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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 (McLuhan, 1994; Commission on Global Governance, 1995; Held, 1995; Archibugi, 2003; Beck, 2006). Others depict globalization as generating new types of economic, gender and racial discrimination and exploitation. Globalization is thus signified as an era of ‘global apartheid’ (Richmond, 1994; Alexander, 1996; Dalby, 1998; Hardt and Negri, 2000). Still others have come to understand globalization as a moment of ‘global empire’. This ‘empire’ is frequently associated with a new geopolitical configuration with the US holding the instruments of power in the aftermath of the attacks of 11 September 2001, but often is more broadly associated with a general process of homogenization into Western culture and capitalism (Barber, 1995; Berger and Dore, 1996; Hardt and Negri 2000, 2004; Balakrishnan, 2003; Ferguson, 2004, 2005).

As these examples illustrate, metaphors are a crucial dimension of what Steger (2003:xii) calls the ‘discursive dimensions’ of globalization – ‘a plethora of stories that define, describe and analyse that very process’ (see also Cameron and Palan, 2004; Fairclough, 2006). This does not suggest that globalization exists exclusively in the realm of metaphors; material processes and changes are crucial in the evolution and dynamic of globalization over time and across space. However, how we come to signify these processes and give them meaning requires more than a simple survey of observed trends and statistics. Whatever these changes may be, Luke (2004:238–39) points out that ‘it is their metaphoric
work-ups, which construct or mediate these changes, that stand out’. Thus, although not reducible to metaphors, globalization exists through metaphors. It is this metaphorical element that we probe in this volume.

This element is of major significance because metaphors provide (new) vocabularies that make political and social change intelligible. Given the novelties comprising globalization processes, such a vocabulary is critical for our attempts to understand the world. Yet the importance of metaphors does not end here. Established metaphors can and may have in turn a self-reinforcing effect, shaping not only how we perceive the world but also how we act and react to it. Some metaphors may fall by the wayside, while others become so deeply entrenched and taken for granted, that their metaphorical status is forgotten and they appear to be the ‘facts of the matter’ of the ‘reality of globalization’. For instance, amongst metaphors designating a global hierarchy, ‘empire’ has been much more influential than ‘apartheid’. Directing our attention more towards traditional power politics and state power than towards racial and economic hierarchy. Yet, all in all, metaphors of hierarchy have not fared well compared to the label ‘global village’. The latter has become thoroughly embedded in popular discussions of globalization to the extent that it is often taken to be the iconic representation of globalization. Consequently, metaphors can impose a particular structure of social and political order by making the world coherent in some ways, while excluding others. Interrogating metaphors, therefore, is a way not only to determine how we have come to make globalization comprehensible, but why it has become so in particular ways and whether or not these should be endorsed, resisted and/or transformed.

This book uses metaphors of globalization as a vantage point to reflect upon our globalizing world. It puts under scrutiny the normalizing and transformative action of agents, structures and processes that entrench and transform, and examines the normative implications. To do this, we propose a novel analytical framework that revolves around three perspectives on the study of metaphors: mirrors, magicians and mutinies. In the remainder of this chapter we provide a brief summary of the vast literatures on globalization and metaphors, identifying the key theoretical concepts central to understanding the scope and importance of metaphors of globalization. From this discussion, we develop the broad context and overarching analytical framework that guides the analyses in subsequent chapters. We end our discussion with an overview of the contributions in this book, highlighting how the themes introduced in this chapter are developed more fully throughout the book.
Globalization

Despite a plethora of publications examining globalization, there is little agreement on what globalization actually is. The theoretical pluralism of the literature adds another reason for definitional contestation. It is not surprising that popular accounts, which overwhelmingly interpret globalization as a largely economic phenomenon (Harvey, 1989; Jameson, 1991; Castells, 2000; Stiglitz, 2002; Friedman, 2005), have a different understanding of globalization than, say, theorists who focus on cosmopolitan ethics (Held, 1995, 2004; Urry, 2002; Archibugi, 2003; Beck, 2006) or critical scholars who interrogate the power discourses that make globalization a process of systemic marginalization (Bauman, 1998; Hardt and Negri, 2000, 2004; Klein, 2000; Kofman and Youngs, 2003; Steger, 2004).

