Por qué? Porque ha sido una agresividad impostada. No era real. Era una actitud externa. ¿Qué puede pasar con una persona como usted enfrentada a un conflicto?" (43).

The psychologists concede that their company is looking for someone tough but who appears to be kind: "No buscamos una buena persona que parezca un hijo de puta. Lo que necesitamos en un hijo de puta que parezca buena persona" (44). In the end, Fernando does not get the position, but in a phone conversation with a friend, he claims that he was offered the position but he turned it down: "Les he dicho que no, que gracias, pero que se podían meter su empresita por el culo... Una pandilla de pirados, te lo juro. Nos han hecho unas pruebas... Están como una puta cabra. No trabajaría en esta empresa ni que me la regalasen..." (44-45). Deception for Fernando – pretending to be who he is not – has become the norm in his life. His personality is a careless ensemble of multiple faces; a representation preceding and determining the real; That is, a "simulacrum" in which there is no distinction between representation and the reality represented (Baudrillard 2).

### **Playing the Game**

Galcerán's criticism is propelled in two directions: to the unregulated market's multinationals, governed only by the greed of the most powerful, and to the corrupt individual who is willing to go across all boundaries in order to be admitted in the circle of power. The play suggests that economic neoliberal policies, unreleased from all restraints, undermine the fundamental ethical and moral values governing a given society. But individuals are also part of the problem because their self-indulgences contribute to corruption. In the specific case of Fernando, the "Spanish

macho,” he is so lost in the fantasy of his own misleading image that his life has become a self-fabricated reality which fulfills his desires and needs, or, at least, that is what he believes. He is a caricature who has turned himself into a mere simulacrum, a pure absence, in a masked and distorted reality.

Spain’s full embrace of global corporatism, Galcerán’s play suggests, has multiplied the problems for the local labor relationship. As Galcerán points out, the abusive behavior has shockingly become the norm, and, worst of all, it marks the individual with a “profunda huella psicológica” (47).**(10)** According to the Spanish psychologist Ricardo Blasco, collective interviews, favored nowadays by most corporations, are barbaric and should be illegal. Applicants are expected to openly disclose personal information that certainly could be used against their own interests. There have been cases, for instance, in which applicants have been asked if he/she is married, have a significant other, have children or want to have them, etc.: “Se trata de datos delicados... que pueden ser utilizados con fines discriminatorios. Por ejemplo, descartando a madres solteras por el mero hecho de serlo y no basándose en su profesionalidad” (Rizzi-Galcerán 48).

Another issue Galcerán’s play explores is the notion of “national identity.” Despite the fact that Spanish corporations have become global and distances within the country have shrunk due to the efficiency of transportation, there is a sense of cultural parochialism affecting the Spanish conscience as a whole. Many Spanish political leaders, paradoxically, find extremely difficult to look beyond their own region or language, let alone their own country. In the past few years, *The Economist* argues, “Spanish’s political leaders have chosen to look backwards and to emphasize the local issue dividing them” (15). The concept of national identity and centralized government has proved to be a positive approach in many parts of the globe, but also it is the multiple faces, languages and identities represented by the commonwealth now integrating the Spanish nation. The best approach, as Galcerán’s play suggests, is ‘glocalization’ – it should be an indigenous vision combined with a global view. One in which the interaction between the local and the global should have a dialectical and productive understanding; one that would allow us to “think locally but act globally.”**(11)**

Joining the EU in 1986 and the euro community in 1999 was not necessarily the answer to Spanish philosopher Ortega y Gasset’s slogan that Europe was the solution for a troubled Spain (513).**(12)** It is true after joining the EU Spain saw a huge influx of investments (*The Economist* 2); it is also true that joining the euro meant low interest rate in the cost of mortgages causing as a result a serious housing boom. In this regard, John Elliot believes that the period between 1975-2000 may come to be seen in retrospect as the “Golden Age” of Spanish economic prosperity (*The Economist* 12). This supposed Golden Age, however, led to a burst economic bubble that resulted in 20% unemployment in 2010, and increased to 24.6% in the summer of 2012. This means that at the present moment in Spain there are six million “desocupados”, that is, people with no jobs. Spain is still negotiating its place in a globalized economy where ideas of national “greatness” are no longer as relevant as they were in the Franco era. While Galcerán criticizes the traces of Spain cultural insularism, he also criticizes the de-humanizing practices of a non-regulated globalization. Rather than a realm of endless possibilities, Galcerán imagines the globalized world and claustrophobic office space where nothing is what it seems, but a meaningless simulation with no relation to any reality whatsoever. In this ‘hyperreal’ world, the play suggests, the ‘real’ seems to be “no longer anything but operational.” The ‘real’ is no longer the real. It space is occupied by a “hyperreal produced by a radiating synthesis of combinatory models in a hyperspace without atmosphere” (Baudrillard 2). For Baudrillard, this is the postmodern order ruling the world in which we live. *El método Grönholm* presents the globalized market as an international game where the players are also the ones being played.**(13)** The play

