




UNIVERSITY OF TAMPERE

This document has been downloaded from
Tampub – The Institutional Repository of University of Tampere

 *Post-print*

The permanent address of the publication is <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:uta-201211121076>

Author(s): Valaskivi, Katja
Title: Dimensions of Innovationism
Main work: Post-Secular Society
Editor(s): Nynäs, Peter; Lassander, Mika; Utriainen, Terhi
Year: 2012-11-12
Pages: 129-156
ISBN: 978-1-4128-4610-3
Publisher: London : Transaction
Discipline: Sociology; Media and communications; Theology
School /Other Unit: School of Communication, Media and Theatre
Item Type: Article in Compiled Work
Language: en
URN: URN:NBN:fi:uta-201211121076

All material supplied via TamPub is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorized user.

Dimensions of Innovationism

Katja Valaskivi

Somewhere in some activity or condition lies a fullness and richness. In that place (activity or condition) life is fuller, richer, deeper, more worthwhile, more admirable, more what it should be.¹

Innovation is a contemporary buzzword, used in a great number of situations. The concept has been circulated from economics to the media, and is used in contexts ranging from national competitiveness strategies to R&D. It appears in business prospectuses and academic textbooks, strategy documents and funding applications, and local industry policy statements and guidelines for cultural enhancement. In each context the concept gains new meanings—gradually becoming almost a blanket term, all-encompassing and inevitable in discussions about the future, science, society, education, development, the economy, and so on. Thus, when one listens to politicians, consultants, academics, and journalists, it can appear that purely through innovations one can achieve a life that is fuller, richer, deeper, and more worthwhile. In this way innovations appear to form a whole worldview or belief system. I refer to this belief system as *innovationism*.

According to Beyer, a central structural feature of secularized societies is the differentiation of institutional subsystems, such as culture, politics, and the economy. These subsystems are relatively independent of religious norms, values, and justifications, and thus we are led into a situation in which the religious area of operations continually becomes narrower.² However, in order to understand the role of the religious in the contemporary world, it will be necessary to widen the perspective. The way in which I wish to discuss the post-secular is connected to the ways in which the religious domain is present in subsystems that might appear to be secular. The apparent invisibility of an explicitly religious domain in a subsystem does not imply an absence of aspects, dimensions, or patterns of action that function in religious ways. Thus, in this chapter I shall attempt to identify how, in this faith called innovationism, practices of faith with religious implications have developed within frames that are not perceived as religious at all—or could even be perceived as totally opposed to religion.

One of the main propositions of the post-secularity debate states that because of the growing public visibility of religion and religious phenomena, theories of secularization are no longer able to explain social conditions in contemporary developed societies. However, in this chapter I wish to look beyond the conventional definitions of religion. Given the pervasiveness of innovationism, it is imperative to understand the ways in which it communicates a belief system that manages power, flows of funding, and social relationships.³

In discussions of secularity and the post-secular society, the question of a search for meaning appears frequently. Charles Taylor acknowledges that even in societies that have rid themselves of God there is nevertheless an aspiration for something better: the issue is an example of what Habermas⁴ describes as “an awareness of what is missing.” Taylor⁵ borrows Luc Ferry’s concept of the “meaning of meaning” (“*sens du sens*”) in explicating the notion that “somewhere there is a fullness or richness which transcends the ordinary.” In this sense, the question indeed concerns “meaning of life.” Why are we here? What is the purpose of all this? The question of (collective) meaning is intertwined with feelings of insecurity and a desire for security in (globalized) times.

In this chapter I shall describe the dimensions⁶ of innovationism and the ways in which it is used in a collective search for meaning, or quest for certainty, in three national settings, the United States, Finland, and Japan. The research has been conducted via a combination of content analysis and discourse analysis⁷; it involves interviews with journalists and innovation systems specialists⁸ in the three countries, focusing particularly on two countries, Finland and Japan.

It is obvious that innovationism could be analyzed in numerous ways, for instance, as a hegemonic ideology. In this chapter, however, innovationism (based on the interviews I conducted) is perceived as a rationalized symbolic universe with religious features. Thus, what I wish to do here is to test the conceptualization of innovationism as a transnational⁹ symbolic universe and social imaginary—one which is apparently used in a rational and secular sense, but which nevertheless has religious usages and implications. In discussing the dimensions of innovationism as a worldview,¹⁰ I wish to elucidate how innovationism works, first of all, in organizing and maintaining core values, and secondly, in managing hope and threat in those post-secular societies in which religion is a matter of choice.

The renowned “theologian of hope,” Paul Tillich, defines religion as being about the ultimate concerns of humankind. Thus, religion provides in the first place a meaningful set of ultimate values on which the morality of a society can be based. When these values are institutionalized, they can be spoken of as central values of a society.¹¹ Secondly, religion provides an adequate explanation for the “ultimate frustrations” which are inherent to the human situation, and which are not manageable or morally meaningful. Death is the type case of (individual) ultimate frustrations, while environmental concerns and climate change are current issues that appear to threaten the whole of humankind.

Ultimate values should be greater than ultimate frustrations, and religion should provide an adequate explanation for ultimate frustrations, so that the individual or the group can accept them without having their core values rendered meaningless.¹² In a similar way, Tillich emphasizes the necessity of hope for human beings and for the collective: hope should exist as the driving force for a human being “as long as he lives.”¹³

In religious studies, Tillich’s view on ultimate concerns has for some time been considered “rather empty and too wide-ranging” to facilitate an understanding of religions. Ninian Smart advocates a comparative perspective, with the study of “dimensions of worldviews.” According to Smart, there are seven dimensions that need to be taken into account: (1) the ritual or practical, (2) the philosophical, (3) the mythic or narrative, (4) the experiential or emotional, (5) the ethical or legal, (6) the organizational or social, and (7) the material or artistic dimension.¹⁴

In understanding innovationism as a belief system or worldview, it appears that the approaches of Tillich and Smart may complement each other. Innovationism is strongly based on certain shared values. The circulation of these values not only contributes to the construction of an imagined (global) community,¹⁵ but is also the basis on which the more practical dimensions are constructed.

Thus, the tentative conclusion would be that innovationism provides for contemporary developed societies both a set of ultimate values and a way of controlling the ultimate frustrations. In this way innovationism can be perceived of as religious. The set of values is institutionalized through the constant circulation of innovationism in different contexts and conjunctures.

In what follows, I will first explore innovationism as it appears in my empirical material from the point of view of ultimate values at the individual,

corporate, national, and global levels, and in relation to dimensions of worldviews. Secondly, I will discuss the ultimate frustrations and how innovationism appears to manage them in its various dimensions. Thirdly, I will study the actors taking part in the institutionalization of innovationism, as demonstrated in the interviews. Finally, I will discuss the mechanisms of innovationism that contribute to the contemporary, collective search for meaning and the quest for certainty.