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; second, is the increasing awareness of this context, what Robertson and Inglis (2004) have called ‘global animus’. In the first dimension, discussions of globalization point to new processes – ranging from financial flows and new social movements to world music, technology, and terrorism – that both create and operate physically in a global space. Most often, this is described as a process of ‘deterritorialization,’ whereby social and political dynamics cannot be contained or controlled by state structures (Scholte, 2000). This is not to say that states do not exist or have no regulatory capacities. Rather, the argument is that states are increasingly embedded in a global context, which may transform or constrain their traditional capacities.

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 the impact of globalizing processes. Contemporary trade flows and communications technology may be more voluminous and more extensive than previous historical periods. However, such changes fail to grasp and consider questions such as how individuals and groups come to understand what it means to live in an increasingly ‘global’ world. From this perspective, globalization is as much, if not more, about how individuals, groups and societies come to interpret what the emergence of a global geography means as a political, economic and cultural space as it is about the conditions that facilitate global interconnectedness.
geographically, be it through trade or information and communications technology.

These two dimensions of globalization – the first emphasizing globalizing space and the second, *animus* – are interrelated and mutually implicating. In other words, globalization is not the genesis of a content-less global plane but a dynamic interaction and interplay of diverse cultural, economic, technological and political processes that imbue that global space with particular social meanings (c.f. Szeman, 2001; see also Harvey, 1989; Giddens, 2000; Robertson, 1992; Appadurai, 1996; Held et al., 1999; Waters, 2001; Scholte, 2000). Given this understanding of globalization, globalization itself seems an indelibly metaphorical process. As one commentator puts it, ‘Beyond the physics of worldwide markets or digital technics, [metaphors] simultaneously project and capture new metaphysics of meaning’ (Luke, 2004:238–39). This begs the question of how specific metaphysics of meaning emerge through metaphors, and how they influence understandings of globalization.

**Metaphors**

In Western thought, scrutiny of metaphor goes as far back as the Sophists, Plato and, most notably, Aristotle. Investigations persist today, with metaphor being a popular topic of inquiry in the natural and social sciences, in linguistics, psychology, philosophy and literary theory, amongst others.\(^1\) Etymologically, ‘metaphor’ derives from the Greek *metaphora* (*meta* – ‘over’ and *phora* – ‘to carry’) and generally denotes a process of creative comparisons or tropes of resemblance between different objects, contexts and/or experiences. Along these lines, Burke (1945:503) summarizes metaphor as ‘a device of seeing something in terms of something else’. Despite the varying emphases of different theories of metaphor, they all generally consider metaphor to express the unfamiliar (and at times abstract) in terms of the familiar or to create novel expressions and understandings by comparing dissimilar objects and/or phenomena. The terminology may differ – ‘tenor’ and ‘vehicle’ (Richards, 1980), ‘focus’ and ‘frame’ (Black, 1980) or ‘target’ and ‘source’ domains (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980a) – but there appears to be an underlying agreement that metaphors graft together different fields of meaning.

Theories of metaphor, however, differ on how metaphors graft together. A useful way to distinguish between major strands of thought on metaphors is by examining their views regarding the relationship
between metaphor and ‘reality’. This yields three broad, but not mutually exclusive, perspectives:

1. theories that focus on metaphors’ power to describe reality;
2. theories that examine metaphors’ capacity to constitute reality;
3. theories that propose metaphors’ potential as a means of criticizing and transforming reality.

In this section, we briefly overview key developments and perspectives in the theory of metaphor and the relationships between them in order to lay the groundwork for how metaphors of globalization can be studied and explored.

