

THE CONSTRUCTION OF ‘GLOBALIZED COMMUNICATION’:
THE FRAMEWORK OF ‘FRAMES’, ‘BORDERS’ AND ‘TERMS’
FOR COMMUNICATIVE DISCOURSE AS SETTING OF
DIGITALIZED MASS MEDIA PRESENTATIONS
OF GLOBAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. INTRODUCTION: THE UNDERSTANDING OF ‘DISCOURSE’ IN THE 21ST CENTURY
DEFINITIONS OF DISCOURSE OF THE AGE OF ‘GLOBALIZATION’: STATE AND
STATEMENTS OF DISCOURSE IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Discourse in the age of ‘globalization’ uses the framework of abstract terms and ideas, which reflect the idea of globalization. The discourse uses these terms as the marks of the contents of the discourse. The discourse is the whole of the contributions, which refer to the issue. So the discourse as a macro-discourse transcends the limits of usual text types and forms as an intertextual phenomenon across all potential texts available. This discourse is both the form of the appearance of the statements related to the issue and the statements itself. The rhetorical theory has brought forward the *stasis*-theory, which inquires the states of an issue and derives arguments from it. Also the discourse arranges itself by the structure of the aspects about the topic ‘globalization’, which are contributions to the discourse. A potential endless variety of deducted statements from the topic ‘globalization’ could be realized here. But the de facto limit of the discourse is the written form and evidently presented contributions to it. In *Collins English Dictionary* (2009) ‘discourse’ has the following definitions:

1. verbal communication; talk; conversation
2. a formal treatment of a subject in speech or writing, such as a sermon or dissertation
3. a unit of text used by linguists for the analysis of linguistic phenomena that range over more than one sentence
4. (archaic) the ability to reason or the reasoning process.

As verb it has the meanings:

5. (intr; often foll by on or upon) to speak or write (about) formally and extensively
6. (intr) to hold a discussion
7. archaic (tr.) to give forth (music).

It is a derivation from the Medieval Latin *'discursus'* for 'argument' (Collins English Dictionary, 2009). In the ancient Greek language fine nuances in meanings exist for the meanings of communication; so *διάλεξις* means 'discourse' and 'argument', *διάλεκτος* 'discourse' and 'conversation', *διαλάλησις* 'talking' and 'discourse', and *προλαλιά* 'discourse'. The verb *διαλεπτολογέομαι* means 'discourse subtly' and 'chop logic' (Greek Translation Tool, 2013). In Latin also a variety of words for 'discourse' exist; among them are *acroasis* for discourse in the sense of 'hearing' and 'lecture', *altercation* for a discourse in the sense of 'debate', 'discussion', 'alternate discourse', *conloquium* for a discourse in the sense of a 'scholarly conversation' and 'conference', *fabulatio* for 'narration' as form of discourse, *locutio* for discourse as 'speaking' and 'speech', *loquela* as discourse for 'speech' and 'words', *oratio* for discourse in the sense of 'speaking', 'speech', 'language', 'faculty of speech', 'use of language', *processus* for discourse as 'advance', 'course', 'progression', 'progress', 'process', 'movement', and *sermo* for discourse in form of 'continued speech', 'talk', and 'conversation' (Latin Translation Tool, 2014). In the *Random House Dictionary* (2013) 'discourse' has the following meanings:

1. communication of thought by words; talk; conversation: earnest and intelligent discourse.
2. a formal discussion of a subject in speech or writing, as a dissertation, treatise, sermon, etc.
3. Linguistics: any unit of connected speech or writing longer than a sentence.

As verb without object 'to discourse' has the following meanings:

4. to communicate thoughts orally; talk; converse.
5. to treat of a subject formally in speech or writing.

The origin of the word in the English language can be traced to 1325–75, when in the Middle English the word 'discourse' is used as a derivation of Medieval Latin *discursus* (Random House Dictionary, 2013). Discourse is a formal structure of dealing with an issue in a structures way in the discipline of philosophy. Since the discourse here and in other scholarly field can be considered a literary form, also literature studies and linguistics study discourse. So the meaning of discourse as a way of written or spoken communication is

a relatively new meaning out of the scholarly context and the formal language of the sciences. The variation of the formal genres of discourse in written and spoken languages we already find in the ancient languages. The discourse is a form of the treatment of issues, which is in any means, oral, literal or medial communication) present. In the following parts we will develop the specific form of discourse in the 21st century analyzing the ‘globalization’ as condition of contemporary communication.

2. STATE OF RESEARCH AND THE RESEARCH PROBLEM: THE INTERDISCIPLINARITY OF DISCOURSE STUDIES AND THEIR CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND ‘GLOBALIZATION’ IN THE LATEST HISTORY OF IDEAS AND CONCEPTS OF DISCOURSE

Scheuerman (2013) wrote on ‘globalization’ in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: “The term globalization has only become commonplace in the last two decades, and academic commentators who employed the term as late as the 1970s accurately recognized the novelty of doing so. At least since the advent of industrial capitalism, however, intellectual discourse has been replete with allusions to phenomena strikingly akin to those that have garnered the attention of recent theorists of globalization. Nineteenth and twentieth-century philosophy, literature, and social commentary include numerous references to an inchoate yet widely shared awareness that experiences of distance and space are inevitably transformed by the emergence of high-speed forms of transportation (for example, rail and air travel) and communication (the telegraph or telephone) that dramatically heighten possibilities for human interaction across existing geographical and political divides.”

