The Handbook of
Language and Globalization

Edited by
Nikolas Coupland

WILEY-BLACKWELL

Praise for *The Handbook of Language and Globalization*

Winner of the 2011 British Association of Applied Linguistics Book Prize.

"An enlightening and engaging collection by eminent international scholars. A major resource for the study of theoretical and pragmatic approaches to Global English, including concerns about 'marginalization' and 'murder' of languages."
Braj B. Kachru, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois

"This *Handbook* provides a fascinating exposition of the complex, multidimensional nature of globalization as it pertains to the world's languages. Coupland has marshalled authors at the forefront of their fields who offer a diversity of approaches and do not flinch from disputes and challenging questions. I suspect that this *Handbook* will transform the discourse on globalization within linguistics and will impel a reconsideration of whether linguistic diversity is inevitably impacted by global processes."
Margaret Florey, Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity

The Handbook of Language and Globalization

Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics

This outstanding multi-volume series covers all the major subdisciplines within linguistics today and, when complete, will offer a comprehensive survey of linguistics as a whole.

Already published:

The Handbook of Child Language
Edited by Paul Fletcher and Brian MacWhinney

The Handbook of Phonological Theory, Second Edition
Edited by John A. Goldsmith, Jason Riggle, and Alan C. L. Yu

The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory
Edited by Shalom Lappin

The Handbook of Sociolinguistics
Edited by Florian Coulmas

The Handbook of Phonetic Sciences, Second Edition
Edited by William J. Hardcastle and John Laver

The Handbook of Morphology
Edited by Andrew Spencer and Arnold Zwicky

The Handbook of Japanese Linguistics
Edited by Natsuko Tsujimura

The Handbook of Linguistics
Edited by Mark Aronoff and Janie Rees-Miller

The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory
Edited by Mark Baltin and Chris Collins

The Handbook of Discourse Analysis
Edited by Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton

The Handbook of Language Variation and Change
Edited by J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes

The Handbook of Historical Linguistics
Edited by Brian D. Joseph and Richard D. Janda

The Handbook of Language and Gender
Edited by Janet Holmes and Miriam Meyerhoff

The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition
Edited by Catherine J. Doughty and Michael H. Long

The Handbook of Bilingualism and Multilingualism, Second Edition
Edited by Tej K. Bhatia and William C. Ritchie

The Handbook of Pragmatics
Edited by Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward

The Handbook of Applied Linguistics
Edited by Alan Davies and Catherine Elder

The Handbook of Speech Perception
Edited by David B. Pisoni and Robert E. Remez

The Handbook of the History of English
Edited by Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los

The Handbook of English Linguistics
Edited by Bas Aarts and April McMahon

The Handbook of World Englishes
Edited by Braj B. Kachru; Yamuna Kachru, and Cecil L. Nelson

The Handbook of Educational Linguistics
Edited by Bernard Spolsky and Francis M. Hult

The Handbook of Clinical Linguistics
Edited by Martin J. Ball, Michael R. Perkins, Nicole Mller, and Sara Howard

The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies
Edited by Silvia Kouwenberg and John Victor Singler

The Handbook of Language Teaching
Edited by Michael H. Long and Catherine J. Doughty

The Handbook of Language Contact
Edited by Raymond Hickey

The Handbook of Language and Speech Disorders
Edited by Jack S. Damico, Nicole Mller, Martin J. Ball

The Handbook of Computational Linguistics and Natural Language Processing
Edited by Alexander Clark, Chris Fox, and Shalom Lappin

The Handbook of Language and Globalization
Edited by Nikolas Coupland

The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics
Edited by Manuel Díaz-Campos

The Handbook of Language Socialization
Edited by Alessandro Duranti, Elinor Ochs, and Bambi B. Schieffelin

The Handbook of Intercultural Discourse and Communication
Edited by Christina Bratt Paulston, Scott F. Kiesling, and Elizabeth S. Rangel

The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics
Edited by Juan Manuel Hernández-Campoy and Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre

The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics
Edited by José Ignacio Hualde, Antxon Olarrea, and Erin O'Rourke

The Handbook of Conversation Analysis
Edited by Jack Sidnell and Tanya Stivers

The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes
Edited by Brian Paltridge and Sue Starfield

The Handbook of Language and Globalization

Edited by

Nikolas Coupland

WILEY-BLACKWELL
A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Publication

This paperback edition first published 2013

Edition History: Blackwell Publishing Ltd (hardback, 2010)

Blackwell Publishing was acquired by John Wiley & Sons in February 2007. Blackwell's publishing program has been merged with Wiley's global Scientific, Technical, and Medical business to form Wiley-Blackwell.

Registered Office
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Offices
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

For details of our global editorial offices, for customer services, and for information about how to apply for permission to reuse the copyright material in this book please see our website at www.wiley.com/wiley-blackwell.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The handbook of language and globalization / edited by Nikolas Coupland.
p. cm. – (Blackwell handbooks in linguistics)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-4051-7581-4 (hardcover : alk. Paper) ISBN 978-1-118-34717-1 (paperback : alk. Paper)
1. Language and languages—Globalization—Handbooks, manuals, etc. 2. Languages in contact—Handbooks, manuals, etc. 3. Linguistic change—Handbooks, manuals, etc. 4. Sociolinguistics—Handbooks, manuals, etc. I. Coupland, Nikolas, 1950–
P130.5.H358 2010
306.44–dc22

2010003118

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Cover image: August Macke, Playing Forms, 1914. Städtisches Kunstmuseum, Bonn. Photo © Erich Lessing/akg-images.
Cover design by Workhaus

Set in 10/12 pt Palatino by Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited

1 2013

Contents

Illustrations

Acknowledgments

This volume found its origins in a research programme titled 'Language and Global Communication' funded by the Leverhulme Trust (Grant F/00 407 / D) to the Centre for Language and Communication Research at Cardiff University, 2001–2007 (see http://www.cf.ac.uk/encap/globalcomm). Colleagues and I are very grateful to the Trust for their support.

My former colleague Theo van Leeuwen, coordinated, directed and inspired the programme for four years until a career move took him away form Cardiff, at which point I took on the coordinating role, but with Theo's continuing guidance and involvement. About 14 Cardiff colleagues played some significant part in the programme's development and in the dissemination of its findings, although not all of them appear in the pages of the Handbook.