Those theories that focus on metaphors’ descriptive power value metaphors for their ability to provide insight into a pre-existing reality. This view perhaps draws greatest inspiration from Aristotelian thought, which considers metaphor to ‘consist in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy’ (Aristotle, 1982:1457b). From a conventional Aristotelian perspective, metaphors provide insight by bringing to light aspects of reality that could not otherwise be perceived: ‘(...) [J]ust as in philosophy’, he argues, ‘also an acute mind will perceive resemblances even in things far apart’. (Aristotle, 2007:1412a). Yet Aristotle’s praise for metaphor is cautious. As a form of figurative language that involves the use of words in ways that deviate from their given meanings, in contrast to literal language, metaphors can obfuscate the facts through far-fetched or ridiculous comparisons. According to Johnson (1980:7), in the Aristotelian view of metaphor, ‘The trick is to stretch the imagination, but always within appropriate bounds, keeping in mind the underlying similarity at work’. Metaphors are thus used best when they capture reality (Kittay, 1987:3). Historically, the effect of Aristotelian theories of metaphor was to move metaphor exclusively into the realm of rhetoric and poetry, outside of serious philosophical study. Hence, classical schools of thought discussed metaphor as a rhetorical device. Medieval theologians, however, were less circumspect, linking metaphor to the revelation of God’s ‘truth’ and the order of the universe (Johnson, 1980). The rise of empiricist and positivist view of language, beginning in the seventeenth century injunctions of Hobbes (1968) and Locke (1988) and persisting today, effectively admonished metaphors. Their empiricist philosophy rebukes all forms of figurative
language for obscuring the truthful knowledge of reality provided by literal language.

A criticism of this view is articulated by more contemporary theories of metaphor that focus less on metaphors’ correspondence with reality and allude to metaphors’ construction of reality. In this second perspective, metaphors do not merely describe reality – they make reality. Building from I.A. Richards (1980), Max Black’s (1980) semantic theory of metaphor points to the power of metaphors to help us make sense of the world and to make the world. From this perspective, metaphors, although literally false, have an additional cognitive meaning (and thus philosophical import) that brings insight into how we can and should understand the world. On the one hand, Black’s view suggests that metaphors give access to reality that might not otherwise have been discovered, and seems to support the correspondence view of language. On the other hand, Black criticizes Aristotelian-inspired theories for contending that metaphor must express objectively existing similarities between objects. Some metaphors, he argues, are not revelatory, but are creative. Accordingly, ‘It would be more illuminating in some of these cases to say that the metaphor creates the similarity than to say it formulates some similarity antecedently existing’ (Black, 1980:72).

Davidson’s (1974) pragmatist critique of Black’s semantic theory of metaphor expands the creative capacity of metaphor. His claim is that metaphors do not work through an additional metaphorical meaning, but through their very absurdity with literal language. From this view, metaphors are literally false statements whose incoherence with established literal language creates new understandings. Metaphors accordingly should be valued not for their cognitive meaning, but for their performative cognitive effects (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1979). What this debate brings to the fore is the way in which metaphors can create (either semantically or pragmatically) understandings rather than simply reflecting or drawing attention to pre-existing realities.

This reference to the creative capacity of metaphors points to a different line of inquiry that investigates how metaphors construct and create, rather than capture and reflect, reality. Historically, the emphasis on metaphors’ creative and constitutive functions is traced to Romantic theories of language, which tend to see imagination as manifest in metaphor: ‘[W]ords construct a reality from within themselves and impose this on the world in which we live’ (Hawkes, 1972:39). Although not drawing from the Romantics, Lakoff and Johnson’s (1980b, 1989) notion of conceptual metaphor is perhaps the most widely cited constitutive theory of metaphor. Looking at how metaphors inform and shape basic
human cognitive systems, they introduce the notion of conceptual metaphor to demonstrate that ‘the way we think, what we experience and what we do everyday is a very much a matter of metaphor’ (1980:297). Accordingly, Johnson (1981:41) argues that ‘(...) our world is an imaginative (...) construction, [and so,] metaphors that alter our conceptual structures (...) will also alter the way we experience things’.4 Although constitutive theories agree that metaphors make reality, there is disagreement on how powerful metaphors are in creating reality. Whereas Nelson Goodman (1980), for instance, provides a relativistic view, in which the limits of reality are fully determined by the limits of metaphors, Ricoeur (1978) contends that metaphors do not constrain reality; reality and metaphor mutually constitute each other.