Before that, however, it will be necessary to take a look at the definitions and usages of the concept of innovation; these can also be analyzed through the *doctrinal dimension* of innovationism.¹⁶

Innovation

The current use of the word *innovation* is generally acknowledged to have derived from the economist Joseph A. Schumpeter. His perception of innovation can be summed up in the following four themes:

1. Innovations are changes in production functions which cannot be decomposed into infinitesimal steps. In other words, innovation involves putting productive resources to uses which have hitherto been untried in practice. At the same time, resources are withdrawn from the uses that they have served so far.¹⁸
2. Innovation should be distinguished from invention or experimentation. It is not invention that matters, but the adoption and actual working of something. In themselves, inventions do not exert any influence on business life at all. In other words: "Innovation, unless it consists in producing, and forcing upon the public a new commodity, means producing at a smaller cost per unit, breaking off the old supply schedule and starting a new one. It is quite immaterial whether this is done by making use of a new invention or not."¹⁹
3. Innovations appear in clusters at certain times because "as soon as the various kinds of social resistance to something that is fundamentally new and untried have been overcome, it is much easier not only to do the same thing again but also to do similar things in different directions, so that a first success will always produce a cluster (e.g., the emergence of the motorcar industry)."²⁰
4. In competitive capitalism innovations are the mechanism which creates disturbance, mainly through the foundation of new firms. In the short term, innovations require large investments and "supernormal energy and courage." In the long term they will—in successful cases—produce progress and profit.²¹

In the empirical material comprising the interviews with journalists and innovation system specialists in Japan, Finland, and the United States, the interviewees produce various explanations when asked to define the concept of "innovation." However, it is apparent that the Schumpeterian definition is to a large extent internalized and

adopted as a doctrinal starting point, since most emphasized that innovation is more than just a new thing. For the interviewees, innovation means a new invention or product which can be, or has already been commercialized and which brings in money to a company or individual who is in possession of the innovation. However, although the fourth characteristic of innovations as creating disturbance is often stated, and might even be referred to directly as “creative destruction,” the point that innovations require risk-taking and a lot of time in order for a profit to be gained is often discarded.

Furthermore, the usage of the word *innovation* (or of the term translated in this way) varies greatly in different languages. For instance, in Japanese there is strong emphasis on new technology and gadgets. Interviewees also use notions such as “service innovation” and “social innovation,” which further blurs the picture. Service innovations and social innovations can be made by public actors as well as private companies, and no cash flow is necessary. The uncertainty in the term has been resolved by some interviewees by referring to the concept of “surplus value.” Thus, innovations would be “new commercialized inventions that bring surplus value to the users and the producer.” In practice, during the interviews the word is used in ways that have a very vague connection with the definitions given by the interviewees at the start of each interview. This demonstrates the doctrinal aspect of the concept: the word *innovation* is used in such a wide range of contexts that its implications are supposed to be known to all.

Thus, it is necessary to make a conceptual distinction between talk about specific cases of innovation and individual innovations (*the technical dimension*), talk about the innovation system and the innovation environment (*the social dimension*), and the wider discursive web of conjunctures where national competitiveness in fear-provoking global circumstances appears to require innovation as a means for national survival (*a blend of the ritual, mythical, and doctrinal dimensions*). In the interviews these distinctions are often blurred and talked of simultaneously.

The Value System of Innovationism

Myths can be defined as authoritative stories belonging to certain groups or traditions. Myths are recited in the community, and these kinds of stories are foundational for the group in question. The shared values of the community are

narrated in circulated and repeated mythic tales. This practice is linked to the *mythic, or narrative dimension* of a worldview.²²

The narrative dimension appears in the definitions of innovations used by the interviewees. By analyzing this dimension it is possible to begin to draft the set of ultimate values on which innovationism relies, and to describe how the values appear in the interviews.²³ Here, values are perceived as aims, as aspirations toward which the actors strive. In the narratives which circulate in the interviews the core values cut across individual, corporate, national, and global levels; moreover, to a certain extent all of the values are present on all the levels, and thus they create a whole circulatory system of innovationism. However, it appears that certain values pertain to particular levels more than others.

Based on the interviews, the following values would appear to lie at the core: success, growth, competitiveness, and progress. These values appear in stories that recur within the interviews.

The values appear on four levels within the narratives: firstly, at the individual level, innovation becomes a means for success for the interviewees, in the United States in particular. The myth of the American dream of the individual entrepreneur is frequently repeated in the U.S. interviews. The success of individual entrepreneurs can also involve new start-up companies, which can generate growth. At the individual level, the narrative dimension seems to have a particular connection with *the ethical dimension*. The innovation system specialists emphasized how the behavior of individuals should become suitable for creating innovations: more mobility, flexibility, creativity, language proficiency, and openness, plus a risk-taking mentality, are qualities required of the citizens of an innovative nation.

At the corporate level, innovation first and foremost provides a means for productivity and the possibility for growth. Innovations can also mark the beginnings of new corporations, which is one of the aspirations of competing nations: to get more start-up companies. It is at the corporate level that the *material dimension* of innovationism appears most visibly: enterprises create new technology, new services, and new markets through innovations.

The competitiveness of the nation-state is the third value appearing in the interviews.

The global setting in which nation-states compete with each other is a myth that is hardly ever questioned. Through innovativeness, the basic starting point of

economic competition is widened to include competition in general. National competitiveness is then more than economic; it is about being useful for the global community, becoming visible and important—being meaningful—for others in the global setting.

At the national level, innovationism is also a part of the political discourse on national competitiveness, a discourse that was introduced during the 1980s throughout the industrialized world. In the narrative of innovationism, the globalizing economy poses a threat to nation-states.²⁴ Thus, national actors became worried about their survival and success. At the same time, Schumpeterian technology-driven ideas on innovation became influential in economics. It is important to note that although the discourse on competitiveness is a global one, the consequences and actions are taken at a national level. Thus, competitiveness becomes an aim primarily at the national level, although it is a value also at the corporate level.

Fourthly and finally, at the global level, the narrative of innovationism appears in the emphasis on progress. This could be considered the *philosophical level* of innovationism. The reliance on constant progress remains even when, occasionally, growth is questioned. Innovations then become a means for the further enhancement of humankind, providing hope during times of global environmental threat. The values of progress and competitiveness are constantly intertwined when the national and the global circulate in the interviews:

[...] in Asia relations between Japan, China, and Korea are complicated and difficult. We have been competing for hundreds of years. During the last twenty years Japan has been the underdog and has suffered severe mental [spiritual] damage. Should we progress [purely] with style or charm? With the arts? [referring to the Cool Japan phenomenon and the global growth of sales in Japanese popular culture] Our citizens are wondering about this as well. That is why we compete in science and want to compete for who is best in developing solutions for the [environmental] threats facing humanity. Our current prime minister has set a target to cut down carbon dioxide emissions by 25 per cent. This is a truly idealistic goal, and a significant one. It is something China and Korea cannot do. We no longer compete in food, fashion, or cars, but we want to be a presence and to be important in the world in other ways. We are looking for these ways now.²⁵

This excerpt from the interview with a Japanese journalist also exemplifies the fear of failure in reaching what is aimed at. A nation that fails in competition will be damaged and will need to seek out new areas in which to become competitive. The

possibility of innovation brings determination and hope: “We will be meaningful in the world of tomorrow.”