Our research problem evolves from multiple layers and interferences of areas of ‘globalization’, which result in a network of associated semantic and concretely in the world existing fields for the concept ‘globalization. Associated concepts of ‘globalization’, which find their usage in the public discourses, are either implicitly implemented in the discourse or *expressis verbis* formulated in the text.

The ‘Globalization’ of Economy

The ‘Globalization’ of Politics

The ‘Globalization’ of Culture

The ‘Globalization’ of Health Issues

The ‘Globalization’ of Education

Associated Concepts of 'Globalization'

The concept of 'globalization' itself is an abstract concept, which in the simplest literal understanding can be described as the process of making something part of the world. Here a certain ubiquity is the rhetorically unspoken elliptical part of the world, which allows it to have become a buzzword in the every-day-language and a term suitable for many phenomena in the world of the 21st century. The terminology of 'globalization' is part of the 'public discourse' and the research terminology, which incorporated the terms or even created them. So McLuhan's term 'global village' is here a prominent example. Lule (2012) extended McLuhan's concept now using the expression 'global village of Babel'. The terminology of 'globalization' has been recorded and put in dictionaries. Jones (2006) and Wunderlich and Warrier (2007) edited a *Dictionary of Globalization*. Silbey's article *Globalization* was published in the *Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology* (2006, 245-248). Amavilah (2009) wrote in *National Symbols, Globalization, and the Well-being of Nations* that 'discourse' as an academic subject is studied in various fields: "Studies of discourse have roots in a range of theoretical traditions that investigate the relations between language, structure and agency. The notion of 'discourse' is the subject of heated debate. It has become one of the key critical terms in the vocabulary of the humanities and the social sciences, so it is not surprising that it is contentious." Lewis (2013) wrote in *Language, Culture, and the Globalization of Discourse*: "The concept of globalisation, like that of culture, is elastic. (...) On the economics front, it is commonly assumed to refer to a group of interdependent economic tendencies which include greater international capital mobility, changes in international trading practices, development of worldwide production networks, increased labour mobility, and integration of financial markets." In *Language and Globalization* Fairclough (2007) explored the effects of language in the processes of globalization. 'Discourses of globalization' are treated by Fairclough (2007, 33-54). A representative of the history of ideas promoting the idea of 'globalization' is the German philosopher Sloterdijk who implemented the concept into the humanities. Nevertheless, 'globalization' is neither a concept of the humanities nor a concept of modern academic disciplines. The concept was created in a non-academic context and its ambivalent character will in the following section be examined.

3. METHODOLOGY: THE STUDY OF DISCOURSE OF THE 21ST CENTURY AS DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE USE OF THE CONCEPT ‘GLOBALIZATION’

In this section we review standpoints and describe our methodological approach. Most researchers study the phenomenon ‘globalization’ as a phenomenon occurring in the public discourse of the late 20th and 21st century. As phenomenon of discourse ‘globalization’ is a method of communication taking place in symbolic interaction via language. The discourse of ‘globalization’ refers to an issue, which itself lacks any clear definition. Instead of this definition the discourse of ‘globalization’ sets in accordance with logical philosophy the endless items of one class of things under the category of ‘globalization’. The ‘universe of discourse’ is built up this way and allows items to be classified as group of things belonging to ‘globalization’. Robertson and Khondker (2010, 135) argued that “the word ‘globalization’ has become so fuzzy and used with such a variety of different meanings that a general theory of globalization must acknowledge and incorporate various discourses. The most prominent current usage of the term ‘globalization’ is undoubtedly associated with the global expansion of the market form of economy.” Hirst and Thompson see (2005, 11) “the standard globalization literature as little more than a collection of anecdotes, impressions, and individual facts taken out of context and arranged to suggest that, taken together, they constitute the “phenomenon” of globalization.” Steger (2005, 11) uses the term ‘globalization’ as follows: “In part, its conceptual unwieldiness arises from the fact that global flows occur in different physical and mental dimensions, usefully divided by Arjun Appadurai into ‘ethnoscapes’, ‘technoscapes’, ‘mediascapes’, ‘finanscapes’, and ‘ideoscapes’.” Moghri wrote in *Globalization as a Discourse* (2012): “Discourse theory is a main and important theory in analyzing political and social matters and affairs. Discursive analyzing of globalization is a new subject in debate of globalization. Globalization is a multidimensional new phenomenon which has more affection in many dimensions of politics, culture, social and economic of human life. Nowadays, there are many theories and views of globalization in different scopes.”