To some theorists, reflections on the ways in which metaphors make reality also provoke answers to the question of how this reality could be transformed. Among these theorists, who are located between the second and the third perspectives, are Ricoeur (1978) and Rorty (1989). Providing a hermeneutic theory, Ricoeur suggests that metaphors have a double reference: metaphors not only imitate human reality, but also ‘redescribe’ it in a way that depicts it ‘as better, nobler, higher than’ (1978:109). By placing emphasis on metaphor’s power to ‘redescribe reality’, Ricoeur argues that metaphors are not merely ‘rhetorical’: rather, they implicate the core of human reality. Rorty’s (1989) reflections on metaphor extend this approach. Rorty encourages us to be aware of the normative and political dimension of metaphors, to investigate how these dimensions evolve and to discuss whether they should be endorsed, resisted or transformed (Booth, 1978; Deibert, 1997; Miller, 2005). His critical means for transformation is ‘metaphorical redescription’, a process whereby a new set of metaphors can ultimately create new societies.5

Through their discussions of redescription, Ricoeur and Rorty intimate at the third perspective of metaphor-reality nexus. Theorists in this third group radicalize the notion of ‘redescription’. Much of this perspective is indebted to Nietzsche’s (1873:180) view of metaphor:

What then is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonymies, anthropomorphisms: in short, a sum of human relations which become poetically and rhetorically intensified, metamorphosed, adorned, and after long usage, seem to a nation fixed, canonic and binding; truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions; worn out metaphors which have become powerless to affect the senses (...)
Building from this view, deconstructive theories of metaphor interrogate the kinds of social realities that become constituted by metaphors, in order to uncover the latent conceptual frameworks, values and power dynamics by which they become established. Whereas the second view of metaphor demonstrates the extent to which metaphor can construct reality, this third view aims to deconstruct the realities that metaphors produce. The most prominent proponent of this deconstructive perspective on metaphors is Derrida (1974). From his view, metaphor is not a special category of philosophical study, or worse, something from which philosophy is to be protected; instead, philosophy, and metaphysics more generally, is made possible by metaphors that develop specific types of signification and thus produce knowledge and reality in particular ways. The task, therefore, is to unmask and expose the forgotten or ‘effaced’ metaphors that constitute our accepted epistemologies and values in order to both expose the limits of and the alternatives to prevailing philosophical systems.6

Inquiring into metaphors of globalization: An analytical triad

In recent years, a number of studies on global politics have addressed metaphors, some more explicitly than others. Although they examine different issues, they tend to adopt one of the three perspectives that we identified in the previous section. In implicit fashion, Fry and O’Hagan (2000), Rosenau (2003), and Ferguson and Mansbach (2004) touch upon the issue of how metaphors help us capture the dynamics of global politics. By contrast, Beer and Landtsheer (2004), as well as Nexon and Neumann (2006), contribute to understanding the processes through which metaphors make reality. Much more radically, Edwards (1996) and Weber (1999) use metaphors to critique the order of things.

Our analytical framework makes these three perspectives engage with one another. We translate them into an analytical triad: mirror, magician and mutiny. The mirror relates to making sense of reality, the magician to the construction of reality, and the mutiny to unmasking hegemonic discourses about what is taken to be reality. Mirror, magician and mutiny are not clear-cut concepts. They are themselves metaphors and do not meet positivist standards of specification. This is deliberate. Mirror, magician and mutiny are not meant to be clearly delineated approaches to the study of metaphor. Their ambiguity is their virtue. Important questions about metaphors in general and metaphors of globalization in particular arise from the tensions among the interpretations of each part of the triad as well as from the ways in
which particular interpretations of these parts are intertwined with other parts of the triad.