Affective Resonance: Threat and Hope

“The emphasis in religion is today on this world, not the world to come,” writes Liselotte Frisk in her discussion of Linda Woodhead’s concept, the “turn to life.” The turn to life refers to the focus on gaining desirable results in this world, in other words in the immanent frame. According to Woodhead, themes of punishment, hell, damnation, and demonology have been losing their importance as societies have become more “this-worldly.”²⁶ Innovationism can be seen as following this trend in its focus on human capabilities and abilities. However, innovationism can also be seen as narrating something of a substitute for “hell,” in foreseeing the failure of humankind to solve global threats, of which global warming is the most threatening.

At every level, the management of threat and hope in innovationism can be analyzed through the emotional dimension: innovationism creates a sense of threat by narrating the ultimate frustrations and also attempts to manage these threats through positing innovations as solutions to the threats it narrates—thus giving hope for the future.

The ultimate frustrations appear in the interviews in expressions of a sense of threat and fear. The sense of threat is concentrated within issues of global warming and environmental change, phenomena that intensify an awareness of the limitedness of natural resources. To some extent, the talk about the environment and demographics is invited by the framework of the interviews, in which innovations are discussed in the context of global warming and aging. Nevertheless, the interviewees frequently list threats and challenges which correspond to multiple features of the risk society.²⁷ The world is dangerous at every level: the global level, the national level, the level of (the media) industry, and at the individual level. Exacerbated by the global economic recession and the development of an aging society (in Japan in particular) the ultimate frustrations are concentrated into the issue of sustaining the nation. However, at the core of global threats is the competition.

In *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Michel Foucault points out that within neoliberalism, it is not the market mechanism that is new. What *is* new is the idea of constant competition and the aim of continuous growth.²⁸ At this point, taking up Foucault’s identification of competition as the novel feature, I wish to set out one of

my central claims: *that through innovationism, competition is transformed into the central generator of the sense of threat*. The operational environment of nation-states and corporations is one of constant competition for resources, for “top” workers, and for foreign investment. And similarly, individuals compete against each other: for jobs, for visibility, for fame.

The outcome of possible failure was hardly ever explicated in the interviews, but it can be read between the lines. In fact, the ultimate frustrations derivable from the interviews involve *death, waning, chaos, and extinction*.

The following table (Table 1) illustrates how innovationism manages hope and threat at different levels in relation to the ultimate values. The table also lists the most relevant corresponding dimensions for each level. It should, however, be noted that all the dimensions and values cut across all the levels. In fact, two other levels, the *narrative* and the *emotional* level permeate all the levels and values to such a degree that it would be unreasonable to mark them in the table.

Table 1
How Innovationism Manages Hope and Threat at Different Levels

Level	Value (Aim)	Hope	Outcome of Failure	Threat	Dimension
Individual	Success	Memory	Unemployment	Death	Ethical
Corporate	Growth	Expansion	Takeover	Merger or bankruptcy	Material
National	Competitiveness	Sustaining the nation	Competitive ineptness	Waning, oblivion	Social/ritual
Global	Progress	Continuity	Climate change	Chaos, extinction	Philosophical

In the manner of a religion, innovationism offers a way to counter ultimate frustrations. The sense of threat is used to create an affective resonance²⁹ for particular institutional demands, and as a justification for political practices and funding decisions. The interviewees repeated the Porterian³⁰ thesis, that in order to survive and prosper amid global competition, the nation has to have a high level of competitiveness.³¹

In the definitions of innovation proposed by Schumpeter (see above), innovation is a means to create growth and productivity and thus competitiveness. However, in innovationism, innovations are loaded with much more significance. Innovations and innovativeness become the aim itself, and the creation of a good environment for innovation becomes the goal of nations. Because of the threat of losing out in competition, the focus is shifted onto innovations as an apparent means of controlling uncontrollable circumstances. In this way innovations emerge not only as an instrument of hope, but also as a chance to shift the focus away from the looming threat of competition and onto innovations per se.

The Power and Social Dimension of Innovationism

I shall now move to the *organizational and social dimensions* of innovationism, focusing on the actors and roles present in the production and circulation of innovationism.

The most important actors in the circulation of innovationism are the national elites. Among the interviewees there are innovation systems specialists and journalists, both of whom can be regarded as the elites of innovationism. Some members of the elite play advocational roles such as “preachers,” gurus, theologians, and prophets. Others take more neutral or even skeptical roles. For “ordinary people” the interviewees provide two possible role positions: they are either the audience, which should be educated or informed, or those who have the potential for creating innovations that the system is not yet able to tap into. I shall return to these actors and roles after considering the *national* frame of innovationism.

Benedict Anderson uses the concept of imagined communities in discussing the development of nationalism. For him, the imagined community is the nation. Many others take a similar view, arguing that the nation holds the position in society that religion used to occupy before the development of modernization.³²

Anderson sees the nation as the idea upon which communities can create a secular transformation, from fatality into continuity, and contingency into meaning. “With the ebbing of religious belief, the suffering which belief in part composed did not disappear- Disintegration of paradise: nothing makes fatality more arbitrary. Absurdity of salvation: nothing makes another style of continuity more necessary.”³³

For Charles Taylor, imagined communities are a particular kind of social imaginary, socially shared in ways in which social spaces are imagined.³⁴ An essential part in the conjuncture of global competition is the reproduction of a social imaginary in which the imagined communities perceived as nations take part. Innovationism can be seen as a complementary element in sustaining the imaginary community of the nation within this conjuncture. The imaginary structure of the world in innovationism is based on two contradictory logics: on the one hand, there is the conforming, global logic of innovations and the emphasis on the global setting, including the idea of the global, imagined center of Silicon Valley. On the other hand, there is the strong emphasis on the nation-state, which in fact has the role of a mediator in the circulation of ideas. (Trans)national elites circulate innovationism to the national level, while doing this they apply the national framework and make use of the imagined community within the nation. The nation and the national political system is the frame within which resources are distributed, and elites with symbolic power themselves possess an interest in this distribution. The affective nature of these processes is significant. The power struggle is conjunctured with questions of national survival and a sense of threat and hope.

