

3 The Contemporary Adjective *Global* II: Enmeshed with the ‘Globalisation’-Discourse

Talk of ‘globalization’ has become rife among academics, journalists, politicians, business people, advertisers and entertainers. Everyday conversation now includes regular reference to global markets, global communications, global conferences, global threats, the global environment, and so on.

JAN AART SCHOLTE (2005: 51)

In the previous chapter, I highlighted two noteworthy aspects of the contemporary word *global*: it is a highly popular and free adjective, and it is ‘disputedly undisputed’. In this present chapter, I reflect on a third aspect. I highlight that the contemporary adjective *global* is intimately enmeshed with what I call the ‘globalisation’-discourse. With the term ‘globalisation’-discourse I refer to the re-production of a distinct web of meanings through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*.

Presenting a selection of different contemporary uses of the adjective *global*, I show that *global* is enmeshed with the ‘globalisation’-discourse in two different ways. First, the adjective is used to establish and justify conceptions of the signified associated with the word *globalisation*. Second, the contemporary adjective *global* gains one of its meanings from the ‘globalisation’-discourse, that is, from the re-production of a distinct web of meanings through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*.

The chapter is divided into two main parts, in which I elaborate on each of these two points in turn. Drawing on the second point and synthesising the observations from this present Chapter 3 and the previous Chapter 2, I conclude my engagement with the contemporary adjective *global* by conceptualising it as a ‘new word’.

My conceptualisation of the contemporary adjective *global* as ‘new’ serves two kinds of purposes. In general, my labelling of *global* as a ‘new

word' is a final scholarly move to draw attention to the hitherto overlooked word, i.e. to free it from its predominating environment by establishing it as something to look at in itself, namely as a 'new word'. In other words, my use of the word *new* is a strategic move to put the spotlight on the adjective *global*.

In particular, my conceptualisation of the contemporary adjective *global* as 'new' is to make us aware that there is, indeed, something 'new', in the sense of distinct about the contemporary *global*. What is distinct about it is its close relationship with the 'globalisation'-discourse, that is, with the reproduction of a distinct web of meanings through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*. Yet, contrary to existing takes on the word *global* (e.g. Scholte 2005: 50), I argue the adjective is not to be seen as the natural 'pedigree' of the word *globalisation*, in other words, it is not to be taken as the linguistic sign, from which the word *globalisation* springs and receives its meanings. Rather, I argue, it is the other way around: what is 'new', in the sense of distinct and not yet sufficiently acknowledged about the contemporary adjective *global* is that it *implies* the 'globalisation'-discourse.

GLOBAL AS A TOOL TO ESTABLISH THE SIGNIFIED OF GLOBALISATION

Since the end of the 1980s and in the course of the 1990s, it has come to be a common practice to capture and explain the social world with the help of the word *globalisation*. Putting it differently, it was in the 1990s that, what I call, the 'globalisation'-discourse was born. In Chapter 4, I focus in detail on the concept 'globalisation'-discourse. For now, it is sufficient to understand that when I speak of 'globalisation'-discourse I refer to the reproduction of a distinct web of meanings through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*.

A look across scholarly works on 'globalisation' makes us aware that the adjective *global* plays a central role in what I understand to be the 'globalisation'-discourse. The adjective is used as nothing less than a tool to establish and justify scholarly ideas of 'globalisation'. This is done in two different ways.

First, and most commonly, the signified of the adjective *global* is taken as a key feature of what scholars set out to conceptualise as the phenomenon (they call) 'globalisation'. In other words, scholars establish and justify an understanding of what they call 'globalisation' by suggesting that what is distinct about it is that there is something 'global' about it.

This is readily apparent in those works, in which scholars set out to develop their conception of the phenomenon that they capture with the word *globalisation* by asking and answering the (rhetorical) question: "What is global about globalisation?". Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton (2003: 15), Scholte (2005: 50), Kirchberger (2002), Axford (2000: 239), and An-

yanwu (2000: 2-4) do this. Implied in this question is the claim that whatever the adjective *global* signifies, i.e. whatever its meanings is, is a key characteristic of what these scholars set out to conceptualise with the help of the word *globalisation*. Going a step further, the signified of *global* is actually taken here as the *central feature* that distinguishes the (respective) idea 'globalisation' from phenomena that are referred to with other linguistic signs, such as the words *internationalisation* or *transnationalisation*.