**Mirror.** The mirror stands for reflection. The mirror has occupied human minds for probably as long as humans have inhabited the earth. Over time, man-made mirrors complemented reflections in lakes and rivers. Poets and philosophers added to commonsensical understandings of the mirror. Three views have been particularly influential. First, the mirror perfectly reflects what really is. In our everyday bathroom routines, for instance, we take for granted that the mirror shows what we look like. So did the Queen in Snow White, eagerly asking ‘mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the fairest of them all?’ The mirror always perfectly reflected the truth, eventually telling the Queen that Snow White had become much more beautiful. Second, the mirror reaches far underneath the surface. According to this understanding, the mirror does not merely tell the obvious, namely, observable truth, but tells much about the usually hidden inner Self of a person. In his *Story of the Lost Reflection*, for instance, E.T.A. Hoffmann tells a story about someone who loses his soul because his reflection is taken away from him. Third, the mirror lies. In the Middle Ages, mirrors were sometimes seen as prone to manipulation. What was to be seen was entirely in the eyes of the beholder. Or worse still, some preachers equated the mirror with witchcraft and saw it as a tool of the devil. The possession of a mirror could lead to lifetime incarceration (Abrams, 1953:187–215).

The tensions between these three views of the mirror are important for the study of metaphors of globalization. Metaphors are omnipresent in the debate about what globalization is. It is not very likely that this will change. Being a novel and evolving phenomenon, scholars have often claimed that we lack an appropriate vocabulary to make sense of it (Ruggie, 1993; Beck, 1997). Metaphors are seen as key part of such a new vocabulary (Deibert, 1997). But we need to be clear about what this vocabulary can accomplish. Do metaphors provide us with the unshakable certainty of a carbon copy of globalization? Do metaphors help us reach behind the façade of globalization? Do metaphors obscure the underlying reality of globalization?

**Magician.** At the heart of magic is transformation. In a puzzling manner, magic transforms something into something else, or someone into someone else (Cavendish, 1977:2; Shapiro, 1998:51). The magician is the agent capable of effecting such a transformation. Different understandings of magic differ about how deep a transformation magic is able to bring about. On the one hand, there is the view that magic constructs the world. Before the scientific worldview dismantled magic, it
was seen as a powerful force in shaping the world. Particular power was attributed to words. A creation myth in ancient Egypt, for example, claimed that the God Ptah thought about what to create, stated these thoughts in words and then the words became reality (Cavendish, 1977:6). Contemporary social theory developing out of an opposition to the scientific worldview echoes this magical power of words. Kenneth Burke, for instance, likens the poet to a magician and rhetoric to magic. Those using words do not merely describe the world but make it (Burke, 1969). On the other hand, the scientific worldview continues to dismiss magic as superstition and a relic of pre-Enlightenment thought. Words, in particular, have nothing to do with magic. They do not transform the world but merely serve as a means to describe, explain and predict. When words are too ambiguous to fulfil this function, they are replaced by the language of mathematics. In this reading, rational – i.e., scientific – explanations ought to replace superstition. The evolution from alchemy to chemistry is seen as exemplary: Alchemy, generating an interest in a particular set of phenomena, was the nucleus for the scientific discipline of chemistry.

The issue of transformation is at the core of the globalization literature. With the exception of some outspoken sceptics (Hirst and Thompson, 1996; Weiss, 1998), there is little debate that we live in a changing world. For the most part, globalization debates revolve around how much transformation is taking place, what exactly becomes transformed and how transformation is to be explained. The tension between the two views on magic helps to clarify the role of metaphors in inventing and reinventing the global world: Do metaphors perform rhetorical magic that transforms the world? If so, who are the magicians and how do they work their magic? Or alternatively, do metaphors merely describe rather than construct globalization? Does believing in their magic imply lapsing into superstition?