allows us to understand not only the complex contingencies governing a globalize reality – in which everything is assumed to be interrelated – but invite us to embrace a new humanism, a new set of relations between the corporate world and citizenship. With today’s unemployment soaring as high as 26 per cent, Spain’s economic future doesn’t seem to be clear. Poverty is on the rise, and the most affected are running out of options. Given today’s circumstances, one would ask, following Ortega y Gasset’s slogan, if Europe was in fact the “solution” for Spain’s problems, or it is just another problem.(14)

---

## Notes

(1) Jan Aart Scholte has identified four definitions of globalization: 1) globalization as internalization; 2) globalization as liberalization; 3) globalization as universalization, and 4) globalization as westernization (55). In principle I use the second concept – globalization as liberalization – however, it may combine with the other three.

(2) My use of Postmodern/Postmodernism refers to a definition provided by Linda Hutcheon in “Representing the Postmodern – What is Postmodernism?” She argues that postmodernism in the arts takes the form of self-conscious, self-contradictory and self-undermining statement. The effect is to *highlight* and to *subvert*, and the mode is therefore a *knowing* and an *ironic* one (1).

(3) De la Dehesa points out that neoliberal globalization is a dynamic process of liberalization, openness, and international integration across a wide range of markets, from labor to goods and from services to capital and technology. It is not a new process but, rather, has unfolded gradually since the mid-1950s and it will take many years yet to finally reach completion, if politics permits (1-2).

(4) According to De la Dehesa, a multinational corporation, contrary to a global company, is one that operates in several countries but makes no attempt to unify its operation from a strategic standpoint (2).

(5) “Anti-globalization” is the term most commonly used to describe the political stance of people and groups who oppose Neoliberal policies of globalization. They are also called the “Anti-neoliberalism” or “Globalization from below” movement, but they prefer to call themselves “Global Justice Movement.” The anti-globalization movement has its precursors in such movements as the 1968 movement in Europe and the protests against the Vietnam War in the United States (*Anti-globalization* 2-3).

(6) The anti-globalization movement accuses the multinational corporations of moving on after doing permanent damage to the natural capital and biodiversity of a nation, in a manner impossible for that nation’s citizens to recover. The movement demands an end to the legal status of what they call “corporate personhood” and the dissolution of all counter-productive reforms introduced by the World Bank, IMF, and WTO.

(7) Modernity – apart from suggesting widely available technologies associated with ‘modern life’ (TV, cars, high-rises, computers) – it more generally refers to a cast of mind, and attitude, an approach to problems as much as to a period (Brennan 43).



**(8)** Santiago Carrillo, the ex-secretary of PCE (Partido Comunista Español), accuses Spanish democracy for granting the Church “privilegios extraordinarios.” He argues that today’s Spanish Church is still dominated by a “mentalidad medieval... [Se trata de] una Iglesia de cruzada y de reconquista que quiere jugar un papel determinante en el Estado” (1).

**(9)** In his definition of simulacra, Baudrillard opposes the meaning of “dissimulation” and “simulation” as follow: to dissimulate is to pretend to have what one’s lack; simulate is to feign to have what one doesn’t have. However, simulating is not pretending: “whoever fakes an illness can simply stay in bed and make everyone believe he is ill. Whoever simulates an illness produces in himself some of the symptoms. Therefore, pretending, or dissimulating, leaves the principle of reality intact: the difference is always clear, it is simply masked, whereas simulation threatens the difference between the ‘true’ and the ‘false’, the ‘real’ and the ‘imaginary’” (3).

**(10)** Andrea Rizzi’ Report, “Se busca empleado (para humillar),” appeared in the Spanish newspaper El País on 10/23/2005. The article has been added as an epilogue to Galcerán’s play as a way to explain the nature of the problems the playwright is addressing.

**(11)** “Piense localmente y actúe globalmente,” recomienda el sociólogo alemán Ulrich Beck, para enfatizar la noción inglesa de “Glocalization.” Asegura Beck que “la globalización cambia la importancia de la relación con lo local, y cambia la relación de la gente con lo local. Es al mismo tiempo un proceso de redefinición de lo local. La globalización significa que estamos a la vez actuando a nivel local pero tenemos que anticipar y reaccionar en base al proceso que está desarrollándose en la esfera global. Diría que necesitamos una ‘visión cosmopolita,’ lo que implica utilizar una metáfora: “tener raíces y alas a la vez” (Sevares 2). See also Roland Robertson Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity in Featherstone, Lash and Robertson (eds) Global Modernities. London: Sage, 1995.