In this sense, the adjective *global* serves an important purpose for 'globalisation'-scholars. Given that the word *globalisation* is a neologism, these scholars are inevitably faced with the task of not only drawing a distinction between the meaning of the word *globalisation* and the signifieds of other, already existing and established words. They also have to make clear what it is that is the 'new' that the neologism *globalisation* captures and that is not already captured by existing vocabulary. I discuss the issue of the 'new' in more detail in Chapter 4. Here, I want to make us aware that it is precisely the adjective *global* that helps scholars in these instances with nothing less but the establishment of the (supposed) 'newness' of whatever the word *globalisation* is applied to refer to.

Let me illustrate the above described scholarly practice with concrete examples. Take, for instance, Jan Aart Scholte (2005: 52) who, in his seminal *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, cautions that the word *globalisation* "should not merely restate what can be known with other terminology", and who criticises, "[m]uch if not most existing analysis of globalization is flawed because it is redundant". In order to avoid this 'flaw' himself, Scholte (2005: 50) sets out to show "what, precisely, is 'global' about globalization." With that, Scholte suggests what makes the signified of the word *globalisation* distinct is that there is something 'global' about it. In other words, Scholte suggests that it is the signified of the adjective *global* that makes the phenomenon, which he associates with the word *globalisation*, a 'new' phenomenon, i.e. worthy being captured with a neologism, namely *globalisation*.

Alexandre Kirchberger (2002), Barrie Axford (2000: 239) and Chika Anyanwu (2000: 2-4) argue in precisely the same way, and so do David Held, Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton (2003: 15). The latter group of authors stress the significance of what they associate with the linguistic sign *global* in and for their conception of the signified of the word *globalisation* by lamenting,

"there is scant evidence in the existing literature of any attempt to specify precisely what is 'global' about globalization."

By specifying "precisely what is 'global' about globalization" themselves, Held et al aim to distinguish their conceptualisation of the meaning of the word *globalisation* from others, such as those building on notions of "accelerating interdependence" (Ohmae 1990), "action at a distance" (Giddens

1990), and "time-space compression" (Harvey 1990). Held et al appreciate these notions but do not consider them as capturing what is 'global' about 'globalisation', i.e. what makes the meaning of the word *globalisation* distinct for them (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton 2003: 15).

I come back to this scholarly practice in due course. At this point, I want to turn to a second manner, in which the adjective *global* is used as a tool to establish and justify scholarly ideas of 'globalisation'. This second manner differs slightly from the first one. It is a less common practice than the one above. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out because it can be found in one of the most influential, in the sense of, often-cited works in the 'globalisation'-discourse, namely Scholte's above mentioned *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (Scholte 2005).

In this second manner, the scholarly *idea* 'globalisation' is established and justified with reference to the meaning of the *linguistic sign globalisation*. And the meaning of the linguistic sign *globalisation* is established and justified with reference to the meaning of the linguistic sign *global*. More precisely, the word *global* is taken as the radical of the word *globalisation*, and the meaning of the word *globalisation*, which is established in this way with the help of the word *global*, is taken as equalling the *idea* 'globalisation'.

Bringing the above together, we see, for a start, that the adjective *global* is utilised by scholars to establish and justify their respective conceptions of 'globalisation'. This observation becomes intriguing, when we now take a closer look at which meanings these scholars actually attach to the word *global*, that is, to this central tool in their conceptualisation of 'globalisation'. More precisely, the above observation becomes intriguing when we realise how the meanings of the adjective *global*, which then serve as the basis for the respective scholarly conceptions of 'globalisation', are actually determined.

Let me start with a look at the first group of scholars that I looked at above, namely those commentators, like Held et al, who use the word *global* to establish an understanding of what they address with the word *globalisation* by suggesting that what is distinct about 'globalisation' is that there is something 'global' about it. Curiously, these scholars determine the meaning of the adjective *global* in a somewhat tautological way. They derive the meaning from a pre-set idea 'globalisation'. This means they derive it from the very idea of 'globalisation' that they actually set out to establish with the help of the word *global* to begin with. On scrutiny we see that the meaning of the adjective *global* is derived in these cases from what these scholars consider is specific about the phenomenon they set out to grasp with the word *globalisation*, and that they intend to establish with the help of the meaning of the adjective *global*. What might sound abstract is easily illustrated if we look back at the above mentioned scholars and the way they derive their concept of 'globalisation'.