Under the aegis of the 'Language and Global Communication' programme, one international conference and a regular series of workshops were held, and several of the contributors to the present volume participated in those events. The Leverhulme Trust has therefore supported this volume in more ways than might be initially apparent, which, once again, I very gratefully acknowledge.

I am particularly grateful to my colleague Adam Jaworski for the leading role he has played in many aspects of our work on globalisation, and not only in his pioneering research in the sociolinguistics of global tourism.

As seems to be inevitable with Handbook-length projects, this volume has been a long time coming. I thank the earliest on-time contributors for their patience, and colleagues at Wiley-Blackwell for theirs too, also for their professional guidance.

Every effort has been made to trace copyright holders and to obtain their permission for the use of copyright material. The publisher apologizes for any errors or omissions in the above list and would be grateful if notified of any corrections that should be incorporated in future reprints or editions of this book.

NC
July 2009

Introduction: Sociolinguistics in the Global Era

NIKOLAS COUPLAND

The End of Globalization?

The gestation period of this Handbook has been an interesting time for observers of globalization. The international 'credit crunch,' apparently triggered by irresponsible over-lending in the United States but in reality the result of financial laxness on a wider scale, has led to severe economic retrenchment in many parts of the world. Several nation-states have moved to restrict some of the more obvious excesses of global capitalism, initially in the banking and finance sectors. But there are indications of a more general global wariness about flows of money and people, which suggests that national authority and national political initiative are not, after all, in terminal decline. There has also been repeated visible political resistance to fast capitalist globalization: for example the estimated 35,000 people who marched in London in March 2009 in opposition to the agenda of the G20 summit – a meeting of the leaders of the twenty most economically powerful nations – under the slogans "Put people first" and "Jobs, justice, climate." Should we conclude that, after all, this is not such a "runaway world" (Giddens 2002) of rampant globalization?

Academic commentators, including several contributors to this Handbook, observe that, whatever globalization is, it isn't an altogether new phenomenon. Indeed, 'it's nothing new' proves to be one of the least new things to say about globalization, but it is an important observation. As, for example, Mufwene (this volume) points out, colonization in its various modes has been characteristic of more aggressive and more benign encounters between peoples throughout history. Colonization in different eras and contexts meant transnational expansion of economic, military, and cultural sorts. It certainly reshaped global arrangements, including linguistic ones. We are also historically familiar with 'empire,' old and new (Hardt and Negri 2000), in the British case from the mid-seventeenth century, and many have interpreted globalization as latter-day imperialist hegemony, often in the form of westernization or Americanization or McDonaldization (or

The Handbook of Language and Globalization, First Edition. Edited by Nikolas Coupland.

Published 2013 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

other, even more inventive, neologisms of this kind – see Mooney, this volume). So why all this fuss about globalization now?

As Kellner (1989) points out, large-scale shifts to more globally based economic arrangements were predicted and theorized well before our own time. Key voices on *both* sides of early ideological debates about capitalism predicted an increasing globalization of capitalist markets. Adam Smith, for example, anticipated the emergence of a (beneficial and liberalizing, in his view) world market system, while Karl Marx saw global emancipation for the proletariat in the demise of national interests and frameworks and in the onset of internationally grounded revolution. Transnational interdependencies and influences are, once again then, 'nothing new.'

So, as we embark on an exploration of language and globalization, do we in fact believe that globalization currently exists as a new social condition, or that it deserves extensive treatment across the disciplines? Is globalization an economic experiment in retreat, or perhaps a faddish academic concept of the 1990s that refers to historical social processes we were already pretty familiar with? In the rest of this section I would like to make a pitch for the social reality of globalization and for its contemporary importance – both as a social mode that we need to keep probing and as a focus for some new ways of understanding language in society. We have to concede that globalization is complex and multi-faceted, and difficult to delimit chronologically. The concept is often over-consolidated, over-hyped, and under-interpreted. But I want to argue (drawing on the views of many others) that it is an indispensable concept, particularly if we take it as shorthand reference to a cluster of changed and still fast changing social arrangements and priorities which are indeed distinctive and (despite opinions to the contrary) *indeed new*. Having done this, I will try to map out, in four sections that outline the four parts of this volume, how the forthcoming chapters inform our understanding of the many productive and necessary links between 'language' and 'globalization.'

What, then, might persuade us to take globalization seriously and to accept that social analysis needs to be framed in relation to an already globalized and increasingly globalizing world? We might start with a quasi-ethnographic appeal to lived experience and perceptions of social change, say, over the last forty or fifty years. What macro-level social changes have impacted on us (or, at least for the purposes of this initial sketch, on the 'us' defined by the privileged lives lived in the west or the north, and through British eyes)? Answers will be tropes of lifespan discourse: "Back then, things were different…"; "I remember the days when …" But such autobiographical fragments would point to the sorts of social change that constitute globalization. I venture some of my own fragments below.[1] I would say that we have experienced:

- an increasing mediation of culture and greater cultural reflexivity
- the proliferation and speeding up of communication technologies
- a large shift to service-sector work, globally dispersed
- the decline of the (British) Establishment

- failing trust in professional (medical, legal, political) authority
- the growth of the middle class but the accentuation of the rich/poor divide
- greater subservience to global market economics, in the face of its demerits
- an upsurge in consumer culture and many new forms of commodification
- more emphasis on individualism and on projects of the self
- an upsurge in ecological politics and sensibilities on a world-wide scale
- a reduction of the grosser inequalities through gender and sexual orientation
- developing ethnic pluralism, especially in urban settings
- increasingly familiar cultural landscapes, widely dispersed
- national boundaries becoming (perhaps until recently) more permeable
- massively increasing demographic mobility, often for economic reasons
- a shift towards more globally based risks, threats and conflicts.

If a list of this sort were supported by research evidence (and a substantial body of work does support many of these claims), then we could easily recognize three familiar dimensions or application domains of globalization within them: *economic*, *political* and *cultural* globalization (see the discussion of these dimensions in Garrett's chapter, this volume). There are financial motivations, motivations linked to production and consumption, behind many of the changes we might otherwise assume to be 'cultural,' for example in the commodification of history as heritage or in the shaping of globally familiar metropolises. The circulation of global capital is what has homogenized the cities we take to be "world cities" (Friedmann 1986). A sense of local culture often has to be worked up in opposition to, or even within, the mechanisms of, globalized systems – for example when 'the local' is performed for mass audiences on TV or in tourism (Coupland 2009a).