Even though discourses seem to be open and allow any class of item to fall under the classification of ‘globalization’, where are limits of discourse. The limits of discourse are on the one hand set by the limitations of the symbolic intercourse of linguistic communication. On the other hand, the symbolic interaction limits by its boundaries to the human

mind and the reality around the human. As for the cognitive linguistic area, the conceptualization of terms like 'globalization' it can be assumed that the human mind operates with a set of limiting borders linguists call 'frames' and limitations of associates meanings to the term. Fiss and Hirsch used the sociological concepts of 'framing' and 'sensemaking' in order to demonstrate that we construct our environment using these filters. Fiss and Hirsch (2005, 32) stated that the concept of framing "captures the processes by which actors influence the interpretations of reality among various audiences. (...) "Like framing, the concept of sensemaking implies that the world does not come to us in "raw form," but that we actively construct it, often using pre-fabricated vocabularies or schemas." Fiss and Hirsch (2005, 45) in their analysis came to the result that "the negative frame depicts globalization as increasing the potential for economic crisis, threatening the livelihoods of workers, resulting in unemployment and poverty. The neutral frame describes globalization as a natural, evolutionary, and largely inevitable development, characterized primarily by increasing cross-national flows of capital. Finally, the positive frame points to the potential gains and benefits of globalization." Kornprobst and Zaiotti (2008, 18) wrote that "despite the varying representations of globalization, it is still possible to identify dominant themes in the globalization literature: The first is the change in the spatial organization of social, economic, political and cultural life; and second, is the increasing awareness of this context. (...) The second dimension points to how individuals and groups identify with and imagine an emerging global space. In this dimension, empirical measurements of globalization are considered to invariably fall short of assessing and illuminating the full significance and impact of globalizing processes." Foucault dedicated one chapter of his *The Archaeology of Knowledge* to the relations of discourse, which he characterizes as the limit of the discourse. The discourse is a pragmatic and evident document of itself and as such a powerful rhetorical device. Neither the language of the discourse nor the environment determinates the discourse, but the practice of the discourse. Discourse relations are 'at the limits of discourse' is Foucault's expression to describe the instant and ingressive power of the discourse, which in neither a rhetorical text internal nor an exterior relationship to the world. Foucault (2013) in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* gives the most concise definition of discourses in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* stating: "Discourses are the practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak." Foucault (2013) wrote that "if one wished to define this discourse by a codified and normative system of statement, one would have to

recognize that this medicine disintegrated as soon as it appeared and that it really found its formulation only in Bichat and Laennec.” Foucault (2013) wrote that “it would be quite wrong to see discourse as a place where previously established objects are laid one after another like words on a page. But the above enumeration is inadequate for a second reason. It has located, one after another, several planes of differentiation in which the objects of discourse may appear.” Foucault (2013) wrote that “discursive relations are not, as we can see, internal to discourse: they do not connect concepts or words with one another; they do not establish a deductive or rhetorical structure between propositions or sentences. Yet they are not relations exterior to discourse, relations that might limit it, or impose certain forms upon it, or force it, in certain circumstances, to state certain things. They are, in a sense, at the limit of discourse: they offer it objects of which it can speak, or rather (for this image of offering presupposes that objects are formed independently of discourse), they determine the group of relations that discourse must establish in order to speak of this or that object, in order to deal with them, name them, analyse them, classify them, explain them, etc. These relations characterize not the language (langue) used by discourse, nor the circumstances in which it is deployed, but discourse itself as a practice.”

The methodological approach here requires the critical analysis of the concept ‘globalization’ in the framework of the contemporary settings of ‘discourse’ and vice versa. It requires the critical distinction between the appearance of discursive material as words, terms, and metaphorical constructions employed by promoting organizations of ‘globalization’. So linguistic-semantic, semiotic, and rhetorical aspects help understand the concept of ‘globalization’. While rhetoric persuades with the ornate formal language it employs, the discourse is the practical form of the establishment of the objects, which are presented in the discourse. Foucault and Laclau showed is that the discourse is an exchange of signs. In other words, discourse is not only a textual format of representation, but it opens and accesses all the corners of the semiotic triangle between our reality, the medium language or any other medium, and our mind.

MIND

Discourse as Formation of the Mind

Δ

WORLD OF REALITY LANGUAGE / MEDIUM

Discourse as Formation of Reality Discourse as Formation of the Medium Language

The Semiotic Triangle: Discourse as Practice of the Formation of Items

The discourse is both the unlimited contents and structure of a communication in a community communicated via media technical means. The discourse is made up by sequences of follow-up of discourse contributions and the association of meaning carrying contributions. The contributions of discourse are 'statements' in the Foucaultian sense, which produce semiotic relationships of signs. The contributions of discourse can have various forms; the discourse is not formally regulated; the participating members of the discourse community contribute to the discourse, set its formal conditions, and regulate it. The discourses built networks according to their networks and technical means. The discourse has a lack of a physical territory and real-time and life communication. The discourse of the age of globalization reflects concepts of globalization. The discourse goes across media and is topic-related. Personal aspects are not important. The discourse has become a non-historical configuration of connected symbols. History and the knowledge of the past are not important as discursive features, which are argumentative aspects without historical dimension. Also the place of the discourse is not important, since media allow the connection between the carriers of the discourse.