The imagined center of Silicon Valley appears in the interviews as the “center” but also as the “peak” of innovativeness. Smart describes the various ways in which height has symbolic value in most cultures and notes how height, size, and centrality are often connected.³⁵ Interviewees, not only in Japan and Finland, but also on the East Coast of the United States refer to the Silicon Valley, not just as a source of innovative new solutions, but also as an ideal innovation environment: a place with a highly competitive atmosphere, plus a creative buzz—both desired characteristics. In Silicon Valley one sees a reversal of the norm: interviewees emphasize that there is no need to travel to see the world, since “everybody comes here.” This mentality can be understood through social practices belonging to the *ritual dimension*. One of these is *pilgrimage*. Groups and individuals traveling to the Silicon Valley and to Stanford University to learn innovativeness can be seen as pilgrims traveling to the center of innovationism. In pilgrimage, travellers go to “high sacral bumps in space, learn and gain from its merit, and convey it back to the periphery.”³⁶ Within the periphery there is a desire to become like the center, or at least to overcome the spatial and mental distance between the center and the periphery.

The strength of the imagined center is underlined in the interviews with the Japanese and Finnish elite experts, who are almost in despair over a national lack of innovativeness, mobility, or openness, and express the desire to reach the level of innovation in Silicon Valley. The sense of inadequacy cannot be assuaged by international comparisons that emphasize the innovativeness of Japan or Finland.³⁷ Nevertheless, journalists, who act as mediators between the elites and ordinary citizens, are not as certain of the circumstances: *In Finland politicians appear to have taken on this [idea of developing innovations]. [They are] creating—I'm not sure if it is an illusion—but at least I have a perception of Finland being innovative.*³⁸

The framework of national competitiveness leads the Japanese and Finnish interviewees into circulating the idea that there needs to be a national solution—an innovation system or innovation environment—that will help in reaching the level of Silicon Valley. The irony is that in Silicon Valley itself the interviewees emphasize the anarchic and unstructured nature of the innovation environment as being the source of its innovativeness.³⁹ Nevertheless, in Finland and Japan the interviewees perceive the orientation first and foremost as a national one: innovations are a means to maintain (national) competitiveness and to help in solving problems on a (national and) global scale. In the United States in general, but particularly in Silicon Valley, interviewees focus more on innovations as means for the success of the individual.

Within the interviews the nation-states become actors in a literal sense. The global community is a stage on which the nation-state wishes to play a major role. Nation-states compete to achieve these roles and hope to become visible on the stage. Nation-states also worry about being overtaken by new actors with superior competitiveness and more innovative ability:

Well, I think that in general world powers are shifting. And the rise of the BRIC⁴⁰ countries and other places outside of the United States as powerful centres of business with much potential for growth has shifted some of our entrepreneurial energy to places like India, China and Brazil, I mean, certainly I would say, I myself have done a bunch of reporting in India around telecom and have been amazed, blown away by the entrepreneurial spirit and the good ideas that are coming out of India and migrating to the US when in fact always in decades before you would see innovation go the other way. Ideas would rise up in the US and they would migrate to India. Now I think you are seeing it happen [the other way around].⁴¹

The national narrative in the United States, as illustrated in this citation, is centered around the supposed essentially innovative nature of the United States. The United

States is perceived as having “always” been the source of innovations, as compared to China, India, or Brazil, but now the roles are reversing for the first time. The nation-state as the leading actor is now under threat of being replaced by younger and more flexible players. Important here is the portrayal of a sense of threat within the imagined order of nations. (The obvious historical distortedness of the perceptions is of less importance.)

I shall now return to the individual actors and role positions in the circulation of innovationism. As noted above, it is possible to make a division between elites and ordinary people. The difference between these groups is in their access to transnational sources of information and opportunities to take part in the circulation of information—in other words, the differences lie at the level of symbolic power that they possess.⁴²

The actors exercise “pastoral power” through the “effects of words.” Foucault emphasizes that power of the pastoral type has spread from religious institutions and has entered the entire social body. The aim of pastoral power, as Foucault sees it, is to take part in “the development of knowledge of man,” both in a globalizing frame and in relation to the individual.⁴³

In his discussion of pastoral power, Foucault refers to “the power exercised by private ventures, welfare societies, benefactors, and [...] philanthropists.”⁴⁴ In a similar manner, innovationism has figures who exercise pastoral power while taking a variety of roles within innovationism. As manifested in the interviews, some of the pastoral figures are academics, consultants, some work for think tanks, and others for multinational corporations. Usually they are not politicians, though they may have had a political career previously. At the present time they tend to be in a managerial position in relation to politics.⁴⁵ Their role can be one of a preacher or sometimes a theologian, who “formulates the doctrines or teachings of a tradition or sub-tradition.”⁴⁶ The role of the theologian often appears to be played by the consultants.

Some of the pastoral figures act as prophets who describe what a future with better innovations will be like. Alternatively, they may issue predictions of a terrible future if national systems are not developed into a functioning innovation system/if new technology is not commercialized effectively/if the social media are not made use of innovatively, and so on. As often as not they are speakers at seminars or workshops and called “Social Media Gurus.” There are even people with the title of

“evangelist” working in technology parks, aiming to achieve “innovation development” or “innovation transfer.”

These pastoral figures constitute the authorities of innovationism; they are the ones who describe the kinds of measures to be taken in order to enhance national innovativeness and to develop the national innovation system. In the case of Finland, these figures include Pekka Himanen, who during the 1990s⁴⁷ was the youngest scholar ever to defend a dissertation in philosophy, and Jorma Ollila, the former CEO of Nokia. The younger generation of these preachers may well be self-made entrepreneurs who have made fortunes through ICT-related innovations. Pastoral power is also exercised by the directors and employees of national funding apparatuses, such as Tekes in Finland or JST in Japan. Consultants and researchers working in think tanks and universities can also fall into this category.

The people mentioned above appear frequently in the media, where they describe and define how the innovation system should be organized in order to maximize the production of innovations. Indeed, some of the people in this category were interviewees for this study. An equally important function of these figures is to “preach” at seminars, symposiums, and workshops; these are the arenas in which they spread enthusiasm, propagate innovationism as a faith, and emphasize the relevance of related values to officials, decision makers, journalists, academics, and entrepreneurs. They are, as it were, performing in such a way as to generate affective resonance, so that institutional structures and funding decisions may be legitimized.