When we observe that people are far more mobile today than in earlier decades (although of course there are severe social class and national restrictions on who actually *is* more mobile), we are reacting not only to technological developments but to how mass media have allowed us to visualize the world's 'distant places' as being within our reach. When we observe that ecological awareness is a development of recent decades, we are seeing how the risks and threats of global economic upscaling, and of course of mobility as part of that, have come to be resisted in newer oppositional discourses. If we see the British Establishment in decline, this is because of wholesale shifts in global political, economic, and cultural *systems*, which need to be seen as interwoven dimensions of how the world has come to be. If there has been some emancipation around gender and sexuality, this has been achieved through activity across transnational networks of various sorts, and so on. My point is simply that there are some general principles at work behind our individual perceptions of relatively recent social change, and that the concept of globalization invites us to reflect critically on changes which are significant, not least in their recency, reach, depth and systematicity.

As Lechner and Boli (2004) point out, there is the difficulty that the word 'globalization' has already become something of a global cliché (and, again, see Garrett's investigation, in this volume, into the variable inferred meanings and

associations of the word 'globalization'). To that extent it is difficult to avoid the objection that subjective generalizations about change may represent a sort of leakage from journalistic or political usage back into personal perceptions and accounts. In fact it is interesting to speculate that, under globalization, mass-mediation reaches deeper into individual psyches and everyday social practice than we might assume. All the same, it would take an impressive level of cynicism to conclude that there was 'nothing new' behind contemporary observations of recent social change and 'nothing new' in the contemporary wave of globalization. It is not part of my brief to review objective sociological evidence in support of the fact that the world has changed, although we live in an era when astounding statistics routinely surface, pointing at least to new *scales* of global interdependencies in contemporary life.[2] At some point too, we need to trust the preponderance of informed opinion in academic literatures. After two decades of claim and counter-claim, globalization theory has achieved a relatively stable consensus, agreeing to set aside several more radical and totalizing arguments but holding to a middle ground. The consensus (though probably not in the chapters of this volume) is that, while globalization is certainly not without precedent, its scale and scope *are* new and detectable in changes over recent decades – and most clearly so since the 1980s. Globalization has certainly has not run its course.

In relation to history and the periodization of globalization, Robertson (1992) noted that McLuhan's idea of 'the global village' (a phrase coined in 1960) and some general notion of global 'shrinkage' entered public as well as academic consciousness fairly soon after World War II. The war itself was an event which clearly encouraged new ways of conceptualizing world orders and systems. Robertson summarizes his own conception of globalization in exactly these terms: the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole. Some key historical events are most commonly associated with the consolidation of the global (or globalized) era. In the anglophone world, these include the beginning of sustained right-wing/conservative periods of political office (Margaret Thatcher in Britain from 1979 and Ronald Reagan in the USA from 1981) and aggressive shifts towards free market, neo-liberal ideologies and policies.[3] In many regions formerly dependent on manufacturing and heavy industry, this period was also associated with rapid and damaging deindustrialization and the outsourcing of manufacturing to cheaper markets in other countries. This shift is in turn linked to a rise in service-sector work and to more emphasis being placed on 'the knowledge economy' (see Heller, this volume, on the new economy), which are inherently more globally structured activities.

The ending of the Cold War (in the late 1980s) and the dissolution of the USSR (in 1991) provided even more self-evident shifts in 'world systems' (in the sense of Wallerstein 1974) and opened up global markets for western cultural and commercial initiatives. Global participation in the internet (from the mid 1990s: see n. 2) and the exponential development of new, globally networked, communication technologies in the same period added to the mix. Therefore, while there are of course historical precursors, over earlier centuries, to most of the general *sorts* of

social process we take to define globalization – demographic mobility, transnational interchange, colonial activity, and even the technologizing of communication, most obviously with the advent of printing – there are also compelling arguments that what we have seen, since 1980, has been of quantitatively and qualitatively different orders. It is in the phenomenal expansion of transnational, global mobility and in the massively increased intensity of commercial and cultural exchange and exploitation that we find a warrant for conceiving of globalization as 'something new,' and indeed (in the words of Appadurai 1996: 27) as something "strikingly new."

Globalization theory is, however, more convincing when it is more nuanced, more cautious, and more contextually refined. Appadurai and many others nowadays have resisted simple linear accounts of globalization, as encountered for example in the McLuhan type of claim to the effect that the world is becoming culturally smaller or more uniform. As Appadurai says:

> Most often the homogenization argument subspeciates into either an argument about Americanization or an argument about commoditization, and very often the two arguments are closely linked. What these arguments fail to consider is that at least as rapidly as forces from various metropolises are brought into new societies they tend to become indigenized in one way or another: this is true of music and housing styles as much as it is true of science and terrorism, spectacles and constitutions. (Appadurai 1996: 29)

This is a persuasive argument that, under the rubric of globalization, we need to explore the *tensions* between sameness and difference, between centripetal and centrifugal tendencies, and between consensus and fragmentation. (This perspective is shared by many contributors to the Handbook, and these tensions are as important in relation to linguistic processes as in other domains.) Globalization is non-linear, just as it is *not* uniformly and (ironically enough) *not* universally and *not* globally experienced. It is better theorized as a complex of processes through which difference as well as uniformity is generated, but in relation to each other. Globalization often produces hybridity and multiplicity (Hall 1996, 1997; Kellner 1989), and the multi-directionality of change has been summarized in the awkward but widely used concept of glocalization (Bauman 1998a, 1998b; Robertson 1995; see Shi-xu, this volume), which expresses the interaction of globalizing and localizing shifts. Importantly, however, it is in the appeal to hybridity and social complexity that we see how it is also necessary to approach globalization from the perspective of late modernity or post-modernity (Bauman 1982), and vice versa.