4. THE SEMIOTICS OF GLOBALIZATION — DISCOURSE OF GLOBALIZATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY: A DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNICATION VIA SIGNS

4.1. *THE SIGNS OF GLOBALIZATION: SYMBOLIC SOCIETY OF GLOBALIZATION: NODES AND THE LANGUAGE OF 'FACTIVITY' OF THE DISCOURSE OF THE 21ST CENTURY.*

As Foucault stated, discourse is performed via signs. In this part we look at the signs, which contribute to the discourse of globalization. The words, which built the inventory of the language for 'globalization', are partly purely metaphorically used, partly they are combinations of compounds, which consist of a realistic part and a metaphorical part joint in one word. Another kind of word used in the inventory of 'globalization' is the abstract noun for a quality ('homogenization') or the abstract noun for a process ('globalization'). A symbol is something that represents something else by association, resemblance, or convention. The word derived from Latin *symbolum* for 'token' and 'mark' and Greek

symbolon used for a token for identification (Collins Thesaurus of the English Language, 2002). De Saussure distinguished between the ‘signified’ and the ‘signifier’ as the two parts for the sign.

The word ‘globalization’, usually considered a term in a specialized terminology, is also actually just a metaphor of space attached to the grammatical form *zion* for the semantic meaning of a process. In Latin *globus* means ‘round body’, ‘ball’, ‘sphere’, ‘globe’. *Hemisphaerium* is ‘half-globe’. *Sphaera* means ‘ball’, ‘globe’, ‘sphere’. *Tellus* means ‘earth’ and ‘globe’. The globe is a basic symbol of the discourse of ‘globalization’. This symbol can have various forms: As metaphor and allegory it is ‘globalization’ in figurative language. As image it is ‘globalization’ in visual or visualized media. As sign it stands for ‘globalization’ of a representative item. As representation is the process of globalization by a representing item. As token it is ‘globalization’ by an item. As figure it is ‘globalization’ in a personification. The pre-linguistic symbolic concepts of the signification of ‘globalization’ are the basic forms, which as symbols appear semantically encoded in the words of the discourse of ‘globalization’. The circle is a symbolic concept of ‘globalization’. According to the *Dictionary of Symbolism* (2013), the circle is a universal symbol for totality. In Latin *globus* means ‘round body’, ‘ball’, ‘sphere’, ‘globe’. *Hemisphaerium* is ‘half-globe’. *Sphaera* means ‘ball’, ‘globe’, ‘sphere’. *Tellus* means ‘earth’ and ‘globe’. Shakespeare uses the phrase “this distracted globe” in *Hamlet* (i. 5. 97) for a confused head (Dyce, 1904). Basic symbolic concepts have a representational function in the discourse of the process in globalization.

WANDERER	Migration of Humans
CIRCLE	
GLOBE	One World-Principle; Unitarian idea
INTERNET	Connectivity
GLOBAL MIND	The Human Cognitive Performance under the paradigm of ‘globalization’
Basic Symbolic Concept Representational Function in the Process in Globalization	

Concepts of Symbols and Discourse Feature of Globalization

4.2. TERMS AND CONCEPTS OF GLOBALIZED AND INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH: GLOBALIZATION AS CONCEPT — GLOBALIZATION AS AN IDEOLOGY — GLOBALIZATION AS A UNIVERSAL PROCESS

The glossary of general globalization terms of *Global Envision*, Lechner’s *Glossary of Globalization* (2013) and the *Glossary of Globalization, Trade and Health Terms of WHO* are examples for the terminology associated to ‘globalization. Here we find terms for different aspects of ‘globalization’. The terms for areas of ‘globalization’ we can distinguish as classifications of ‘globalization’ as a concept, an ideology, and a process. The concept is here the basic mental and linguistic construct, the ideology means here the visualized and theoretical aspect of the ‘globalization’, and the process refers to de facto existing historical aspects.

Globalization as a Concept Fields of ‘Globalization’	Globalization as an Ideology Political Aspects Qualities	Globalization as a Process Historical and Developmental Aspects
<i>Cultural globalization</i> <i>Economic globalization</i> <i>Political globalization</i> <i>Market globalization</i> <i>Globalization of education</i> <i>Legal globalization</i> <i>(mondialization)</i> <i>Financial globalization</i> <i>Ethical globalization</i>	<i>Periphery</i> <i>Sovereignty</i> <i>Supraterritoriality</i> <i>Transparency</i> Organization <i>World Government</i> <i>Global Governance</i> <i>Multinational Corporation</i> <i>Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs)</i> <i>Developing Countries</i> <i>Civil Society</i> <i>Human Capital</i> <i>Cosmopolitanism</i> <i>Cultural Imperialism</i>	<i>Communication</i> <i>Migration</i> <i>Deterritorialization</i> <i>Commodification</i> <i>Homogenization</i> <i>Development</i> <i>Economic Growth</i>