The actors taking part in the circulation of innovationism are predominantly male, and so too (almost exclusively) are the pastoral figures appearing in the media. The overall picture is one of men predominating in discussions concerning innovations, innovation policies, and the measures that need to be taken. Overtly, the world of innovations is gender neutral, and it is true that women are not explicitly excluded, however, they are not actively included either. In practice, this means that the women who are actually visible in this field are exceptions.⁴⁸ The point here is that in both Finland and in Japan, innovation discourse exists as part of a continuum of science and technology policy discourses, and that women have been sidelined for decades in national discourses related to technological development.⁴⁹ Similar restrictions apply in discourses related to a number of areas of technology—ICT in particular.⁵⁰

The belief that innovations can raise a nation's competitiveness is obviously strongest among specialists in innovation systems. These interviewees emerge not only as "believers" but also as "theologians," or as the kinds of "preachers" mentioned above. For these people, innovations are self-evidently phenomena to be supported. The repeated argument is that we need methods to develop more innovativeness: the innovation system or innovation environment should be made more fertile so that innovations can increase.⁵¹ The comparisons with the Silicon Valley ideal are frequent and admiring. The people in question see many kinds of problems in the innovation system, in the national mentality, in the general mood of the times, and in the attitude of the "ordinary people." Criticism is also directed at the quality of scientists and journalists.⁵²

The symbolic, pastoral power that is represented and reproduced by elites through the circulation of innovationism is connected to economic and political power. Symbolic power in general differs from other forms of power in the sense that it affects "not just what we do, but our ability to *describe* the social itself; it affects the perception of the inequalities in the social world, including the unequal distribution of those very symbolic resources themselves."⁵³

The elite interviewees saw society first and foremost as an environment for innovation—one whose purpose is to provide good circumstances for more innovative activities and competitiveness. The question is predominantly one of flows of public funding. Innovationism has meant that the flood of public money to the private sector has been plentiful and rapid. Among other things, it has meant that health care institutions, schools, and universities are seen as deserving of investment, insofar as they are basic elements of the innovation environment.

One of the contradictions of innovationism lies in the relationship between the transnational and the nation. The processes to which innovationism is attached—namely, the free flow of capital, economic growth, and competition—are transnational, and could in fact lead to the dissolution and erosion of the nation-state. However, the particular actors and elites with symbolic power in the circulation of innovationism are always national, although they have access to the transnational mechanisms by which innovationism is circulated. Consequently, national elites, while preaching innovationism within the nation, in fact use their symbolic power in a contradictory manner, to advance the globalizing processes that are tightly bound up with their faith in innovation. The nation-state is a necessary vehicle for globalization.

And at the same time, global trends constitute the vehicle through which the elites attempt to sustain their power. This happens through twin endeavors—the summoning up of threatening images of globalization and the preaching of innovationism.

The Consecrating Role of the Journalist and Journalism

Pierre Bourdieu describes the way in which the art-businessman has the power to *consecrate* works of art and to create value for works and artists.⁵⁴ In a similar way, journalists have symbolic power in the process of consecrating individual innovations, and in the recycling and reproduction of innovationism. This consecrating role is recognized both by specialists and by journalists themselves, but the perspectives of the parties are different. The pastoral specialists would like to have journalists employ their consecrating power and take part in the national project of supporting innovations. The specialists see the role of journalism and the media as focal in creating a more innovation-friendly mental environment within society. “It is the media through which we construct the world of technology and innovations,” was how one of the Finnish specialists put it.⁵⁵ But (as indicated above) it is clear that journalists, too, recognize the potential influence of journalism⁵⁶:

The Japanese in general have a relative mentality; they watch people or society and then adopt their standpoints, judging what to do. This is a national feature, because Japan is so closed. In that sense, the media in Japan play a more important role than in other countries. I think that it is not bad to be balanced in writing, but sometimes I think that the established media prioritise consensus.⁵⁷

Within the interviews, “ordinary journalists” might repeat slogans on innovation that are similar to those used by specialists. However, it is less likely that journalists will be able to explain the entire structure of the innovation system. It was notable that those interviewees who had a deeper knowledge of the innovation environment seemed also to be more committed to innovationism. Generally, specialists would like journalists to take on a “consecrating” role. The journalists in the interviews were, in some cases, explicit in resisting such wishes. Thus, there were interviewees who subscribed to the idea of global competition and who believed in innovations, but who were nevertheless opposed to the position offered to them by “the state”—a position equivalent to the national, official stance toward innovations:

<Extract>These days you very seldom encounter this thing that journalists are supposed to commit themselves to promoting good things. And here, suddenly, they’ve dug this idea out of its grave, I feel, that we all have a

shared agenda here. This idea that we've been sent to Stanford and it's assumed that we understand that this is important, important for the future of the nation. [...] The way those in the top echelon of society talk about innovation as a subject [...] they have this idea of the survival of the nation. And then, it seems so easy to extend [the idea to journalism] and to say that journalism should commit itself to this objective, too. But [we] should just be able to separate [ourselves] from this. [The task of journalism then] is to put these matters on the agenda [...] to that extent we have a common project. After that, journalism and journalists should continue in an independent and self-contained manner.⁵⁸

Even though interviewees might be critical of the demands placed on them to further the innovation system and promote innovations, they nevertheless do believe that innovations are good and necessary: innovations can help to solve social problems and contribute to economic growth; they can also help the nation to gain and or/maintain its status among other nations.⁵⁹

Looking for Security in a Dangerous World

In this section, I shall describe how questions of collective meaning (in the sense of meaning in life) were bound up with innovationism in the interviews. For this purpose, I shall make a brief detour via John Dewey (1929/1999), who noted that human beings living in a dangerous world have to look for safety and certainty. According to Dewey, humans have historically done this in two ways: either by trying to conciliate the surrounding environmental forces through prayer, rites, and magic, or by developing skills to use natural forces for human advantage. The second of these methods changes the world through action, while the first changes human thoughts and feelings.⁶⁰

In the search for meaning and certainty, innovations combine action and feeling in at least three ways. First of all, innovations appear to be the only means for survival in the “risk society” and in a world full of threats. Producing more innovations provides a way of changing the world through action. Thus, I would suggest that within innovationism these two aspects—action and feeling (or affect)—are merged: innovationism aims at changing human thoughts and feelings concerning the world, since it suggests that the world is there first and foremost for utilization.

Secondly, innovations provide a way of changing human feelings and thoughts related to certain looming threats. Innovations give hope for a better future at the

national level (we can become visible on the global stage) and at the individual level (what I do can have meaning, and I can become rich).

Thirdly, innovationism has an exhilarating aspect, containing within it enthusiasm for creating a better future. Innovations appear to achieve something more than reliance on economic growth; they contain the possibility for a nation to become visible on the global stage even when it is about to shift involuntarily into an era of degrowth because of an aging population. By being innovative as a nation, the country (Japan) can become a notable model for other nations in demonstrating controllable degrowth.

“There is a limit to which economic growth can answer the question of the meaning of life. We are like the sorcerer’s apprentice: What we have unleashed is out of control. Nowhere is this more true than in Japan.”⁶¹ An interviewee puts this in other words:

[...] Our success at present is based on economic success. However, the natural resources, such as oil, which made that success possible, will run out sooner or later, and we can’t think of the economy alone. The five billion people in the world suddenly have to face difficulties. I think we have to make efforts to solve the problems. Since there is no way we can get out of this reality, we should try to think how to mitigate the damage or how to alleviate it. We need to find a balance and find a way to downgrade our standards of living. From that perspective, the decrease in the population of Japan might not be so bad after all. [...] But we need to maintain some basic level of economy. We need bread first, and we can’t let the economy come crashing down. The downgrading should be controlled, and we need overall planning for that. In Japan the population is decreasing. When this development becomes visible, and if we can manage the downgrading here, we can give examples to other countries as well.⁶²

By these means, through innovations, nations can prove that they are original and authentic. This includes being useful for the global community and for humanity, amid the worrisome, threatening issues of global warming and aging. Some of the interviewees believed that if innovative thinking became sufficiently advanced, it could find ways toward a better future in which economic growth would no longer be the necessary framework.