Different views are held about whether late modernity and globalization (or, more accurately, the social condition of globality) can be, or need to be, distinguished theoretically. But many of the key conditions associated with late modernity – heightened cultural reflexivity and social complexity, indeterminacy and hybridity in personal and social identities, changed thresholds of risk and trust, increased emphasis on individual life-projects and responsibilities, detraditionalization and the decline of institutions (see for instance Beck 1992,

1999; Giddens 1991, 1994; Harvey 1989) – are much easier to appreciate if we situate them in the dynamics of a more globally connected world. As I noted above, mass-mediation, for example, is a powerful factor in the dense representation of cultural difference, and people are more likely to construe alternatives to their inherited selves against this complex backdrop of images and social types. Individualization, in Beck's thesis, is a demonstrable consequence of heightened levels of global consumption, and so on. So globalization matters in the analysis of the transition from modern to late modern social arrangements, and (as many contributors to this book show) there are many specifically sociolinguistic elements to late modernity; late modernity in fact places new emphases on language, meaning, and social semiotics.

Still following an historical track, it is often observed that the earliest tangible evidence of globalization was in economics, where the impact of transnational flows of money and influence became obvious from the 1980s onwards, to some extent challenging the autonomy and authority of states and national governments. Globalization theory has often posited 'the decline of the nation–state' (Evans 1997; Hardt and Negri 2000; Ohmae 1995) – again, with the risk of overgeneralization. National governments of course can – and do – continue to dictate swathes of policy within their own confines, and national boundaries and identities remain significant in many social dimensions. But there are increasingly troublesome domains where states have only limited opportunities to act conclusively on their own, for example in relation (as Beck has recently pointed out)[4] to transnational terrorism, global warming, or economic globalization itself. These are, once again, issues within our own individual realms of experience, and the concept of globalization provides a route into the critical assessment of several of the defining characteristics of our lives.

Appadurai's (1996) concept of "financescapes" (or financial landscapes) was an attempt to point to the new global architecture of financial systems – commodity speculation and rapidly shifting global currency markets – in the same way in which he encouraged us to be aware of new global "ethnoscapes," "mediascapes," "technoscapes," and "ideoscapes" (ideational and ideological landscapes: see Block's discussion of some of these concepts in the present volume). We find a compelling instance of how these 'scapes' work together under globalization in Hardt and Negri's account (2000: 253–4) of the demographic consequences of globalized macroeconomic arrangements: ghettos, favelas, and shantytowns appearing in 'First World' cities, and stock exchanges, banks, and large corporations emerging in 'Third World' localities for example.

Probably the key insight from the now voluminous literature on globalization is the need to understand socio-cultural arrangements in terms of different forms of *mobility* and *flow*. Hannerz (1992, 1996), for example, develops the view that we can no longer conceive of cultures as neatly bounded entities. Cultures diffuse and flow into each other, constructing, and responding to, complex hierarchical relationships that he calls "centres" and "peripheries" (Hannerz 1992: 218; see Blommaert and Dong, this volume). Cultural centers are sources of authority and taste that peripheries often revere and seek to emulate. In Hannerz's view,

globally powerful economic and political centers need not always be cultural centers, and vice versa, so that we need a multi-dimensional "world systems" model. France, for example, Hannerz claims, is an authoritative cultural center in many respects, more so than it is a political center. He argues that Japan has tended to keep a lower cultural profile despite its economic successes. Hannerz theorizes a constantly evolving pattern of cultural influence and change which is very *un*likely to lead simply to cultural homogenization, although it could include what he calls stable forms of "creolization" or cultural hybridity. Some peripheries develop to become centers, and cultural values and markets themselves evolve and change in the flow of "cultural traffic."

As we shall see, flow has been picked up as an orienting concept by sociolinguists too, and it will be useful to refine the term's application. Bartelson (2000) tries to distinguish three ways in which global flows have been conceptualized: namely in terms of *transference*, *transformation* and *transcendence*. Transference is the most material and most readily interpretable form of flow – the movement or exchange of things across pre-existing boundaries and between pre-constituted units. Demographic migration and the dissemination of cultural formats and products are straightforward examples of transference. Although transference is very much a characteristic of global social arrangements, it is not different in kind from processes that have been labelled 'internationalization' or 'political/economic/cultural interdependence.' The 'nothing new' comment on globalization seems mostly applicable to globalization seen as transference, notwithstanding the important objection that the scale and intensity of contemporary transference is unprecedented. Globalization as transformation implies a more radical change, whereby flows modify the character of the whole global systems in which they function. Boundaries and units are themselves refashioned, as well as things flowing across and between them. In the third scenario, transcendence, "globalisation is driven forward by a dynamic of its own and is *irreducible* to singular causes within particular sectors or dimensions" (Bartelson 2000: 189, original emphasis). This abstract, third condition is strongly echoed in Hardt and Negri's (2000) notion of "empire," but also (as Bartelson points out) in Lash and Urry's (1994) argument that contemporary information and communication structures are reconstituting the world as networks of flow rather than (as we might say) as "flows of things" and through signs rather than objects, which of course provides an entrée into linguistics and semiotics.

These, then, are some of the concepts and interpretive stances that have emerged from theoretical work on globalization. Many others are picked up and debated in the following chapters, several of which incorporate their own reviews of globalization theory. My intention in this section has been simply to illustrate the resourcefulness of globalization theory and to suggest that, *prima facie* at least, social changes associated with globalization are perceptually salient for most of us and pose significant contemporary personal and intellectual challenges. Academic disciplines across the social sciences and humanities do need to (continue to) engage with globalization, and of course to (continue to) contribute to its analysis in circumstances of rapid social change.

Globalization theory has reached a point where it is quite widely recognized that we need to distinguish different disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives, indeed different *discourses*, on globalization (Robertson and Khondker 2009). It is in response to this challenge that the contributors have offered their work to the Handbook. In introducing an earlier and much smaller collection of work on sociolinguistics and globalization (Coupland 2003b), I commented that linguists were, at that time, "late getting to the party," in the sense that commentaries and treatises on globalization were already in full spate across other disciplines,[5] but non-existent in sociolinguistics. The present volume is able to demonstrate the considerable distance that sociolinguistics has travelled in just a few years, to the extent that linguistic perspectives on globalization do now constitute an independent discourse of globalization, albeit one that helps to synthesize and refine many others.