	<i>Fundamentalism</i> <i>Multiculturalism</i> <i>Neoliberalism</i> <i>Protectionism</i> <i>Universalism</i>	
	<i>Metaphors / Images</i> <i>Global Distillation</i> <i>Global Surveyor</i> <i>Global Village</i> <i>Global Warming</i>	

The terminology of ‘globalization’ entails terms for institutions of ‘globalization’, terms for ideas of processes of values of ‘globalization’, terms for processes of ‘globalization’, and terms for values of ‘globalization’. We can call these words ‘terms’, since they refer to ‘globalization’ exclusively and are used by institutions promoting ‘globalization’ as thesaurus of their specific professional jargon. A limitation of the terms is also that they make meaning only in the context of the discourse of ‘globalization’. Nevertheless, the majority of these terms are actually fabricated metaphors, when evaluated as linguistic elements of texts.

4.3. ‘SIGNIFYING MEDIA’ FOR THE SYMBOLIC STRUCTURE OF DISCOURSE OF MASS MEDIA COMMUNICATION: THE FRAMEWORK OF CONCEPTS AND TERMS OF COMMUNICATIVE DISCOURSE

Frames are the equivalent structures of the mind for the ‘terms’ used in linguistic communication, where we set the borders of a specific issue by the use of a specified and specifying word, which is called term. The framework of our mind is the equivalent of the cognitive structure of the human to the terminology, which we share in a language. The borders in our world are the equivalent structure for the reality we experience. This is the semiotic disposition of the relationship of mind, world, and language in the terms of cognitive linguistics. Frames are in the theory of Lakoff cognitive structures of the human thinking. Framing as a discursive strategy sets the boundaries for the human thinking as metalinguistic categories. As such, framing is considered to be a powerful method of persuasion. Frames are set according to one’s own interests and in this regard they are different from

neuter categories of thinking, which philosophers aim to establish. The framework of concepts and terms of communicative discourse in the settings of digitalized mass media presentations of international organizations is the condition of the mediated communication: Independent communication without the barriers of time and place, which Kant once called categories of our framework of existence; the discourse can be conducted under a ubiquitous condition. This access from all areas and communicability of everything is a feature of the 'globalization'. It is an example for the application of 'globalization' and as a tool this mediated communication allows to globalize other areas of life. Media signify in mass communication processes Barthes (2013) in *Elements of Semiology* stated and referred to de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics*, where Saussure "postulated the existence of a general science of signs, or Semiology, of which linguistics would form only one part." Barthes used the term 'signifying media' for the practice of mass communication: "There is no doubt that the development of mass communications confers particular relevance today upon the vast field of signifying media, just when the success of disciplines such as linguistics, information theory, formal logic and structural anthropology provide semantic analysis with new instruments. There is at present a kind of demand for semiology, stemming not from the fads of a few scholars, but from the very history of the modern world." Dijk (1989) gives us an answer, when we question about the agents of the society in the age of 'globalization', which communicates via symbols. It is the corporate society, which he calls 'symbolic elite, and which can be put in contrast to the 'civic society'. The term 'civil society' comprises in the usage of 'globalization' terminology all "relationships not controlled by the state or, more commonly, all forms of association outside of state and market" (Lechner 2013). Dijk (1989, 23) in *Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power* wrote that "the production mode of articulation is controlled by what may be called the "symbolic elites," such as journalists, writers, artists, directors, academics, and other groups that exercise power on the basis of "symbolic capital". They have relative freedom, and hence relative power, in deciding about the discourse genres within their domain of power and determine topics, style, or presentation of discourse. (...) They are the manufacturer of public knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, norms, values, morals, and ideologies. Hence their symbolic power is also a form of ideological power." Dijk (1989, 25) in *Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power* wrote: "If most forms of discursive power in our society are of the persuasive type as claimed earlier, then, despite the essential and often ultimate con-

trol of the modes of production and distribution (especially for mass mediated discourse) the decisive influence on the "minds" of the people is symbolically rather than economically controlled. Similarly, recognizing the control expressed over the less powerful in the socioeconomic domain (money, jobs, welfare), a major component in the exercise and maintenance of power is ideological, and is based on various types of acceptance, negotiation, and challenge, and consensus." The common distinctions between communication in the age of 'globalization' comprise 'global communication', 'transnational communication', 'international communication', 'cross-cultural Communication' and 'intercultural communication', which signify the specific global settings of communication. These communication styles are usually communication styles of the corporate society and are communication styles beyond personal communication. These communication styles usually involve mass media as tools. The concept of 'globalization' is an example par excellence for such a process of the 'signifying media'. The mass media have participated in the creation of 'globalization', if we understand it as a worldwide communication process. As producers of the discourse of 'globalization' the media, especially the digital media, also are the evidential argument for the existence of 'globalization'. The signs of the discourse of 'globalization' are present in the media for the conduction of the discourse:

Written and spoken contributions to the discourse of 'globalization'

Images as contributions of the discourse of 'globalization'