<Extract> Competition is part of the today’s world, and I think there are two parts that we should think of, today and the future. These two often contradict each other. At present, if we put a higher priority on the former, say, selling goods more and ruining natural resources, we will end up ruining the future, too. I think we should make rules like in boxing matches; in the course of the match, people compete with one another, but keep to certain rules of sportsmanship. Of course, politicians can make rules, but they have to think

mainly about today, in order to survive an election, so ideally, the intelligent citizens or NGOs should form groups for discussion. These kinds of ideal groups can't be brought about by the UN, unfortunately. It can't be the OECD or a world economy forum or anything like that. It should be something unrelated to the economy, because the point of view of the economy belongs to today, not to the future.⁶³

This perception is nevertheless very different from the ideology of what has been termed the degrowth movement. The degrowth movement calls for the dissolving of the global financial system and a return to local economies, in which consumption and needs would be in balance with natural resources. It criticizes the concept of sustainable development on the grounds that it continues the exploitation of the natural environment by virtue of the ideology of growth. In fact, such critical notions in respect of growth and global competition did not appear in the interviews.

Innovationism is attractive because it provides a hope for a better collective future, and hope for security during times that appear to be full of insecurities. By circulating a belief in innovations, late modern societies have created a transnational, yet nationally applicable belief system which appears to be rational and intelligible. Here we have a way of managing prevailing fears and insecurities—and holding to a utopian view of a better future. In line with this, and taking an optimistic view, Hautamäki (2010) offers the possibility of “sustainable innovation,” or “creating products and services promoting sustainable economic growth without undermining quality of life and equilibrium with nature”⁶⁴—hence a mechanism for creating a sense of certainty. Thus, innovationism rises above the mundanities of politics and the economy: it becomes a promise that we will find tools not only for economic survival, but also for physical survival in an age of environmental dangers.

To Conclude: A Quest for Certainty in the Immanent Frame

If the idea of a God is ruled out, the answer to the issue of the meaning of life can be sought from two directions: either by denying the question itself or by saying that one of our present purposes already has the fullness or richness that we seek.⁶⁵ The discourse on innovations can then be seen in conjunction with the latter. It provides a means of avoiding the underlying, deeper question about a collective and individual meaning for life by appearing to provide one. The belief in innovations is based on rationality and has no (apparent) connection with divinity, however, it is strongly oriented toward the future. There is no doubt that innovationism is a this-

worldly belief system: its focus is on continuous growth through innovations. Yet, innovationism also has its utopian side, since it forms a collective way of imagining a better future.

Socially, innovationism creates a sense of “us,” connected to an imagined (global) community, and it offers a chance to contribute to this community, in creating solutions for problems that threaten the very existence of that community (including, preeminently, global warming). In this worldview, innovations themselves build a bridge to a better future and to saving the world.

Charles Taylor describes different ways of perceiving secularity. He describes how secularity refers to a condition in which “public spaces have been emptied of God” and belief in God is declining. Taylor wishes to move further, and to discuss the conditions of belief in a society where God is one alternative among others rather than unchallenged and unproblematic as was the case in previous centuries.⁶⁶

Berger calls this pluralism. In his article *Protestantism and the Quest for Certainty*, he admits to having made one big mistake in his career: thinking that modernity would lead necessarily to the decline of religion. This, of course, has been documented as contrary to fact by many others as well.⁶⁷ The insight that Berger says he has had during his career is that modernity leads to pluralism. And in pluralism, certainty is hard to find:

People may still hold the same beliefs and values that were held by their predecessors in more uniform situations, but they will hold them in a different manner: what before was given through the accident of birth now becomes a matter of *choice*. Pluralism brings on an era of many choices, and by the same token, an era of *uncertainty*.⁶⁸

This citation can be reflected on from two sides in relation to the empirical findings of this study. On the one hand, modernity, undoubtedly, did bring plurality in a certain sense. However, considering the strength of the ideology of national competitiveness and the belief in the beneficial nature of innovations manifested in the interviews, I might provocatively ask whether or not there is any pluralism in these beliefs. Has believing in innovations perhaps taken on the position of a “consensus on the nature of reality and on the norms by which one should lead one’s life”⁶⁹—at least in large parts of the three societies where the persons interviewed in this study live? (And if this is the case, are they living in conditions that can no longer be called modernity?) On the other hand, we can interpret a belief in innovations as an attempt to control the *uncertainty* brought on by the conditions of pluralism.

Relying on innovations would thus be a “quest for certainty” and a quest for knowledge, an effort to transcend belief. As Dewey points out, belief is often assumed to be a mode of thinking about a realm of uncertainty.⁷⁰ The future, including innovations, belongs to the realm of uncertainty, as one of the interviewees agonises: “Innovation is fundamentally unpredictable [...] it’s hard to put a narrative on a process which is fundamentally unpredictable. [...] it was just not easy to predict beforehand.”⁷¹ Thus, relying on uncertain innovations as the way to a seemingly certain future becomes a contemporary, mundane version of religion. There is a strong parallel here with Noble’s argument about the religion of technology, by which human engagement with technology provides a means to regain the (supposedly) lost sense of divinity, meaning, and control over the world.⁷²

Innovationism is a secular belief in the sense that it does not belong to the realm of institutional and historic religions. It can be regarded as belonging more to the secular subsystem of the economy, politics, or science.⁷³ Thus, it is not practised in the “religious” sphere and is not perceived as religious. Because of this, innovationism provides an important case in our understanding of changes in society. Post-secularity might thus mean not only more instances of institutional religion in the public space, but also understanding and identifying features of belief systems and worldviews across what used to be understood as separate subsystems of society.

Innovationism is public. Its narratives appear to invoke the rational *homo economicus*. I would argue that this is the particular allure of belief in innovation. It appears to belong to the rational, scientific, public sphere: it is collectively acceptable to be ecstatic about new gadgets, future prospects, and economic growth. Like any ideology, innovationism is invisible and naturalized: the shared faith in it is transparent and seems self-evident. There is nothing mystical about innovationism, and thus it is more than acceptable to be enthusiastic about innovations, to go on pilgrimages to Stanford, to take part in revival meetings where canonized preachers profess their faith.

In a pluralist society, where life is complicated and values are created by individuals themselves, believing in innovations provides an accepted, self-evident, future-oriented—and collective—way of imagining a better future.

Notes

1. Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2007), 5.