In the remainder of this Introduction I shall try to map out the different ways in which 'language' and 'globalization' are brought together in the four parts of the present volume and to anticipate some of the key insights that emerge from the wealth of new material that follows.

Global Multilingualism, World Languages and Language Systems

In Part I of the Handbook we find perspectives that have an impressive history within sociolinguistics. Proponents of 'nothing new' can legitimately point to rich traditions in the sociology of language that have dealt extensively with multilingual systems and with language contact processes and cases. These include classic studies by Michael Clyne, Ralph Fasold, Charles Ferguson, Joshua Fishman, Heinz Kloss, William Mackey, William Samarin, William Stewart and others (for a related review, see Ammon 1989; also Ammon, this volume). To pick out just one landmark study, Stewart (1970) reported a succinct but limited notational system designed to capture systemic relationships between languages and a taxonomy of language 'types': *vernacular, standard, classical, pidgin and Creole*. Original conceptualizations like Stewart's laid the ground for systematic descriptive accounts of languages in communities and languages in contact, and these early initiatives have been massively extended in recent scholarship; see for example Apel and Muysken (1987), Kachru (1992), Myers-Scotton (2002), Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004). The sociology of language has always been interested in the relative vitality of languages and communities, and in language death and attrition internationally. It might be tempting to argue that, even if globalization itself refers to a new and newly important social condition, we can account for 'language and globalization' simply by extending the remit of a traditional sociology of language. As we shall see, however, this is to understate significantly what is required.

In response to globalization, the most obvious requirement is for a sociology of language that can model relationships among languages on a global scale. In

his opening paper, Mufwene[6] does extremely valuable ground-clearing work, reviewing the concept of globalization and its relationship with earlier processes of colonization and bringing a critical eye to the widely debated concept of 'global English.' Mufwene is a strong proponent of the 'nothing new' stance, certainly in relation to 'world languages,' and perhaps also in relation to 'language and globalization.' He is skeptical about the need to defend the concept of 'world language' at all, and he argues that, throughout history, we have seen languages expand and fragment. His account of 'global English,' as others call it, finds close parallels with Latin, which came to be favored mainly for its association with international trade but then diversified into different Romance varieties. The world, he argues, is not heading towards monolingualism, and English is not a "killer language" (see also Mufwene 1994, 2008).

It is therefore useful to assess the orientations that subsequent chapters in Part I take, implicitly or explicitly, to Mufwene's stance, which will strike some as laissez-faire and as rather apolitical. In fact, however, De Swaan is, rather similarly, matter of fact and certainly not romanticizing in his overview of global language systems (compare De Swaan 2001; also Crystal 2000 and Winford 2003). De Swaan assesses the relative "communication values" of different languages in the "world system," their "prevalence" and their "centrality," and proceeds to explain and predict the changing fortunes of languages – what, in the terminology of classical sociology of language, is referred to as ethnolinguistic vitality, language maintenance, and language shift (see Fishman 1991). De Swaan's top-down model captures the apparently rational and pragmatic decisions people make when they decide to invest in particular languages or to leave them behind. The world's linguistic system is described as an evolving set of relationships among languages as their utility values change.

Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson trust less in rational choice and take a more overtly political approach in their assessment of the prospects of the world's languages (see also Phillipson 1992, 1993; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). They align against "linguistic neo-imperialism," "linguistic genocide," and "crimes against humanity in education." Ammon, again, reviews the concept of 'world languages' (and compare Ammon, Mattheier, and Nelde 1994); and, like De Swaan, he attempts a synthesis of the ranking of languages within a global linguistic system by referring to previous accounts. Ammon debates lingua franca uses of English (compare House 2003, Jenkins 2007, Seidlhofer 2004) in which the authentic 'Englishness' of English arguably ceases to be an issue. Ricento then asks whether countries can and should protect their national linguistic resources, opposing globalist neo-liberal discourse and assumptions. He reflects on the early linguistic history of North America and on language policies in South Africa, India and elsewhere, concluding that neo-liberal claims – that an 'open market' will liberate people to make informed linguistic choices and will lead to more democratic arrangements – are not supported by historical evidence.

It is clear, then, that some authors are much more vociferous than others on the topic of how global languages, and English in particular, come to be imposed on an expanding range of territories and on other languages. Ammon and De

Swaan model global systems in which languages have different capital values and vie for recognition and for speakers, while both Ricento and Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson bring more human and ethical considerations to the fore. Mufwene stresses that linguistic globalization, however we define it, is an historically continuous and rather unexceptional process. Ricento frames his arguments in relation to recent globalization theory more than the others do. Even so, there is consensus across the Part I chapters I have mentioned so far – at the level of theory. All these contributors develop analyses couched in terms of relativities of ethnolinguistic vitality – what we could reductively describe as balance sheets of global linguistic entitlement and opportunity, where world languages (if they can be named so) are shown to be winning out at the expense of others. Similar approaches are found in other important existing accounts, including Brutt-Griffler's *World English* (2002), Gordon's *Languages of the World* (2005), Graddol's two volumes analyzing future global trends within English and other languages – *The Future of English* (1997) and *English Next* (2006) – Maurais and Morris's *Languages in a Globalizing World* (2003), Nettle and Romaine's *Vanishing Voices* (2000), and Wright's *Language Policy and Language Planning: From Nationalism to Globalization* (2004).

As we will see in later chapters, however, there are authors who want to take issue with the broad orientation found in all these works. For example Blommaert (2006, 2009, and also later in this volume) argues that sociolinguistics has settled into a dominant but reductive mode of describing the spread of linguistic variables over restricted horizontal spaces, in the general manner of Labovian variationism (see Labov 1972 and Coupland 2007 for a review); but he thinks that this is also apparent in the sociolinguistic field of language contact. His objection is that this perspective gives us only a restricted account of space and time, when globalization theory stresses how time and space have themselves been radically reconfigured. Blommaert is concerned that systems approaches pay very little attention to the particular functions of communicative repertoires under conditions of mobility. In her chapter, later in the volume, Heller similarly challenges some of the assumptions underlying rights-based appeals to linguistic ownership and autonomy. Going back to some conceptual distinctions that we considered a little earlier, we might say that contact models in sociolinguistics have tended to deal with flows as *transference* – as movement of codes and people across predefined and unchanging boundaries – rather than in terms of *transformation* and *transcendence*. The underlying issue is whether in fact we need more theory, and different theory, in the sociolinguistic framing of globalization, or whether it is sufficient to widen the scope of existing treatments. These debates come back in the subsequent parts of the book.