*Mutiny.* Mutinies rebel against the existing order. They are an integral part of naval history. Given the hardship that a ship's hierarchical order imposed on the lower ranks, in particular in the age of the galleons, it is perhaps surprising that mutinies did not occur more often. Yet the power of socialization and physical punishment made sure that the order of things on the ship usually was maintained. It is no coincidence that the famous mutineers of the HMS *Bounty* rebelled soon after they had left Tahiti. For almost half a year, they had lived in a paradisiacal environment that was diametrically opposed to the stark discipline on board (Nordhoff and Hall, 1960). The term mutiny is used in two diametrically opposed ways: first, mutiny is used as a label for a
small and inconsequential as well as illegitimate plot to destroy the established and cherished social order. To military establishments, mutinies have been shocking events because they violate the taboo not to interfere with the supposedly legitimate order. Yet most mutineers do not manage to rid themselves from the grip of the hierarchy of which they are a part. Many mutinies fail to change the order of things. This is why the term mutiny has also often been employed to discredit a rebellion not only as illegitimate but also inconsequential (Epkenhans 2003). The so called Indian Mutiny, for instance, was a real threat to British rule in India and perhaps even the British Empire and it is far from clear that it was illegitimate, but the label of mutiny was meant to baptize it as such. Second, Mutiny is seen as liberation and emancipation. The mutineers of the HMS Bounty, for instance, rid themselves of Captain Blight, left the ship behind and settled in what had previously seemed utopia to them. Even mutinies that were considered failures at the time they occurred can come to be seen as harbingers of major change in retrospect. The Indian Mutiny was such a harbinger of change.

Examining metaphors as mutineers against the existing global order completes our analytical triad. From globalization protests in Seattle to academic writings, there have been many critical voices casting globalization as a deeply unjust and undemocratic process. Criticism has frequently been articulated by metaphors. Global apartheid, for instance, has been a rallying point for a rebellion against the existing global order. The contradictions between the two views on mutiny provoke a set of important questions about these mutinies: Do metaphors have the potential to rebel against the existing order or at least particular aspects of it? If so, how does such a mutiny proceed? What ought to be the goal of such a mutiny and from where does it gain its legitimacy?

These questions arising from the tensions among interpretations of mirrors, magicians and mutinies also allude to the interrelatedness of the components of our triad. Interesting linkages include the following: The manner in which mutinies against metaphors of globalization proceed is critically shaped by their interpretations of the mirror. The interpretation of the mirror is the epistemology that underpins the mutiny. If the mirror is seen as a pathway to objective knowledge, the critique of reality proceeds from an assumed privileged standpoint. If the mirror is seen as incapable of delivering such objective knowledge, the mutineer has to find an avenue to criticize without claiming to have privileged access to the truth. The way in which the mutiny develops is also critically shaped by the interpretation of the magician. The understanding of
the magician is the ontological underpinning of the mutiny. The question of whether metaphors transform reality and how they transform it predispose the mutineer to formulate and practice his or her critique in a certain way.

Mirrors, magicians and mutinies, therefore, are inclusive clusters of questions. Answers to the questions of the one cluster have repercussions for answers to the questions of other clusters. The analytical triad is best understood as a triangle. Theories of metaphor in general and examinations of metaphors of globalization in particular may be located at different points on and inside the triangle. They usually cluster close to one of the three corners of the triangle but this focus on mirror, magician or mutiny is hardly ever exclusive.

The winding road ahead

Figure I.1 provides an overview of the chapters of this book. The book consists of four parts. Focusing on a particular corner of the triangle, the first three parts cluster around mirror, magician and mutiny, respectively. Exploring the middle of the triangle, the final part investigates the linkages across the three perspectives. Each of the clusters around mirror, magician and mutiny is made up of four contributions, which explore the three perspectives from different meta-theoretical, theoretical, methodological and empirical angles. The concluding part encompasses two chapters.