For instance, for Held and his colleagues what is ‘global’ about the signified of the word *globalisation* are “its distinctive spatial attributes and the ways these unfold over time” and transform “the organization of human affairs by linking together and expanding human activity across regions and continents” (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton 2003: 15). For Kirchner (2002) “what is ‘global’ about ‘globalisation’ is the ideology of ‘globalisation’ that literally spreads everywhere”. For Axford (2000: 241, 243; drawing on McGrew 1992b) what is ‘global’ about the signified of *globalisation* is the production of “‘an essential sameness’ in the surface appearance of social and political life across the globe” together with “contradictory tendencies towards increasing interconnectedness and greater fragmentation”. And for Anyanwu (2000: 2-4), what is ‘global’ about the signified of the word *globalisation* is the subsumption of

“the cultural and geopolitical differences of people. While globalisation is a form of neo-colonialism where the non-western Other is placed in a deceptive position of artificial competitiveness, it is a system that uses what Robert Stam would call the ‘fictive we’ to subjugate us through what Roland Barthes would call a ‘subjective nominated truth’.”

What we see above is an intriguing scholarly practice, in which the key character of the phenomenon that is captured with the word *globalisation*, is taken to be that it is ‘global’. The signified of the word *global*, in turn, is explained as whatever the commentators consider to be the key characteristics of what they pre-imagine as the phenomenon to which they refer with the word *globalisation*. Hence, the respective understanding of the distinct feature of the phenomenon, to which these scholars refer with the word *globalisation*, arises out of and is justified based on a tautological move, which has the adjective *global* at its heart.

Referring back to the discussion in Chapter 2, I suggest it is this kind of use of the word *global* that partly accounts for and explains the above observed ‘invisibility’ of the adjective. As is apparent in these practices, in a curious way the contemporary word *global* is locked into the orbit of the reproduction of the web of meanings, labelled ‘globalisation’, through utterances that contain the word *globalisation*. In this setting, it is the signified of the word *globalisation* that is at the centre of critical attention. The adjective *global*, in turn, is utilised in a way that turns it into something like a satellite of this interest. *Global* is locked into the shadow of ‘globalisation’. The word *global* is strategically utilised but then ‘disappears’ as a supposedly self-evident and ‘innocent’ linguistic ingredient of the negotiation of the signified/s of the noun *globalisation*.

The above mentioned second manner, in which the adjective *global* is used to establish and justify ideas of ‘globalisation’, namely the one that we find in Scholte’s seminal *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, is as intriguing as the tautological practice, which I just sketched. Instead of describ-

ing it in the abstract, let me turn to a concrete example straight away to illustrate my point.

As we saw above, in order to establish what Scholte understands 'globalisation' to be, he turns to the linguistic level and stresses the importance of a robust definition of the word *globalisation*. He writes,

"[k]nowledge of globalization is substantially a function of how the word is defined. Thus every study of globalization should include a careful and critical examination of the term itself." (Scholte 2005: 50)

In order to come up to this task, Scholte decides to set the foundation for his definition of the word *globalisation* through what he refers to as "trac[ing] the rise of the vocabulary of globalization in academic and lay thinking" (ibid.).

In doing this, Scholte builds on two premises. First, he pre-assumes that the word *globalisation* is a derivative of the words *globe* and *global*, as well as *globalise* and *globalism*. He claims these words are the natural "pedigree" (ibid.) of the word *globalisation*. Second, Scholte suggests that a fruitful way of 'trac[ing] the rise of the vocabulary of globalization in academic and lay thinking' is to look up the etymology of these, for him, interconnected words as it is recorded in a selection of one English and two American-English dictionaries.

This second premise is evident in the fact that, as if it was a natural matter, Scholte starts his 'tracing' by consulting the 2003 edition of the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* and the 1989 edition of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, as well as the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language* from 1961; he also refers to the insights of two other scholars who appear to have gone through a similar dictionary consultation exercise (Robertson 2001, 1983 and Schreiter 1997).

The first of Scholte's premises is expressed in his opening explanation:

"Although the term 'globalization' was not coined until the second half of the twentieth century, it has a longer pedigree. In the English language, the noun 'globe' dates from the fifteenth century (derived from the Latin *globus*) and began to denote a spherical representation of the earth several hundred years ago (Robertson 2001: 6, 254; MWD 2003). The adjective 'global' entered circulation in the late seventeenth century and began to designate 'planetary scale' in the late nineteenth century, in addition to its earlier meaning of 'spherical' (OED 1989: VI, 582)." (Scholte 2005: 50)

In this text segment, we also see that Scholte picks out 'planetary scale' as the meaning of the word *global*. Given that he understands the word *globalisation* to be a derivative of the word *global*, he takes the word *globalisation* to imply 'planetary scale', too. Consequently, he takes the *condition* 'planetary scale' as a central component of his definition of the *phenomenon* that he labels with the word *globalisation*. In other words, Scholte derives a con-

stitutive part of what he associates with the word *globalisation* from his definition of the word *globalisation*, which he derives from a meaning of the word *global* that he picks out from a number of codified lexical meanings, which are provided in a selection of dictionaries.