Still on the theme of global languages, Pool takes us in a different direction. He offers a pro-active vision of "panlingual globalization" in which, through marketing and other strategies, the world's 7,000 or so existing languages might be protected, offsetting the drift (*pace* Mufwene) towards global monolingualism through English. He then discusses and illustrates a set of semantic principles according to which panlingual translation might be facilitated. In some ways, a

brave new world of linguistic engineering sits rather well with the commodification of language that others see as a hallmark of linguistic globalization. But in any account of 'world languages' it is crucial to recognize that languages other than English have their own claims to this status (compare the concluding discussion in Block's chapter). As Mufwene argues, even without the focused global intervention of the sort Pool envisages, it is a mistake to predict a world unilingual in English without close investigation of shifts being experienced by other languages and their users. Part I of the Handbook would ideally contain chapters reflecting on many other languages and national settings, 'majority' and 'minority' alike, and on their shifting patterns of vitality. Chapters in the other parts of the book do, however, bring in detailed commentaries on many of them – for instance Bhatt's observations on South Asia and West Africa, Heller's observations on La Francophonie, Kramsch and Boner's references to Tanzania, Mooney's analysis of the linguistic bases of global religions, Pennycook's remarks on popular culture in various global settings, Shi-xu's commentary on China, van Leeuwen and Suleiman's reference to Egypt and Arabic.

As detailed case studies in Part I, we have Mar-Molinero's assessment of the spread of global Spanish and Busch's account of the development of new national languages in eastern Europe, the former Yugoslavia in particular. Each of these two case studies raises issues of general importance. Mar-Molinero points to a mix of centralized language policy initiatives, particularly by Spain, and to grassroots initiatives, particularly centered on popular music, which is helping to promote varieties of Spanish globally. The power of vernacularity has been underestimated in language systems approaches, which mainly seek to map out the status of 'whole languages.' Yet one of the themes that emerge strongly in the later parts of the Handbook is the need to attend to the globalization of *genres* and *styles* of particular languages, as well as – or in preference to – commentaries on 'whole languages' themselves. It can be argued that, under globalization, languages are evolving and spreading less and less as coherent uniform linguistic systems. Mar-Molinero explains that 'Spanglish' and *Livin' la vida loca* play a key role in the transnational appeal of Spanish, but also in shifting evaluations of what matters as 'language' in global communication.

Busch describes shifts in the other direction in eastern Europe – shifts whereby codes formerly institutionalized as 'majority languages' have been repositioned and decentered as 'minority languages' (such as Russian in the Baltic states) and whereby varieties rise to prominence as new 'national languages.' Like Mar-Molinero, she points to the limitations of top-down measures in implementing language planning, even under authoritarian conditions, but again to the importance of understanding the language-ideological basis of demarcating one language from another (see also Gal 2006). Busch quotes Bakhtin's view that a 'national language' is an ideologically saturated object and an expression of a world view, rather than a strictly linguistic category.

In Part I, therefore, we are already seeing some significant disputes, both within key contributors' positions on global multilingualism and between the ways in which that broad area of scholarship and others make sense of 'the sociolinguistics

of globalization'. There are different levels of political engagement: Is the global expansion of particular languages something we should regret and oppose, or something inevitable and familiar? There is disagreement over units of analysis: Is linguistic globalization about the fates of languages, regarded as bounded linguistic systems within changing social and sociolinguistic systems, or is it about ways of using language, new repertoires, diffusing genres and styles, and changing ideologies around language use? There is disagreement about the necessary theoretical infrastructure: To what extent should sociolinguistics refashion its own theory in response to the new challenges posed by globalization? Or can we get by with what we have? These are some of the debates around which a sociolinguistics of globalization is being carried forward, and there are many more to come in the volume. The terrain is too challenging and too interesting for us to expect bland consensus.

Global Discourse in Key Domains and Genres

Part II of the Handbook shifts focus from language regarded as a system (and from language systems functioning in global systems) to language regarded as social action – or from languages to discourses. In his 2006 book, Fairclough sets out a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) agenda relating to globalization (see also Fairclough 2009). He espouses a realist position, accepting that there are objective facts of globalization to be observed and measured, but he says that these objectivities are generally "much too complex to be fully controlled by any human intervention" (2006: 28). Hence critical attention needs to be given to how the discourses that drive forward the objective changes we associate with globalization are constructed – or selected – and consumed. For Fairclough and for all critical analysts of discourse, discourses do have social consequences. Discursive change, in Fairclough's view, often presages and facilitates real social change. The key elements for Fairclough are the (pro-globalization) discourse of "globalism" and the way it is impacting on patterns of work, government, politics, and personal identity in different social settings. In fact globalism is, he says, a new *order* of discourse – a new structured configuration of discourses, genres and styles, based on neo-liberal political assumptions (ibid., p. 29).

Related issues concerning markets and values inescapably feature in many chapters; they are dealt with most directly in Part III. In Part II, contributors explore instead some of the key communicative genres and practices that globalization has not only facilitated but brought into being. We might also say that these are some of the key discourses through which globalization has *itself* been brought into being: discourse practices associated with mass media (Androutsopoulos; van Leeuwen and Suleiman), tourism (Jaworski and Thurlow), language teaching (Block), global terror (Hodges), and global religion (Mooney).

Androutsopoulos describes the main characteristics of 'Web 2.0,' where the internet becomes more radically interactive via content-sharing and social networking sites and platforms. He shows how engagement with the interactive web

involves new forms of textual and symbolic manipulation and appreciation. In Androutsopoulos's chapter we immediately see that a sociolinguistics of new media needs to be elaborated, both descriptively and theoretically. Textual resources, including the ones Androutsopoulos refers to as "spectacles," are inherently multi-modal rather than strictly linguistic, for example video clips that become a focus for interactive reassessment and critical comment among networks of users. Associated web pages show complexities of visual syntax and trans-modal relations. Androutsopoulos argues that users and analysts alike need to be sensitive to intertextual relationships, because meanings are often made by appropriating pre-existing resources and embed them in new environments (see Johnson and Ensslin's (2007) concept of "intermediality"). We also have to be alert to heteroglossic relationships, because users often take particular stances, sometimes oppositional or "vari-directional," to materials that they comment on. Older sociolinguistic themes emerge too, but they require new interpretations. Androutsopoulos traces new ways in which the interactive web positions vernacular varieties such as the Bavarian dialects of German.