Media as contributions of the discourse of 'globalization'

Media of the Discourse of 'Globalization'

In the *Glossary of Globalization, Trade and Health Terms of WHO* is written regarding 'global communication': "Global communications play an extremely important role in the cultural dimensions of globalization. The term refers to the use of new information communication technologies such as the Internet, mobile phones, e-mail, and satellite TV. These technologies are becoming cheaper and more widely available. The increasing ease and speed of global communication has both direct and indirect influences on health." (Glossary of Globalization, 2013). In terms of the images for this discourse, a specific iconographic and emblematic tradition has developed in association with the media promoting 'globalization'. The elements of this visualized concept are commonly the descriptions of a globe or world map and humans, in many images from different countries and nationalities,

which are harmoniously connected. Written and spoken discourses also circulate around the idea of a world, which is united.

4.4. HOW METAPHORS PRODUCE 'GLOBALIZATION' AS 'SYMBOLIC INTERACTION':

THE ARTIFICIAL AND THE COGNITIVE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF 'GLOBALIZATION' IN DISCOURSE

Musolff (2012, 301-310) discussed the metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. The study of figurative language use in the writings available in the mass media of the late 20th and early 21st century contributes to questions of their functions usually answered by rhetorical analysis and critical discourse analysis. The metaphor is a fundamental means of the establishment of concepts and arguments. A general distinction exists between the artificial metaphors of rhetoric and the 'ad hoc' built metaphor, which in linguistics is a part of the cognitive disposition of the human mind; the mental metaphor is not learned and comes from the pre-linguistic background of the human's cognition. While poetic metaphors arise from the rhetorical art, conceptual metaphors arise from the mental disposition of the mind. The metaphors of the texts used in the discourses of 'globalization' have the effect to produce a second reality for the consumers of these texts. The metaphors are the evident text documents, which demonstrate the 'factivity', the intended production, of these metaphors serving as signs. These signs are not signs for something, which exists, but for the created reality, which is symbolically present in the text. The metaphors and semi-metaphors are signs for a created world; this is the persuasive action of these metaphors, The words serve the purpose to be symbolic representations for a created world. The metaphors are the actively working discourse element in the process of 'globalization' as a linguistic process. As conceptual markers of the discourse of 'globalization' the usage of metaphors is not spontaneous, but emerges from the conceptual needs of the metaphorical framework of the concept 'globalization'. So metaphors as the linguistic formal representations of the conceptual background and the idea of 'globalization' are used in order to implement specific aspects into the idea or ideology of 'globalization'. These words are compounds with the imprecise association between 'global' and an object and are less than symbolic, since they only present something in the framework of the other terms of 'globalization'. The UK based programme *TLRP (Teaching and Learning Research Programme)* of the *Economic and Social Research Council* and the *Institute of Education* of the University of

London in *Education, Globalisation and the Knowledge Economy. A Commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme* (2008) used for example terms like ‘global skills race’ (4) and ‘global skills web’ (7). These terms have not become prominent buzzwords of ‘globalization’ like the ‘global village’. The claim of being a term, which is often formulated by representatives of ‘globalization’, is also dubious, since these metaphors are created and serve only as ideological words and carriers of the idea of ‘globalization’. Lu wrote on ‘World Government’ in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: ‘World government’ refers to the idea of all humankind united under one common political authority. Arguably, it has not existed so far in human history, yet proposals for a unified global political authority have existed since ancient times—in the ambition of kings, popes and emperors, and the dreams of poets and philosophers.” The Greek language has already used words for ‘global governance’ like *κοσμοδιοικητικός* for ‘governing the world’ and *κοσμοκράτωρ* for ‘lord of the world’. The verb *κοσμοποιέω* means ‘make the world’, the *κοσμοποιητής* is a creator of the world, and *κοσμοποιός* is the process of creating the world. Also *κοσμουργέω* means ‘create the world’ and the *κοσμουργός* is the creator of the world. In Greek *πάγκοσμος* is used for an entire world and *παγκόσμιος* means ‘common to all the world’ in the sense today ‘global’ is used. In the fragment *Cosmos Basileus* Nancy writes: “The unity of a world is not one: it is made of a diversity, including disparity and opposition. It is made of it, which is to say that it is not added to it and does not reduce it. The unity of a world is nothing other than its diversity, and its diversity is, in turn, a diversity of worlds. A world is a multiplicity of worlds, the world is a multiplicity of worlds, and its unity is the sharing out [partage] and the mutual exposure in this world of all its worlds.” (Nancy 2007, 93). The most known metaphor of ‘globalization’ is the ‘global village’ of McLuhan. This metaphor made its way into the research about ‘globalization. So Kornprobst and Zaiotti (2008, 2) wrote that “globalization has been represented and articulated in a diversity of contexts, with different implications for culture, economics, and politics. Given the interconnectedness wrought by a vast array of global processes, particularly telecommunications, many describe the new dynamics of globalization as generating a ‘global village’ to represent an inclusive and cosmopolitan global society.” In the *Glossary of Globalization, Trade and Health Terms of WHO* is written regarding communication and the metaphor of the ‘global village’ is considered a term: “For many, the result of global communications is the global village, a term referring to the increased contact between cultures, identities and