The insights into lexical meanings that I provided in the previous chapter make the strategy, which Scholte follows in order to conceptualise ‘globalisation’, intriguing. We saw above that dictionaries do not provide *the* meaning of a word. Consequently, “precisely because words change in meaning over time, the meaning of a word cannot be established from its etymology” (Stubbs 2001: 172). Hence, as lexicographer David Crystal (1995: 136) puts it, “[f]ascinating as etymologies are, in debate they can only be a rhetorical cheat”. The meaning ‘of planetary scale’, which Scholte suggests is *the* meaning of the word *global* and, consequently, is *the* (natural) characteristic of the phenomenon he associates with the word *globalisation* is, of course, not *the* meaning of the adjective *global*. As we saw in the previous chapter, there is no ‘*the* meaning’ of any word that could be naturally derived from a consultation of a dictionary. Hence, Scholte’s way of establishing the (supposedly natural) meaning of the adjective *global* as a means to determine the (supposedly natural) meaning of the noun *globalisation*, in order to present it as the (supposedly natural) feature of the phenomenon, which he associates with the word *globalisation*, is a distinct way of legitimising a scholarly decision by building on the authority of the dictionary and on the etymology of a word.

To be clear, Scholte’s conceptualisation of the phenomenon ‘globalisation’ in his *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* might be valuable in many respects. There is also nothing wrong *per se* with his move to select one codified lexical meaning of the word *global*, namely ‘planetary scale’, and use it as the centre of his definition of the word *globalisation*, and subsequently, as what he understands as the phenomenon ‘globalisation’. Yet, his move needs to be acknowledged as a scholarly *practice*, rather than a neutral and natural depiction of an unquestionable (linguistic) reality; however, the latter is the way, in which he presents it.

My above reflection of the case of *global* in the ‘globalisation’-literature captures one way in which the contemporary adjective *global* is closely enmeshed with the ‘globalisation’-discourse. I illustrated that the adjective *global* is applied in various ways by commentators to establish and justify conceptions of ‘globalisation’, i.e. of the (constructed) object that is the product of the various utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*. In addition to this general insight, we also got a sense from the above that there is something intriguing about how this is done. Like in my brief analysis of the use of *global* in the post-9/11 rhetoric of President George W. Bush at the end of Chapter 2, we get again a sense of the politics of the use of the word *global*, this time in the context of the *scholarly* (‘globalisation’-) discourse, in which the adjective *global* features as nothing less than a tool

for scholars to establish and justify their individual conceptions of the phenomenon that they associate with the word *globalisation*.

GLOBAL AS AN 'OUTCOME OF GLOBALISATION'

In addition to the above, I identify a second way, in which the contemporary adjective *global* is enmeshed with the 'globalisation'-discourse. This is that the adjective actually *gains* one of its meanings from this discourse.

As we saw in the previous chapter, meanings are not naturally attached to a linguistic sign. They are also not fixed entities that could be easily looked up in a dictionary. Meanings arise and are visible in the use of language; they are conventional.

In the previous chapter, we saw that there are countless of meanings attached to the adjective *global*. In the following section, I carve out another of these countless of meanings that is attached to the contemporary adjective *global*. This carving out is grounded in an empirical exploration of the use of the contemporary *global*. With the help of a selection of concrete examples, I show that the contemporary adjective *global* also means 'outcome of globalisation'. Grounded in this observation, I argue that the adjective gains one of its meaning from the 'globalisation'-discourse.

Let me start my selection of illustrative examples with a familiar case, namely Jan Aart Scholte's *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. As we saw above, Scholte begins his conceptualisation of the signified of the word *globalisation* by referring to etymological insights into the linguistic signs *globalisation* and *global*. He suggests that the word *globalisation* goes back to the adjective *global*, which itself goes back to the noun *globe*. We noticed that what Scholte labels a linguistic 'tracing' of the word *globalisation* is actually the establishment of a scholarly claim by utilising a selected lexical meaning of the word *global* (which he takes as the supposed radical of *globalisation*) and by building on the widely perceived authority of dictionaries. Scholte decides to take 'planetary scale' as *the* meaning of the adjective *global* in order to claim that the word *globalisation* refers to 'planetary scale'. This, then, serves as the ground, on which Scholte argues that the condition 'planetary scale' is a key component of the phenomenon that he imagines the word *globalisation* refers to. In other words, as we saw above, Scholte derives a constitutive aspect of his definition of the signified of the word *globalisation* from a meaning of the word *global* that he picks out from a number of codified lexical meanings provided in a selected set of dictionaries. Now, what is intriguing about Scholte's case is not only that he utilises etymological insights to establish a scholarly concept. At least as intriguing is that, despite the importance he attributes to his theory that *global* means 'of planetary scale', he himself does not use the adjective *global* with this meaning. Reading through his body of work and looking carefully at how he *uses* the adjective *global* brings to light that Scholte's own applica-

tion of *global* encodes something different from what he claims the adjective ‘really’ encodes (i.e. ‘of planetary scale’). On scrutiny, it becomes apparent that, somewhat curiously, Scholte’s use of the adjective *global* encodes that it is something that is the *outcome of* ‘globalisation’. The following section of his *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* illustrates my point:

“Talk of ‘globalization’ has become rife among academics, journalists, politicians, business people, advertisers and entertainers. Everyday conversation now includes regular reference to *global* markets, *global* communications, *global* conferences, *global* threats, the *global* environment, and so on.” (Scholte 2005: 51; emphasis added)

Here, Scholte implies that the existence of concepts, which have come to be pre-modified with the adjective *global*, is a manifestation of the “talk of ‘globalization’”. In other words, Scholte uses the adjective *global* here as encapsulating (whatever is the signified of the word) *globalisation*. More precisely, he uses *global* to refer to something that is the ‘outcome of globalisation’.

As soon as we look beyond Scholte, we realise that he is by no means alone in *using* (as opposed to *defining*) the adjective *global* in this way. Reviewing all sorts of social and political studies publications shows that this is a common usage of the adjective. For example, Mary Kaldor (2003: 1) sets out to re-conceptualise ‘civil society’ as ‘*global* civil society’ and explains, “[w]hat is new about the concept of civil society since 1989 is globalization”. In other words, what motivates Kaldor to add the adjective *global* to the concept ‘civil society’ is what she associates with the word *globalisation*. In a similar vein, Olaf Cramme and Patrick Diamond (2009: 3; emphasis added) make clear that by “rethinking social justice in the *global* age” they aim to articulate “a modern conception of social justice that remains relevant for an era of rapid globalisation.” Similarly, for Anthony Giddens (2007: ix), in his *Europe in the Global Age*, “the global age” is an age shaped by “intensifying globalization”, a process “responsible for those changes”, which make the age a “*global* age”. Equally, for Peter Berger (2005: 13), it is the “intense discussion of the phenomenon of globalization” that prompts him to speak of ‘*global* civil society’, rather than just ‘civil society’. John Tomlinson (1999: 32) applies the adjective *global* to the noun *modernity*, i.e. uses the term ‘global modernity’, in order to express “the empirical condition” that he refers to with the word *globalisation*. “One clear manifestation of the impact of *globalisation* in the governance of nations can be seen in the emergence of the *global* market [...]”, suggest Tadashi and Ashizawa (2001: 16; emphasis added) and, with that, they too use the adjective *global* as encapsulating the signified of *globalisation*. More precisely, in all of these different cases *global* means something like the ‘outcome of globalisation’.

This list of examples from all sorts of contemporary writings could be easily extended, for instance with the earlier mentioned Dennis Altman (2001: 1), who, in his conception of 'global sex', aims to "connect two of the dominant preoccupations of current social science and popular debate, namely globalization and the preoccupation with sexuality", and with Brice Cossart's understanding of 'global history' as being partly about "focusing on the history of globalization" (Cossart 2013: 1). The same kind of use of the adjective *global* is also apparent beyond academic texts. See for instance how former BP manager James Krupka (URL) links the adjective *global* with the signified of *globalisation*: "[w]hether it is the global reach and interconnectedness of BP's business worldwide, [...] or the global impact of groups like CRS; globalisation is real"; or look at US President George W. Bush (2006), who uses the expression "in this global world" for the world shaped by "the effects of globalization":

"I'll give you an example of the effects of globalization. When India buys more fossil fuels, it causes the price of crude oil to go up, which causes our price of gasoline to go up. That's an example of globalization. As these new jobs of the 21st century come into being, people are going to hire people with the skill sets. And if our folks don't have the skill sets, those jobs are going to go somewhere else. That's one of the effects of the world in which we live. [...] A lot of countries, in trying to be competitive in this global world, are doing the same thing to encourage research and development [...]."

US President Clinton's spokesperson, Mike McCurry (Clinton 1998; emphasis added), uses *global* in a similar way in his account of a conversation between Clinton and French President Jacques Chirac:

"Other subjects they discussed – the situation in the Asia economy, a fascinating discussion about globalization and its impact on domestic economies. There's a longstanding and vibrant exchange of views between France and the United States about the effects of globalization on our respective economies. And the President [...] very much appreciated the opportunity to hear the Prime Minister's [sic.] thinking and to learn more about his views of how global economies can balance the need for job creation with the provision of benefits that improve the quality of life for the citizens of these global economies."