Van Leeuwen and Suleiman share the view that sociolinguistic analyses of globalized mass media need to be multimodal and focused on local-global tensions. They start from the view that analysis of glocalization processes is often over-generalized, for example in the idea, contrary to the McDonaldization hypothesis, that global mass media are always localized and indigenized. They prefer a case-by-case approach, which can be sensitive to just what is globally uniform and what is locally specific in particular media products, for instance the many national versions of *Cosmopolitan* magazine (see Machin and van Leeuwen 2007; also Machin and van Leeuwen, this volume). In the case examined in detail here, that of an Egyptian superhero comic, *Zein*, van Leeuwen and Suleiman find that "becoming global" is not considered legitimate, so that the comic ultimately fails, commercially and in its reception by critics. That is, the clearly USA-sourced genre of superhero comics proves to be "unlocalizable," even though the *Zein* data that van Leeuwen and Suleiman analyze are in themselves designed as highly globalized texts.

Van Leeuwen and Suleiman's approach to analysis and their concerns about premature generalization are significant for a sociolinguistics of globalization, as well as for sociolinguistics generally. A specifically linguistic/discursive approach to globalization offers the resource of detailed critical commentary on particular instances, of a sort that is not available to most other social science treatments. As Labov said about the sociolinguistic approach that he pioneered, in the detail of empirical investigation "we encounter the possibility of being right" (Labov 1972: 259), and this is a particularly precious resource in an area of theory that tends towards the grandiose. (Later on in the run of chapters, Mooney makes a similar appeal for sociolinguistics not to set aside its traditional concerns with linguistic detail and specific cases.)

Jaworski and Thurlow share the commitment to analytic particularity, and also to analyzing discursive *practice* – or what we might call the 'coming to be' of globally situated communicative interaction. They also show how careful analysis

of discursive events can illuminate, refine, or challenge some of the more abstract and general claims about global social processes. So this is not empirical particularism as an alternative to social theory, or linguistic analysis in the service of social theory. It is the attempt to understand the general in the context of the particular and to expose the theoretical significance of local discursive practices – the perspective that motivates CDA as a discipline. Jaworski and Thurlow analyze tourism encounters (and see Jaworski and Thurlow 2010; Jaworski et al. 2010; Thurlow and Jaworski 2010), which they see as a focal genre of "banal globalization," the everyday textual realization of global capitalism. But they also draw attention to the fact that "language," in many different ways, becomes a central practice in the performance of tourism and comes to be associated with particular exchange values, especially in interactions between tourists and "hosts" or "locals." They identify particular act-types that are structurally linked to the economic frameworks of global tourism, for instance "tourist teases" and "tourist greetings." This is language (discourse) constituting globalization.

Reflecting, partly autobiographically, on the institutions and priorities of English language teaching around the world, Block argues that a globalized ideoscape dominates contemporary practice (and see Block and Cameron 2002; Canagarajah 1999). This provides an opportunity to assess the implementation of glocalization in language education contexts – how westernized and homogenized teaching materials and approaches are and to what extent they accommodate presumed or actual local cultural context. Block points out that, in the past, English language teaching materials have tended to realize British and American cultural ideologies, while more cosmopolitan and global consumerist values have now started to be represented. Global cultural flows are coming to be incorporated in teaching materials (for instance engagement with global celebrities and lifestyles), and those texts constitute a flow mechanism in its own right. In fact there are interesting resemblances between Block's description of the social representations found in more cosmopolitan teaching texts and the intuited list of social changes with which I began this introduction.

There is no clearer or more chilling instance of a discourse that drives social change and new global relations – Fairclough's CDA agenda – than the discourse of the George W. Bush administration referring to 'the war on terror.' Bush's rhetoric, as analyzed by Hodges (and compare Hodges and Nilep 2007), forces new global disjunctions between 'them' and 'us,' between terrorists and victims, and between Islamic fundamentalists and (at least by implication) rational westerners. That discourse, Hodges shows, was a device for constructing different interpretations of global relations – for example when Bush identified the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center as a triggering event for a legitimate 'war on terror,' which Bush and others then took as a warrant for military exploits in Iraq and elsewhere. The discourse becomes available for recontextualization or application in other contexts, for example by Serbian intellectuals who rationalize their own conflict with Bosnian and Kosovar Muslims.

Discourse is of course not only a means of obscuring and manipulating political processes; it needs to provide means of disambiguating veiled or double-voiced

meanings. We might associate this function with CDA itself; but, as Hodges shows, there are many voices, not least voices in the mass media, interested in renegotiating the 'war on terror' discourse and its presuppositions. If we stand back from the detail of Hodges's commentaries on these processes, it becomes possible to see global international relations and conflict as a series of complex flows of contested meanings. This is arguably where we find the most pressing case for a linguistic perspective on globalization, particularly in the form of critical analyses of discourse.

Religion itself is a casualty of the 'war on terror' discourse, in the sense that it looms in the background of contemporary global antagonisms and is non-specifically implicated in conflict discourses (see the attribution 'fundamentalist,' mentioned above, and the discussion of fundamentalism in Mooney's chapter). It is important, then, to review the wider links between language, discourse, place, and religion and to reflect on their changing inter-relationships under globalization. This is what Mooney offers in her chapter: a critical and comparative sociolinguistic reassessment of world religions and of their globalizing forms and functions. Religious systems are discourses, variably amenable to change and to hybridization and with different historical connections to global zones and languages. These discourses are, as Mooney shows, increasingly carried to people via satellite, cable TV, and the internet (which includes virtual reality domains), creating global "religious marketplaces." Televangelism, for example, is a genre broadcast mainly through English, which shows that religion is not at all immune to the general pressures we saw discussed in Part I. But it is the corporatization and technologization of religion that stand out perhaps as being most significant; the internet, as Mooney suggests at one point, may be in the process of becoming a metaphor for the divine.