views across national boundaries that results from the application of modern communications. This represents a positive view of globalization in which societies come closer together and develop shared values and interests.” (*Glossary of Globalization, Trade and Health Terms of WHO*). Scheuermann (2013) in the article *Globalization* of the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* wrote on the relation between ‘globalization’ and ‘postmodernity’: “The unabated proliferation of high-speed technologies is probably the main source of the numerous references in intellectual life since 1950 to the annihilation of distance. The Canadian cultural critic Marshall McLuhan made the theme of a technologically based “global village,” generated by social “acceleration at all levels of human organization,” the centerpiece of an anxiety-ridden analysis of new media technologies in the 1960s (McLuhan 1964, 103).” (Scheuermann, 2013).

4. DISCUSSION: ‘BORDERS’, ‘FRAMES’, AND ‘TERMS’ OF ‘GLOBALIZATION’: A THEORY OF THE CONCEPTUALIZATION OF REALITY AS CONCEPTUAL PRODUCT

We have seen that the concept of ‘framing’ is in cognitive linguistics used to describe the borders of a mental configuration of an object or issue. Comparable to the borders of the real world this configuration is done intentionally or arbitrarily. A similar phenomenon occurs, when we look at language: Also language entails arbitrarily set limits of meanings in the specific terminology of a special group of communicators. Such a group shares the terminology as a specific code only understandable for them and usually serving as a reference to specific complex aspects of reality. In contrast to the simple semantic and semiotic relation between the general vocabulary of a language, which is shared among many languages and is easily to identify as a words with a clear reference to the reality, ‘terms’ of a terminology are complex sequences referring to processes of reality and abstraction. The metaphors are a specific kind of words, which could be described as the terms of the professional rhetorician.

With the semiotic triangle we can describe the limits of the conceptualization of ideas like ‘globalization’ as follows:

MIND

Borders as ‘frames’



MEDIUM REALITY

Borders as ‘terms’ Borders as frontiers etc.

The Semiotic Triangle: ‘Frames’, ‘Frontiers’, and ‘Terms’ as Borders of Discourse

In the case of the idea of ‘globalization’ the terminology is employed to describe the theoretical framework. So usually abstract nouns are the framework, which as an unreal construct and serves like a mental layer covering the situations in reality. In other words: Things or processes that happen are identified and described not with their actual names, but with the meanings form the set of the terminology of ‘globalization’. The reality we experience or the mental representation of reality is coded in the conceptual framework of the discursive structures of ‘globalization’. This ‘re-naming’ of things promotes the subordination of the reality under the desired aspects of the mental framework. Foucault pointed out that the discourse is a limited issue by its structure; operating as a generating tool for the treatment of things, the discourse generates them as a set of items, which belong to the same class. With the classification as ‘belonging to the world’ actually and virtually everything can be listed under the class of things belonging to ‘globalization’. So the discourse of ‘globalization’ can be endlessly performed. In contemporary scholarly writings the term ‘discourse of globalization’ covers this issue as an application of the ‘universe of discourse’. On the other hand, the ‘discourse of globalization’ has limits, which not only derive from the theoretical and artificial wordings of the terminology, which is supplied by rhetorical metaphors and other figures of speech. The discourse is a generalizing form of setting an agenda; the discourse cannot enter the individual and the personal realm of the human. Interestingly, that what was depicting in the Greek language the *‘idiotes’*, the idiot as a private person not participating in the public state affairs, has changed to the citizen of the civic life in the naming of the terminology of ‘globalization’. The discourse of ‘globalization’ is a discourse, which aims at the integration of all its elements as issues of the world, and this classification is the actual process of a powerful selection of an agenda setting. It depends on the perspective of the communicated linguistic contents to judge about the linguistic framework of ‘globalization’: Designed as terms within the community of promoters of this idea, the linguistic contents can be classified as terminology; but a critical revision demonstrates also the ‘factivity’ and construction of these terms letting them appear as metaphors of an ideological perspective of their producers. Here the process of classifica-

tion determinates the position of 'things' in a hierarchical or otherwise selective process. As a consequence, limitations like historically set borders of nations and ethnic cultural heritage fall under the classification as marketable values, assets, or qualities.