Our exploration of different aspects of the triangle begins with four chapters that cluster around the mirror. In the contribution that comes closest to the mirror's corner of the triangle, Kornprobst scrutinizes
attempts to assess globalization against interpretations of history. Fully endorsing the use of history to make sense of today's world, but cautioning that unquestioned mirrors may well become troublesome magicians, he contends that metaphors become intersubjectively useful – but not objective – tools of making the world intelligible through debate. Drawing upon Sophist thought, he proposes a methodological framework for discussing metaphors. Pouliot casts doubts on metaphors' mirroring function. Alluding to post September 11 attempts to comprehend novel global threats, he calls for epistemological vigilance in order to avoid the reification of threats. He holds that treating knowledge as metaphor is helpful for such a stance because it reminds us that our writings are not about how everything is but what it resembles. Brassett moves further towards the mutiny corner of the triangle. His examination of whether the Tobin tax is a warranted mutiny against existing patterns of globalization is a scrutiny of the mirrors underlying the mutiny. He argues that developing ethical conversations about globalization requires going back and forth between mirrors and mutinies. Zaiotti's chapter is situated between mirrors and magicians. He investigates the possibilities for policy-makers to justify practices that go beyond the existing commonsense. Analysing the European Union's post-national approach to border control, Zaiotti contends that members of Europe's border control community have relied on pragmatic metaphors in order to anchor their practices and that some of these justifications over time have come to constitute the new commonsense. Although these four chapters about the mirrors cluster are located on different points on the triangle and deal with different facets of globalization, there is a distinct pragmatist leitmotiv that unites them. Metaphors do not objectively mirror globalization. The question is less about which metaphors adequately capture globalization and more about which metaphors have come to establish fallible and contingent truths about various globalization processes.

Focusing on contributions that approximate to the magician corner of the triangle, the second part of the book examines how metaphors, through appeals to reason and emotion, come to make the world. Spicer places more emphasis on magic than on mirror. Also pointing to a pragmatist understanding of metaphor, he investigates into how what comes to be understood as mirror sometimes comes to reconstruct reality. Examining the Australian National Broadcasting Corporation's nation-building discourses, he contends that metaphors employed by the broadcaster have played a critical role in reconstructing the nation as well as its image as a global broadcaster. Hülsse places further emphasis on magic. Analysing different levels of discourse on money-laundering,
Hülsse questions the orthodoxy that money-laundering is constructed as ‘dark’ side of globalization. Employing the method of ‘artificial foolishness’, he contends that the underpinnings of money-laundering reveal an unacknowledged longing for money-laundering paradise. Moving somewhat closer to the mutiny corner of the triangle, Mutimer examines the construction of wars and enemies. Identifying the differences in how George W. Bush and Tony Blair constructed Iraq and Saddam Hussein through the use of analogies, Mutimer concludes that globalization is constructed differently in different places and that resistances against globalization vary accordingly. Luke moves further towards mutiny. He surveys how globalization studies metaphorically imagine technology as a force of construction, destruction and instruction. He holds that these imaginations critically shape the processes through which globalization comes to be appraised positively or negatively. These four chapters on magic are similarly heterogeneous as the chapters on mirrors. Yet they are also connected by a common thread. The authors show that metaphors play a crucial role in constructing globalization and, therefore, that metaphors are anything but politically innocent.