Even if we leave the English language and look at the German adjective *global*, we see a similar use of the word, for instance, in German Chancellor Angela Merkel's rhetoric (Merkel 2006). Merkel follows the same logic in her use of the adjective when she links the word *global* with the signified of *globalisation* in an interview in which she elaborates on her argument that 'the social market economy requires a regulatory framework'. In this interview, she explains her understanding of the nature of the signified of *globalisation* in order to conclude that 'in a global world it is of course not possi-

ble that each country develops its own rules'.¹ Again, the adjective *global* is applied here to encode something that is an outcome of the phenomenon that is associated with the word *globalisation*. And, going back to the English word *global*, to give a final example, this is the same way the adjective is used in Kofi Annan's report 'We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21st Century'. Annan writes, "[t]his system [of the post-1945 international order] worked, and made it possible for globalization to emerge. As a result we now live in a *global* world" (Annan 2000; emphasis added).

CONCLUSION

My project was triggered by the question what the highly popular use of the adjective *global* in public, political and scholarly discourse implies, if anything interesting at all, and what *global* actually means. My project was shaped by the observation that there is little scholarly engagement with the word *global* in the political studies and IR scholarship and beyond. The word is taken as if it was obvious. In this way, it has become 'invisible'. Consequently, the aim of this present chapter and the previous chapter was to make the adjective *global* 'visible' to begin with, and to bring it onto the scholarly radar. I set out to do this by making the contemporary *global* strange. For this purpose, I highlighted three aspects that I identify as constituting the contemporary adjective *global*. First, in the previous chapter, I suggested *global* is popular and free. Second, I pointed out that it is, in a somewhat paradoxical way, 'disputedly undisputed'. Finally, in this present chapter, I demonstrated that *global* is closely enmeshed with the 'globalisation'-discourse, where I understand 'globalisation'-discourse to be the reproduction of a distinct web of meanings through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*.

In the above sections, I developed this latter point by illustrating that *global* is used by commentators as a tool to establish their idea of 'globalisation'. At the same time, I showed that the contemporary *global* gains one of its meanings from the 'globalisation'-discourse. This is evident in the fact that *global* is used (though not necessarily defined) these days to denote 'outcome of globalisation'.

-
- 1 Merkel (2006; emphasis added): "Weil sich durch die *Globalisierung* die Mobilität und die Reaktionsgeschwindigkeit des Kapitals im Vergleich zur Arbeit massiv erhöht hat. Das ist ein neuer Trend, der auch eine der Ursachen dafür ist, dass die Menschen gar nicht mehr verstehen, was heute eigentlich die Maßstäbe von Erfolg und Misserfolg sind. Denn das, was sie überblicken, ihre Arbeit, ist nur noch ein Teil der Wertschöpfung, während ein großer und zunehmender anderer Teil Bedingungen unterworfen ist, auf die eine einzelne Volkswirtschaft, so auch Deutschland, immer weniger Einfluss nehmen kann. [...] In einer *globalen* Welt ist es natürlich nicht möglich, dass jedes Land seine eigenen Regeln macht."

Moving on from this observation, I want to finalise my attempt to remove the cloak of invisibility, under which the adjective *global* has been hidden, and conclude this chapter by conceptualising the contemporary *global* as a 'new word'.

Global as a 'new word'

What makes a word a 'new word'? Sara Tulloch, editor of *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words: A Popular Guide to Words in the News*, suggests this "is a question which can never be answered satisfactorily, any more than one can answer the question 'How long is a piece of string?'" (Tulloch 1991: v). There is not one ultimate and objective criterion that makes a word a 'new word'. The question when it is useful and meaningful to call a word 'new' is inevitably a question of context and scholarly reasoning and decision.

Most obviously, a word is reasonably acknowledged as 'new' if it constitutes a new lexem, such as the recently invented words *metrosexual* or *crowdsourcing*. Words can also be usefully called 'new' if their *sense* is 'new', i.e. if a lexem that used to refer to one thing, e.g. to a male honey bee, has come to be used also to refer to another thing, e.g. to an unmanned aerial vehicle, like in the case of the word *drone*;² or if a company/product name is used to refer to the activity of searching the Internet for information, as it is the case with the verb *googling*. But there are also infinitely more instances, in which it makes sense to speak of 'new' words. Tulloch (1991: v), for instance, applies the following criterion in her *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words*:

"a new word is any word, phrase, or meaning that came into popular use in English or enjoyed a vogue during the eighties and early nineties. [...] the deciding factor has been whether or not the general public was made aware of the word or sense during the eighties and early nineties."