**(12)** In the years before the Spanish Civil War of 1936, Europe was for Spain the equivalent of prosperity and modernization. The loss in 1898 of Spain’s last colonies to the hand of the United States inaugurated a whole generation of intellectuals who felt ashamed for what they called “el desastre de España.” The “europeización de España” – they thought – was the key element for Spain entrance into modernization. As early as 1910, Ortega y Gasset expressed: “Regeneración es inseparable de europeización; ... apenas se sintió la emoción reconstructiva, la angustia, la vergüenza [de 1898], se pensó la idea europeizadora. Regeneración [era] el deseo; europeización el medio de satisfacerlo. Verdaderamente se vio claro desde un principio que España era el problema y Europa la solución” (513).

**(13)** In 2005, the Argentinean director Marcelo Piñeyro made Galcerán’s play into a film. Instead of the play’s four characters, the film introduces seven: two women and five men. The action takes place on the top floor of a modern skyscraper in Madrid. The city is portrayed as an apocalyptic space semi-destroyed by a violent confrontation between police and political demonstrators. The movie – although it was the official selection by the International Film Festivals of Toronto, Vancouver and AFI Los Angeles – did not have the success of the theatrical play.

**(14)** José Ignacio Torreblanca points out that today’s polls “speak of a crude awakening: only 30 per cent of Spaniards hold a positive view of the EU and 28 per cent a negative one. Spain is now,

after Cyprus, the member state where the EU's image is most negative. Spaniards will not revolt against Europe but they are learning a lot about tough love" (2).

## Bibliography

- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994. Print.
- Brennan, Timothy. "Postcolonial Studies and Globalization Theory." *The Postcolonial and the Global*. Eds. Revathi Krishnaswamy and John C. Hawley. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2008. 37-53. Print.
- Carrillo, Santiago. "La crispación española debe mucho a tener una iglesia muy de derechas." *20minutos.es*. Web. 18 Jan 2011.
- De la Dehesa, Guillermo. *Winners and Losers in Globalization*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. Print.
- Galcerán, Jordi. *El método Grönholm* (El método Grönholm), Trans. Risardo. biblioteca.d2g.com, 2003. Web. 7 Aug 2009.
- Graham-Jones, Jean. "Editorial comment: theorizing globalization through theatre." *Theatre Journal* 57.3 (2004) viii-xvi. Print.
- Gray, John. "It depends." *Does the free market corrode moral character? Thirteen views on the question*. John Templeton Foundation, Autumn 2008. Web. 15 Aug 2009.
- He, Hinglian. "No." *Does the free market corrode moral character? Thirteen views on the question*. John Templeton Foundation, Autumn 2008. Web. 15 Aug 2009.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. 2nd edition. London-New York: Routledge, 2002. Print.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1991. Print.
- Kasparov, Garry. "Yes, but..." *Does the free market corrode moral character? Thirteen views on the question*. John Templeton Foundation, Autumn 2008. 16 Aug 2009. Web.
- Kellner, Douglas. "Globalization and the Postmodern Turn." ucla.edu. Web. 3 Jan 2010.
- Mandel, Ernest. *Late Capitalism*. New York: Verso Books, 1978. Print.
- Ortega y Gasset, José. "La pedagogía social como programa político". *Obras Completas. Vol. I* Madrid: Occidente, 1946. 494-513. Print.
- Rizzi, Andrea. "Se busca empleado (para humillar)." *El País.es*. Web 23 Oct 2009.
- Robertson, Roland. "Globalization as a problem." *The Globalization Reader* Eds. Frank J. Lechner and John Boli. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004. 93-99. Print.

Scholte, Jan Aart. *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Print.

Sevares, Julio. Entrevista al sociólogo alemán Ulrich Beck: “En la globalización necesitamos tener raíces y alas a la vez”. *Clarín.com*. Web 15 Nov 2009.

Smith, Stan. “Introduction. Globalisation and Its Discontents.” *Globalisation and Its Discontents*. Ed. Stan Smith. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2006.1-46. Print.

*The Economist*. “The Party’s Over: A Special Report on Spain,” November 11th (2008): 1-14. Print.

Torreblanca, José Ignacio. “Europe must show Spain it is the answer”. *Financial Times*, October 16, 2012. Web. 22 Jan. 2013.

Walzer, Michael. “Of course it does”. *Does the free market corrode moral character? Thirteen views on the question*. John Templeton Foundation, Autumn 2008. Web. 15 Jan 2009.