2. See Peter Beyer, *Religion and Globalization* (London: Sage, 1994), 75.
3. “[...] religion is a type of communication based on the immanent/transcendent polarity, which functions to lend meaning to the root indeterminability of all meaningful human communication, and which offers ways of overcoming or at least managing this indeterminability and its consequences.” Beyer, *Religion and Globalization*, 6.
4. Habermas appears to be referring to solidarity as the thing missing, but that is not completely explicit in his text. Jürgen Habermas, “An Awareness of What is Missing,” in *An Awareness of What is Missing. Faith and Reason in a Post-Secular Age*, ed. Jürgen Habermas and others (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), 15–23.
5. Taylor, *Secular Age*, 676.
6. Ninian Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred. An Anatomy of the World’s Beliefs* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 8–14.
7. The interviews were first thematically coded to a computerized qualitative analysis program (Atlas.ti). Thereafter, a close discourse analysis was conducted on particular thematic sections relevant for this chapter.
8. The research material was collected within a research project that studied the conditions and consequences of “innovation journalism.” The material (eighty interviews in total) included sixty-nine interviews with journalists and eleven with innovation systems specialists. I interviewed journalists in three different countries, Finland ($n=34$), the United States ($n=21$), and Japan ($n=14$). The interviewees also represent three different thematic groups: business/technology reporters (those who typically write about innovation topics, $n=34$), journalists who focus on environmental issues including climate change ($n=18$), and journalists who have written on issues related to aging ($n=16$). The Finnish focus group consisted of journalists writing for daily newspapers and magazines (print/online). The U.S. journalists are employed by newspapers, magazines, and online publications. The Japanese journalists represent journalists writing for the most substantial and oldest-established newspapers. The gender split for the journalists was thirty-nine males and thirty females. The interviewees are identified in this study by national codes FI1...FI34, US1...US21, and JP1...JP14. The interviewees within a given national group are categorized alphabetically. The interviews were conducted by four different interviewers in several locations in Finland, Japan, and the United States. Some of the Finnish interviews were conducted on the phone or by e-mail, whereas all the interviews in Japan and the United States were conducted face-to-face.
 In addition to the interviews with journalists, eleven innovation system specialists were interviewed, six in Finland, one in the United States, and four in Japan. All of them were male, except for one female interviewee in Japan. These interviews are coded with the “A” prefix, hence AFI1...AFI6, AUS1, and AJP1...AJP4.
9. Transnational phenomena occur across nations and cultures, but are nevertheless connected with the concept and framework of the nation. That is why I have chosen to perceive innovationism as transnational rather than a global phenomenon. In this paper, “global” and “globalized” are seen as belonging to the discourse of innovationism rather than as analytical concepts.
10. Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 8–14.
11. Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology I* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), see also Robert Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion. The Cultural Roots of Modern Japan* (New York: The Free Press, 1957; repr. New York: The Free Press, 1985).
12. Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion*, 6–7.
13. Paul Tillich, “The Right to Hope,” in *Theology of Peace*, ed. Ronald H. Stone (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1990), 182–193.
14. Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 9.
15. On the concept of imagined communities, see Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991; rev. and ext. repr., London: Verso, 2003), 9–36; 37–46.
16. Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 27–69.
18. Joseph A. Schumpeter, “The Analysis of Economic Change,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 17, no. 4 (1935): 4; “The Instability of Capitalism,” *The Economic Journal* 38, no. 151 (1928): 378.
19. Joseph A. Schumpeter, “The Explanation of Business Cycle,” *Economica* 21 (December 1927): 297; “Analysis of Economic Change,” 6; “Instability of Capitalism,” 378.
20. Schumpeter, “Analysis of Economic Change,” 6.
21. Schumpeter, “Instability of Capitalism,” 384.
22. Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 136.

23. It is important to remember that Schumpeter himself emphasized that he was talking *only* of the economic system and that he explicitly attempted to mark out “external” influences. Thus, he did not talk of society as a whole, or of developing societal models. Despite this, his work is constantly used in ways that are bound up with the development of society in different national settings. Indeed, his work implicitly supports this. For example, in his “Instability of Capitalism,” Schumpeter juxtaposes competitive and “trustified” capitalism.
24. Anu Kantola and Hannele Seeck, “Dissemination of Management into Politics: Michael Porter and the Political Uses of Management Consulting,” *Management Learning* 41, no. 4 (2010): 1–23.
25. JP9.
26. Liselotte Frisk, “Globalization: A Key Factor in Contemporary Religious Change,” *Journal of Alternative Spiritualities and New Age Studies* 5 (2009–2011): i–xiv; Linda Woodhead, “The Turn to Life in Contemporary Religion and Spirituality,” in *Spirituality and Society in the New Millennium*, ed. Ursula King and Tina Beattie (Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2001), 110–23.
27. Cf. Anthony Giddens, *Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990); Ulrich Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (New Delhi: Sage, 1992); see also Pat Caplan, “Introduction: Risk Revisited,” in *Risk Revisited*, ed. Pat Caplan (London: Pluto Press, 2000), 1–29.
28. Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979*, ed. Michel Senellart (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), x–xx.
29. William Mazzarella, “Affect: What is it Good for?” in *Enchantments of Modernity. Empire, Nation, Globalization*, ed. Saurab Dube (London: Routledge, 2008), 292–309.
30. Kantola and Seeck, “Dissemination of manatement into politics, 1–23.
31. Harvard professor Michael Porter is the leading consultant on national competitiveness. He has analyzed the competitive advantage of more than fifty nations. See Kantola and Seeck, “Dissemination of Management into Politics,” 1–23.
32. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1991; rev. and ext. repr., London: Verso, 2003), 1–8; Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 1–25.
33. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 11–12.
34. Taylor, *Secular Age*, 713.
35. Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 138–40.
36. *Ibid.*, 86–87.
37. Cf. e.g., Richard Florida and Tim Gulden, “The World Is Spiky,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, October 2005.
38. FI17.
39. E.g., AUS1, US3.
40. Brazil, Russia, India, and China.
41. US8.
42. For the concept of symbolic power, see Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: CUP, 1991), 105–137; Stuart Hall, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London: Sage 2003), 12–74.
43. Michel Foucault, “The Subject and Power,” *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4 (1982): 783–85, 792.
44. *Ibid.*
45. cf. Kantola and Seeck, “Dissemination of Management into Politics,” 1–23.
46. Smart, *Dimensions of the Sacred*, 215–25.
47. <http://www.pekkahimanen.org/> Accessed Dec. 19, 2011
48. It was difficult to find female interviewees for the project. Among the specialists, only one of the interviewees was female. The journalists specializing in science and innovations were predominantly male, while the journalists focusing on aging were almost exclusively female in all three countries.
49. Marja Vehviläinen, “Teknologinen nationalismi,” [Technological nationalism]in *Suomineitonen hei! Kansallisuuden sukupuoli*, [Hello, Maiden of Finland. Nationality of gender.] ed. Tuula Gordon, Katri Komulainen, and Kirsti Lempiäinen (Tampere: Vastapaino, 2002) 211– 229: “Gendered Agency in Information Society: On Located Politics of Technology,” in *Women & Everyday Uses of the Internet. Agency & Identity*, ed. Mia Consalvo and Susanna Paasonen (Oxford: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002), 275–291.
50. William A. Stahl, *God and the Chip: Religion and the Culture of Technology* (Waterloo, ON: Wifred Laurier University Press, 1999), 54.
51. E.g., AJP2, AFI1, AFI2, AUS1.
52. AFI1, AFI2, AJP1, AJP3.
53. Nick Couldry, *Media Rituals. A Critical Approach* (London: Routledge, 2003), 39, original italics.