Lexicographer Orin Hargraves (2004: viii), in turn, suggests more generally that a word is usefully called 'new' if there is "something genuinely innovative about the word hitherto unnoted in dictionaries". He suggests applying the following criteria in the 'search' for 'new words':

"Has the word escaped a relatively narrow field of usage, such as youth slang or trade jargon, to enjoy more general currency? Is the word likely to enjoy continuing cur-

2 Following Zaloga (in Mehta 2013), the use of the word *drone* to refer to an unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) dates back to 1935, when the US used UAVs for gunnery practice. As Zaloga explains, the word *drone* was chosen to refer to these UAVs in reference to the British Royal Navy's system with the same function that was called DH 82B Queen Bee (see Selchow 2015: 58).

rency, or does it designate a fad or phenomenon that will probably no longer need a word for next year.” (ibid.)

In Chapter 2, we saw that the adjective *global* has had a long dictionary life. Adding to this, over the course of its life, *global* has also been explicitly perceived as a ‘new word’ three times. Hence, my move to recognise *global* as a ‘new word’ is not without precedent. In the three instances, in which the adjective had been acknowledged as ‘new’, this was done on the grounds that *global* had gained a noteworthy meaning that, using Hargraves’s words from above, had remained “hitherto unnoted in dictionaries” (ibid.). The three instances, in which *global* was acknowledged as a ‘new word’, were in 1954 and 1955 with regard to the sense of ‘worldwide’ and in 1991 in light of the adjective’s use in environmental discourses.

In 1954 A. M. Macdonald (1954: 94) finds,

“[p]erhaps, the most significant of all new words in English is the adjective *global*: war, strategy, problems of food and other necessities, are no longer regional but world-wide.”

A year later Mary Reifer (1995), too, takes up *global* as a ‘new word’ in her *Dictionary of New Words*. The ‘new’ sense that she identifies the adjective *global* had acquired by 1955 is: “[p]ertaining to a strategic or political view which includes the whole world in its scope” (Reifer 1955: 93). Both instances bring us back to Chapter 2 because they seem to be related to the peak in the use of the word *global* that is apparent in the COBUILD American English corpus (ref. Figure 1).

Not long after *global* was treated as ‘new’ in the 1950s, it was also taken up in the revised edition of H. W. Fowler’s popular *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (1965), where it was called a ‘vogue word’. Ernest Gower, the editor of Fowler’s *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, explains a ‘vogue word’ as follows:

“Every now and then a word emerges from obscurity, or even from nothingness or a merely potential and not actual existence, into sudden popularity. It is often, but not necessarily, one that by no means explains itself to the average man, who has to find out its meaning as best he can. His wrestlings with it have usually some effect upon it; it does not mean quite what it ought to, but to make up for that it means some things that it ought not, by the time he has done with it. [...] Ready acceptance of vogue words seems to some people the sign of an alert mind; to others it stands for the herd instinct and lack of individuality. [...] the second view is here taken. [...] Many, it should be added – perhaps most – are vogue words in particular senses only, and are unobjectionable, though liable now to ambiguity, in the senses that belonged to them before they attained their vogue.” (Gower 1965: 684)

Gowers distinguishes between different kinds of 'vogue words' and explains that the adjective *global* is one of the "words owing their vogue to the joy of showing that one has acquired them" (ibid. 229). He puts it into one group with words such as *allergic*, *ambience*, *ambivalent*, and *catalyst*, and explains it as follows:

"The original meaning, now archaic, was globular. Towards the end of the 19th c. it acquired a new one: 'pertaining to or embracing the totality of a number of items, categories, or the like' (OED Supp.). With that meaning it was a useful word, but there seems to be a curious attraction in it [...] that leads to its misuse for aggregate or total, with which it is properly in antithesis. For instance, the compensation paid to the coal industry on nationalization was a global figure representing the estimated value of the industry as a whole, to be apportioned among its constituent units, not an aggregate figure arrived at by adding together the estimated values of the several units. Global, moreover, seeking wider fields, has now established itself unnecessarily but firmly, as a synonym for what we used to call world-wide. Mondial is also available for writers who dislike both words." (ibid.)