References:

- Amavilah, Voxi Heinrich; 2009, National Symbols, Globalization, and the Well-being of Nations; <http://mpira.ub.uni-muenchen.de/14882/>, 2013-10-20
- Barthes, Roland; 2013. Elements of Semiology; <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/barthes.htm>, 2013-10-23
- Brown, Phillip; Lauder, Hugh; Ashton, David; 2008, Education, Globalisation and the Knowledge Economy. A Commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme. TLRP Teaching and Learning Research Programme. Economic and Social Research Council 2008; <http://www.tlrp.org/pub/documents/globalisationcomm.pdf>, 2013-10-23
- Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology; 2006, Bryan Turner (ed.), Cambridge: University Press
- Collins English Dictionary; 2009, Discourse; <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/discourse>, 2013-10-12
- Collins Thesaurus of the English Language; 2002, "Symbol"; <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/symbol>, 2013-05-23
- Dictionary of Symbolism; 2013-05-23, Originally Constructed by Allison Protas. Augmented and refined by Geoff Brown and Jamie Smith in 1997 and by Eric Jaffe in 2001, University of Michigan; <http://www.umich.edu/~umfandsf/symbolismproject/symbolism.html/C/>, 2013-05-23
- Dijk, Teun A. van; 1989, Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power; in: Communication Yearbook nr 12: 18-592; <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Structures%20of%20discourse%20and%20structures%20of%20power.pdf>, 2013-10-23
- Dyce, Alexander; 1904, A General Glossary to Shakespeare's Works; Boston: Dana Estes and Company; <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.03.0067%3Aentry%3Dglobe>, 2013-05-23
- Education, globalization and the Knowledge Economy; 2008, TLRP, ESRC; www.tlrp.org/pub/documents/globalisationcomm.pdf, 2014-03-15
- Fairclough, Norman; 2007, Language and Globalization; London and New York: Routledge
- Fiss, Peer C; Hirsch, Paul M.; (2005), The Discourse of Globalization. Framing and Sensemaking of an Emerging Concept; in: American Sociological Review nr 70: 29-52; <http://www-bcf.usc.edu/~fiss/Fiss%20and%20Hirsch%20ASR%202005.pdf>
- Foucault, Michel; 2013, The Archaeology of Knowledge; <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/foucault.htm>, 2013-05-23

- Global Envision; 2013, General Globalization Terms; <http://www.globaleenvision.org/library/25/1618>, 2013-08-23
- Glossary of Globalization; 2013, Trade and Health Terms.WHO; <http://www.who.int/trade/glossary/en/>, 2013-05-23
- Greek Translation Tool; 2013, Discourse; <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/definitionlookup?type=begin&q=discourse&lang=greek>, 2013-10-23
- Hirst, Paul; Thompson, Grahame; 2005, Globalization. A Short Story; Princeton: University Press
- Jones, Andrew; 2006, Dictionary of Globalization; Cambridge: Polity Press
- Kornprobst, Markus; Zaiotti, Ruben; 2008, Introduction: Mirrors, Magicians and Mutinies of Globalization; in: Kornprobst, Markus; Pouliot, Vincent; Shah, Nisha; Zaiotti, Ruben (eds.). Metaphors of Globalization. Mirrors, Magicians and Mutinies; New York: Palgrave Macmillan: 1-24; <http://www.sant.ox.ac.uk/people/knicolaidis/introduction.doc>, 2013-10-23
- Latin Translation Tool. Discourse; 2014-03-13; <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/definitionlookup?type=begin&q=discourse&lang=la>
- Lechner, Frank; 2013, Glossary of Globalization; <http://sociology.emory.edu/faculty/globalization/glossary.html>, 2013-08-23
- Lewis, Diana M.; 2013, Language, Culture, and the Globalization of Discourse; [http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/IC%20and%20Diplomacy%20\(FINAL\)](http://www.diplomacy.edu/sites/default/files/IC%20and%20Diplomacy%20(FINAL)), 2013-08-23
- Lu, Catherine; 2013, "World Government." Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/world-government/>, 2013-06-23
- Lule, Jack; 2012, Globalization and Media: Global Village of Babel; Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield
- Moghri, Rahmat Abbastabar; 2012, Globalization as a Discourse; in: Journal of Law, Policy and Globalization, 4; <http://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JLPG/article/.../2046>, 2013-05-23
- Musolff, Andreas; 2012, The Study of Metaphor as Part of Critical Discourse Analysis; in: Critical Discourse Studies nr 9 (3), 301-310
- Nancy. Jean Luc; 2007, The Creation of the World or 'Globalization'; Albany: State University of New York Press
- Protas, Allison; 2001, Circle; Dictionary of Symbolism; <http://www.umich.edu/~umfandsf/symbolismproject/symbolism.html/C/>, 2013-05-23
- Random House; 2013, Discourse; <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/discourse>, 2013-10-23
- Robertson, Roland; Khondker, Habib Haque; 2010, Discourses of Globalization. Preliminary Considerations; in: European Journal of Social Theory nr 13, 135-152
- Scheuerman, William; 2013, Globalization; Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/>, 2013-09-23
- Silbey, Susan S.; 2006, Globalization; in: Turner, Bryan (ed.); Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology; Cambridge: University Press, 245-248
- Steger, Manfred B.; 2005, Ideologies of Globalization; in: Journal of Political Ideologies nr 10 (1), 11-30

WHO; 2013, Glossary of Globalization, Trade and Health Terms; <http://www.who.int/trade/glossary/en/>,
2013-05-23

Wunderlich, Jens-Uwe; Warriar, Meera; 2007, A Dictionary of Globalization; London and New York:
Routledge