Language, Values, and Markets under Globalization

Many chapters in Part I and Part II of the Handbook have made reference to the economic basis of contemporary globalization, as I did in my introductory remarks on globalization theory in this chapter. The forces that reconfigure patterns of multilingualism are to a large extent economic, as for example when the 'value' of English consists in the access it is often perceived to give to wider markets, and hence to financial advancement of different sorts. International tourism is above all, as Jaworski and Thurlow emphasize, a global economic system, and so is global English language teaching. As we have just seen, even religion may be tending that way. Sociolinguists have for some time used Bourdieu's "symbolic capital" framework (Bourdieu 1991) and his analysis of neo-liberalism as economic fatalism (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1999; Fairclough 2006, 2009). But a sociolinguistic conception of *le marché linguistique* was established as early as the 1970s (see Sankoff and Laberge 1978).

In Part III, although sociolinguistic engagement with markets is 'nothing new,' we do see many of the new ways in which markets and values have taken on significance in relation to globalization. This involves taking a broader view of 'values,' one which spans monetary and material value as well as cultural values of various sorts. Two general issues are addressed in this part of the book. First, how does globalization create new value systems in which language is implicated (including new values for language use and for the language varieties themselves)? Secondly, how are the discourses of globalization valued in different places and under different conditions?

Heller critiques the role of language in the globalized new economy. The new economy has come about through the relocation of heavy industry and manufacturing out of former industrialized areas; it is evident in the rise of service-sector and niche markets in their place. Heller's research has been extremely influential in pointing out new demands made on language use and new value frameworks around varieties and multilingualism, especially in new economy work practices (Duchêne and Heller 2007; Heller 2007; see also Cameron 2000). In her chapter here, Heller explains how language comes to be commodified, treated as a marketplace skill or as resource that bears little relation to older understandings of the fact that ways of speaking are historically structured into communities through socialization. Sociolinguistics has repeatedly shown the local value of minority linguistic varieties within their own community settings, indexing ingroup allegiance and ethnolinguistic distinctiveness. But in new economy settings, minority varieties can be treated as shortcuts to cultural authenticity, for example in international tourism contexts (see Jaworski and Thurlow). Heller then widens the debate, cycling back to the issues discussed in Part I. She argues that rights-based and ecologically framed arguments against "killer languages" make assumptions which are strongly locked into nationalist assumptions and out of step with changed, globalized social circumstances. In fact she argues that we need a new sociolinguistics, one that deals with language as a resource and not with language as a system.

A similar case is made by Blommaert and Dong, who urge us to see language as a set of mobile, trans-locally operative resources rather than as localized and "sedentary" sociolinguistic patterns. Blommaert and Dong lobby for a difficult concept of sociolinguistic scales (compare Blommaert, Collins, and Slembrouck 2005), which superimposes a vertical hierachization of value onto language varieties and uses in their particular 'horizontal' (social and geographical) locations. In ways reminiscent of Gumperz's theory of conversational inferencing (Gumperz 1982), they point to the indexical importance of sociolinguistic fragments or truncated repertoires (alongside the importance of whole varieties, traditionally conceived) as the focus of assessments of linguistic adequacy or acceptability. These theoretical resources are needed, Blommaert and Dong argue, to account for changing and uneven patterns of attributed value when people and ways of speaking and texts "travel." If we return to Bartelson's three-way reinterpretation of flow, Blommaert and Dong's dissatisfaction with distributional sociolinguistic accounts is similar to Bartelson's comment that contemporary

globalization entails something more significant than 'transference.' Blommaert and Dong insist that global flow disrupts the landscapes over which movement happens, and this is what is implied in Bartelson's concepts of "transformation" and "transcendence."

Those indexical fragments or 'bits' of language, as in the accent-shifts that Blommaert and Dong comment on in their Beijing example, are also the stuff of variationist sociolinguistics, and particularly of approaches to the social meaning of variation referred to under the heading of 'style' (Coupland 2007). Johnstone considers the apparent paradox that regional variation at the level of accents or dialect (for example of English) continues to be socially and stylistically meaningful and noteworthy in the contemporary context of globalization, where what others have called 'superdiversity' reigns. How can small-scale local meanings be significant in the vast sociolinguistic marketplaces of the globalized world? Johnstone argues that dialect indexicality is actually a *consequence* of globalization rather than representing a series of fitful attempts to maintain a sense of the local in the face of global homogenization (although one could argue that this is likely too). Johnstone's point is that, under globalization, very local linguistic forms and styles are resemioticized, given new ideological values and loadings, particularly in stylized usages and in performance frames of different sorts. They become the focus of discourses of differentiation and they are culturally noticed or enregistered (Agha 2006). Johnstone then goes on to discuss dialect "enregisterment" processes and outcomes in Pittsburg, USA, as elements of the process of producing 'the local,' much of it mass-mediated.

Valuing the local is, from one point of view, an ecological sensitivity, and we saw in relation to arguments about global multilingualism that a general valuing of 'diversity where it exists' motivates many language maintenance efforts. There is, however, an important distinction to be drawn between valuing 'one's own difference' (which surfaces in nationalist discourses and in some sorts of language-rights arguments, and which endorses sometimes questionable, essentialist claims about linguistic ownership) and valuing diversity for its own sake. The latter position is a far 'deeper' ecological stance, especially when it is applied to the biosphere as a whole rather than to 'languages' or 'language varieties,' which are social constructs rather than organic entities. Stibbe presents the arguments for bringing a deep ecology framework to sociolinguistics: an ecolinguistics that will expose how particular ways of using language conspire in the destruction of the planet. Language is seen as a barrier to ecological understanding and action. Stibbe reviews the history of ecolinguistics in its different waves before commenting on the spread of discourses he considers hegemonic – including the globalist discourse of progress and consumerism, which Fairclough analyses (see above). But he also comments on how environmental discourses themselves often embed consumerist and anthropocentric attitudes that militate against their authors' own ambitions.

A particular paradox of glocalization is how to reconcile the need to establish universal principles – say, of linguistic self-determination, or of health care entitlement, or of environmental protection – with the need to respect and attune to