The third 'discovery' of *global* as a 'new word' after 1954 and 1955 took place in 1991 in the above mentioned *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words: A Popular Guide to Words in the News*, compiled by Sarah Tulloch. *The Oxford Dictionary of New Words* sets out to "provide an informative and readable guide to about two thousand high-profile words and phrases which have been in the news during the past decade" (Tulloch 1991: v). The new meaning of *global* is described here as one that has appeared in "environmental jargon":

"**global** [...] *adjective* In environmental jargon: relating to or affecting the Earth as an ecological unit. Used especially in: **global consciousness** [...]; **global warming** [...]" (ibid. 133; emphasis in the original)

In concluding this chapter and my initial engagement with the adjective *global*, I suggest that we understand the contemporary *global* again as a 'new word' – for the fourth time after 1954, 1955 and 1991.

My move to call the contemporary *global* a 'new word' has two different purposes. On the one side, it is a scholarly decision with the aim of drawing attention to the widely overlooked word *global* and, with that, to free it from its dominating environment by establishing it as something to look at, namely a 'new word'. It is a final move to free the adjective *global* of the shadow of the word *globalisation* and the concept 'globalisation', in which it has come to be 'locked up'. We saw this in the above provided overview of how the adjective *global* is used by scholars to establish ideas of 'globalisation'. Given the general nature of proclamations of something as 'new', the scholarly decision to call something 'new', like "new wars" (Kaldor 2006[1999]), "new terrorism" (Neumann 2009), or, in fact, 'new

word', is a strategic move that problematises this respective 'something' in contrast to existing perceptions and understandings of it, and, as such, inevitably provokes critical attention.

On the other side, my move to call the contemporary *global* a 'new word' has the purpose of highlighting that there is, indeed, something 'new', in the sense of distinct and, using Hargraves' words from above again, "hitherto unnoted" (Hargraves 2004: viii) about the contemporary *global*. This is the new meaning, with which the adjective is used these days, namely 'outcome of globalisation'.

In and of itself, and especially if one is not a linguist, the discovery of the 'new' meaning of the contemporary adjective *global* is not more nor less interesting than the acknowledgment of all the various other meanings the word is used with, which I pointed out in Chapter 2. And yet, it makes the adjective *global* interesting because it forces us to think about the distinct relationship between *global* and the 'globalisation'-discourse, which it implies, and, ultimately, about the nature of the 'globalisation'-discourse:

Above, we saw that the adjective *global* is naturally locked into the shadow of 'globalisation', i.e. into the shadow of the web of meanings that is re-produced through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*. This is because *global* is taken as the natural "pedigree" of the word *globalisation*; Scholte's (2005: 50) use of the word *global* illustrated this point. We saw that the adjective *global* is considered as and treated like something that comes from 'outside' into the 'globalisation'-discourse. However, grounded in my above sketched insights into the enmeshment of the adjective *global* with the 'globalisation'-discourse, in general, and, in particular, the realisation that the adjective has come to be used these days with the meaning 'outcome of globalisation', I argue that, in actual fact, the relationship between the contemporary *global* and *globalisation* is best to be thought of the other way around. I argue what is distinct about the contemporary *global* is that it cannot be thought of anymore as independent of and existing outside the 'globalisation'-discourse. The contemporary *global* is inextricably enmeshed with the 'globalisation'-discourse, i.e. with the reproduction of a distinct web of meanings through utterances, which contain the word *globalisation*.

In this sense, I partly confirm the intuition of those commentators, mentioned in Chapter 2, who criticise the adjective *global*, grounded in the suspicion that it is part of the talk about 'globalisation' and, as such, part of a hegemonic Northern and capitalist discourse. Grounded in my above analysis, I agree with these commentators and confirm that the contemporary *global* is interlinked inextricably with the 'globalisation'-discourse. Yet, as I unfold in the following chapters, this means something more complex and intriguing than that the use of the adjective *global* fosters a Northern neoliberal discourse of open markets. This is because 'globalisation', i.e. the web of meanings that is re-produced in the 'globalisation'-discourse, is something more complex than a world shaped by widespread market integration.

As I will argue in the following Chapter 4, the 'globalisation'-discourse is about the reproduction of a web of meanings called 'new world'. It is this distinct nature of the 'globalisation'-discourse that makes it intriguing and that makes the discovered enmeshment of the adjective *global* with the 'globalisation'-discourse noteworthy.

For now, I conclude my reflection on the word *global* in this present and the previous chapters by introducing the adjective as a 'new word' that is inextricably interlinked with the 'globalisation'-discourse. This insight and the fact that it is a popular and free word, which leads a 'disputedly undisputed' shadow existence, while simultaneously serving an important role in the re-production of the web of meanings commonly called 'globalisation', leads me to argue that, contrary to what seems to be the widespread conception among the majority of scholars, the contemporary *global* is worthy of being taken seriously. There is something intriguing about this adjective. It is not enough to "assume that we are reasonably clear about what is meant by 'global'" (Berger 2005: 11).