Focusing on mutinies, the last set of contributions elaborates on the politics of metaphors. Among the four contributions, Sullivan’s chapter is closest to Luke’s on the magicians and mutinies side of the triangle. Albeit being alerted by the authoritarian tendencies of identities transformed under the condition of globalization, Sullivan holds that new conceptions of space and culture also offer opportunities for emancipation. She argues that glocal politics – thinking and acting glocally – has the potential to seize these opportunities. Empowering metaphors such as the holoflux help to imagine such a reorganization of social lifeworlds. With somewhat less emphasis on magic but equally mutinous, Szeman investigates the new possibilities of literary criticism in a globalizing world. He argues that metaphors provide openings for creative critical thinking. They help not only to intervene against hegemonic narratives of globalization but also to generate alternatives. These alternatives challenge the hegemonic narrative about the good of capital. Shah’s chapter moves the focus of the book closer towards the middle of the triangle. Drawing from Rorty’s work, she argues for a metaphorical redescription of globalization. Echoing the clusters of contributions on mirrors and magicians, Shah cautions that what appears prima facie as mirror often turns out to be also magician. This also applies to mutinies of globalization. They may be meant merely to describe in a novel fashion, but, if successful, they end up reinventing globalization. Thus, she argues for a reflexive stance towards mutinies
that interrogates their political imaginations. Falk's contribution is situated on the mirror-mutiny side of the triangle. Focusing on attempts to reform the United Nations, Falk argues that the widely used fork in the road metaphor is misleading and distorting. The choices that the fork offers are all rooted in a geopolitically dominated reality, which is in all likelihood unable to prevent past catastrophes from recurring. The metaphor of horizons, by contrast, alludes to the required modes of change: horizons of feasibility for reforms and horizons of desire for radical change. Despite their different locations on the triangle, the contributions that cluster around the mutiny corner of the triangle also share several themes. The most important among these is the belief that globalization generates not only new obstacles but also new opportunities for emancipation, and that metaphors help us imagine new horizons for seizing these opportunities.

Having examined the clusters around mirrors, magicians and mutinies, the two last chapters are located at the centre of the triangle. Fierke's commentary as well as our conclusion reflect on how the insights gained in the clusters speak to one another and suggest, departing from the middle of the triangle, further roads for exploration.

Notes

1. Although the essays in this book focus on linguistic metaphors, it is important to note that metaphors are not merely linguistic, but found in visual art, music, architecture, to name but a few.

2. It is important to note that these discussions directly implicated science. Joined by the common pursuit of truth, traditional conceptions of science also marginalized metaphor. Based on developments within philosophy, notably the Work of Max Black (1980), Hesse (1966) argued against a sedimented view that either treated metaphor as irrational and thus extraneous to science, or valued metaphor only for its heuristic value in scientific explanation, Hesse argued that theoretical models are extended metaphors, and as such metaphors were tied directly to the process of scientific discovery and justification (cf. Kittay, 1987:7). This view found further support, stated more radically, in the writings of Kuhn (1970) and Quine (1978).

3. Other proponents of metaphor were critical of attempts to inject cognitive content into metaphor. In their view, discussing the cognitive value of metaphors remained caught within the prevailing categorical constraints of philosophy by making metaphor meaningful only if it could be linked to knowledge (Cohen, 1978:5).

4. A number of critics have noted a tension in Lakoff and Johnson’s thesis between their view that metaphors are both culturally specific and experientially derived (Bono 2001). However, although Lakoff and Johnson’s theory of metaphor has been criticized and subsequently reformulated, their seminal insight into metaphor’s structuring of conceptual and cognitive systems
has served as a key foundation upon which a notable literature and a research programme on conceptual metaphor has been developed, especially within cognitive psychology and cognitive linguistics (see Charteris-Black, 2004; Chilton 1996; Goatley 1997; Semino 2002).

5. Ricoeur (1978) also implicitly expresses this view, arguing that metaphor’s mimetic power redescibes the world, injecting it with new meaning.

6. It is important to note that by showing that tracing a metaphor reveals yet another metaphor, Derrida’s larger objective, following Nietzsche, is to abandon a search for metaphor’s origins. This is not an attempt to say that everything is metaphor, but more that there is no foundation upon which metaphor as a philosophical category is based. Despite this, his deconstructive approach provides an opening for thinking about the function and use of metaphor in particular circumstances in a more critical way.


8. The beginning of the Old Testament and the Torah is remarkably similar in this regard.
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