54. Bourdieu, Pierre, "The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods," in *Media, Culture and Society. A Critical Reader*, ed. Richard Collins, James Curran, Nicholas Garnham, Paddy Scannell, Philip Schlesinger, and Colin Sparks (London: Sage, 1986), 134.
55. AFI2.
56. However, this does not apply to the United States, where both specialists and journalists see the role and power of journalism as much smaller. This corresponds to the fact that the national framework in relation to the innovation environment is weaker in the United States.
57. JP5.
58. FI4.
59. US13, JP6, FI14.
60. John Dewey, *The Quest for Certainty* (New York: Minton Balch, 1929, repr., New York: Capricorn Books, 1960), 11.
61. Robert Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion*, xx. The theme is analyzed empirically in Gavan McGormack, *The Emptiness of Japanese Affluence* (London: M.E. Sharpe, 1996) 287–298.
62. JP12.
63. Ibid.
64. Antti Hautamäki, "Sustainable Innovation: A New Age of Innovation and Finland's Innovation Policy," *Sitra Reports Series 87* (2010).
65. Taylor, *Secular Age*, 677.
66. Ibid., 3–5
67. E.g., José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994).
68. Peter Berger, "Protestantism and the Quest for Certainty," *The Christian Century* (August 26–September 2, 1998): 783, his italics.
69. Ibid.
70. Dewey, *Quest for Certainty*, 7.
71. US13.
72. David F. Noble, *The Religion of Technology: The Divinity of Man and the Spirit of Invention* (New York: Penguin, 1999), 199, 201; see also Heidi A. Campbell and Antonio C. La Pastina, "How the iPod Became Divine: New Media, Religion and the Intertextual Circulation of Meaning," *New Media & Society* 12, no. 7 (2010): 1193.
73. Beyer, *Religion and Globalization*, 75–76.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank professor Risto Kunelius from the University of Tampere and adjunct professor Johanna Sumiala for their comments and encouragement in different phases of writing this article.

Bibliography

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 1991. Rev. and ext. reprint. London: Verso, 2003.
- Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. New Delhi: Sage, 1992.
- Bellah, Robert. *Tokugawa Religion. The Cultural Roots of Modern Japan*. New York: The Free Press, 1957. Reprint, New York: The Free Press, 1985.
- Berger, Peter. "Protestantism and the Quest for Certainty." *The Christian Century* (August 26–September 2, 1998): 782–96.
- . *Religion and Globalization*. London: Sage, 1994.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: CUP, 1991.
- . "The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods." In *Media, Culture and Society. A Critical Reader*, edited by Richard Collins, James Curran, Nicholas Garnham, Paddy Scannell, Philip Schlesinger, and Colin Sparks, 131–63. London: Sage, 1986.

- Campbell, Heidi A., and Antonio C. La Pastina. "How the iPod Became Divine: New Media, Religion and the Intertextual Circulation of Meaning." *New Media & Society* 12, no. 7 (2010): 1191–207.
- Caplan, Pat. "Introduction: Risk Revisited." In *Risk Revisited*, edited by Pat Caplan. London: Pluto Press, 2000, 1–9.
- Casanova, José. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Couldry, Nick. *Media Rituals. A Critical Approach*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Dewey, John. *The Quest for Certainty*. 1929. Reprint, New York: Capricorn books, 1960.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979*. Edited by Michel Senellart. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- . "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4 (1982): 777–95.
- Florida, Richard, and Tim Gulden. "The World Is Spiky." *The Atlantic Monthly*, October 2005.
- Liselotte Frisk, "Globalization: A Key Factor in Contemporary Religious Change." *Journal of Alternative Spiritualities and New Age Studies* 5 (2009–2011): i–xiv.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
- Habermas, Jürgen. "An Awareness of What is Missing." In *An Awareness of What is Missing. Faith and Reason in a Post-Secular Age*, edited by Habermas et al. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007, 15–23.
- Hall, Stuart. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, 2003.
- Hautamäki, Antti. "Sustainable Innovation: A New Age of Innovation and Finland's Innovation Policy." *Sitra Reports Series* 87 (2010).
- Kantola, Anu, and Hannele Seeck. "Dissemination of Management into Politics: Michael Porter and the Political Uses of Management Consulting." *Management Learning* 41, no. 4 (2010): 1–23.
- Mazzarella, William. "Affect: What is it Good for?" In *Enchantments of Modernity. Empire, Nation, Globalization*, edited by Saurab Dube. London: Routledge, 2008, 291–305.
- McGormack, Gavan. *The Emptiness of Japanese Affluence*. London: M.E. Sharpe, 1996.
- Noble, David F. *The Religion of Technology: The Divinity of Man and the Spirit of Invention*. New York: Penguin, 1999.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. "The Analysis of Economic Change." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 17, no. 4 (1935): 2–10.
- . "The Explanation of Business Cycle." *Economica* 21 (December 1927): 286–311.
- . "The Instability of Capitalism." *The Economic Journal* 38, no. 151 (1928): 361–86.
- Smart, Ninian. *Dimensions of the Sacred. An Anatomy of the World's Beliefs*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Stahl, William A. *God and the Chip: Religion and the Culture of Technology*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1999.

- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2007.
- Tillich, Paul. "The Right to Hope." In *Theology of Peace*, edited by Ronald H. Stone. Westminster: John Knox, 1990, 182–195.
- . *Systematic Theology I*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Vehviläinen, Marja. "Gendered Agency in Information Society: On Located Politics of Technology." In *Women & Everyday Uses of the Internet. Agency & Identity*, edited by Mia Consalvo and Susanna Paasonen. Oxford: Peter Lang Publishing, 2002, 275–291.
- . "Teknologinen nationalismi." [Technological nationalism] In *Suomineitonen hei! Kansallisuuden sukupuoli*, [Hello, Maiden of Finland. Nationality of gender] edited by Tuula Gordon, Katri Komulainen, and Kirsti Lempiäinen. Tampere: Vastapaino, 2002, 211–229.
- Woodhead, Linda. "The Turn to Life in Contemporary Religion and Spirituality." In *Spirituality and Society in the New Millennium*, edited by Ursula King and Tina Beattie, 110–23. Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2001.