

1 Glocal Languages, Coloniality and Globalization From Below

Lynn Mario T. Menezes de Souza

There is strictly speaking no single process called globalization; there are, rather, globalizations; bundles of social relations that involve conflicts and hence both winners and losers. More often than not, the discourse of globalization is the story of the winners as told by the winners. The victory appears so absolute that the defeated end up vanishing from the picture altogether.

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2002a)

Our capacity to see is poor because our apparatus of knowledge-production is poor. We are tied up with our European inheritance and more recently, with an American empire, in the thinking of our Social Sciences.

Milton Santos (2007)

In the context of current language scholarship, reflections on the relationship between language practices, policies and language ideologies are not new. It seems, however, that the ideologies within which these studies are framed need to be the object of more critical focus. As Joseph (2006) reminded us, language is a political construction. Makoni and Pennycook (2007) highlighted the inequality of power dimension by adding that language classification is a political construct instrumental for the control of variety and difference.

Previously, Blommaert and Verschueren (1992) had also pointed out the controlling role of language ideologies in Europe but saw them as emerging from and pertaining to nineteenth century European nationalism. Makoni and Pennycook (2007) see both language *and* the metalanguages that conceive and categorize it as political constructs. As such, languages are inseparable from *metadiscursive regimes* that are not only representations of language but also social-institutional instances that produce knowledge about and control language. Makoni and Pennycook point to the need to not only see language and its study as inherently implicated in ideology and politics (local, national, colonial,

or Eurocentric) but to also understand the interrelationships that prevail in order to seek ways to reconstitute the constraining consequences of these interrelationships.

More recently, Flores (2013) and Kubota (2014) discussed the interconnections between language ideologies and global neo-liberal ideology. Canagarajah (2017), building on these interconnections, reinforces the need to consider language ideologies more deeply rather than persist in the current focus in applied linguistics to describe and analyze strategies deployed by users in multilingual practices. Stroud (2015), also building on the interconnections between language, ideology and politics and the need for a reconstruction of these interconnections, introduces the concept of *linguistic citizenship* as “an invitation to rethink our understanding of language through the lens of citizenship at the same time that we rethink understandings of citizenship through the lens of language” (24).

Given these interconnections between language and ideology, this chapter discusses the concept of glocal language, globalization and globalization from a southern perspective in the context of decoloniality. These terms will be explained below.

Hegemonic and Non-Hegemonic Globalization

Speaking epistemically from the margins of the hegemonic North, Santos (2002a), in an effort to examine emancipatory possibilities away from the negative effects of globalization and its accompanying cultural influences, proposes an analytical framework to apprehend globalization from a non-hegemonic, *southern* perspective. Santos prefers to see globalization as plural and sensitive to social political and cultural factors and *always entailing localization*. He differentiates between hegemonic and non-hegemonic forms of globalization. Whereas hegemonic globalization builds on and maintains established hierarchies and functions through an impetus for *regulation*, non-hegemonic globalization seeks horizontal collaboration and *solidarity*. When neo-liberal globalization and its penchant for de-regulation¹ becomes hegemonic, de-regulation acquires a normative stance; by forcibly demanding de-regulation it maintains a hegemonic position and functions as a variant of regulation (the rule is to de-regulate).

For Santos, there are two interconnected manifestations of hegemonic globalization: First, there is the successful **globalization of a localism**. The point here is that there is nothing that is transnationally globalized that does not originate *locally* somewhere; i.e. there is nothing that is not always already embedded in some specific culture. Given that all knowledge needs to be produced by someone, somewhere, there is, in social terms, nothing that is not already a localism. Through hegemonic expansion, certain localisms are globalized and acquire the aura of being universal. One consequence of the hegemony acquired by these globalized

localisms is their capacity, not only to deem themselves universal, but also to deem all other localisms as merely and insignificantly local.

For Santos (2010a), such is the case of what is considered to be scientific knowledge. As a *monoculture of knowledge*, modern science has ‘forgotten’ its local origins and development in Western Europe, and its implications in European philosophy, history and politics, and transformed itself into a global, universal yardstick that does not accept as science or as knowledge the multiple knowledges produced outside Europe. It is our contention in this chapter that hegemonic ‘language ideologies’ considered to be placeless, and hence ‘universal,’ may be following the exemplar of modern science.

The second manifestation of hegemonic globalization, according to Santos, is **localized globalism**; this refers to the imposition on particular localities of elements originating in the hegemonic transnational ‘global.’ Given their hegemonic force, such elements cannot be easily resisted but *can be recontextualized to suit the conditions and interests of the local*. Santos exemplifies this with the case of North American cinema whose stars are seen as transnationally global whereas other national cinemas and their stars are seen as merely local. He also cites the case of the global spread of English becoming a lingua franca in several local contexts. Both forms of hegemonic globalization maintain their hegemony by establishing an *abyssal line*, which separates what is considered to be of value on *this* (hegemonic) side of the line and consequently produces the *invisibility* of whatever is located on the *other* side of the line. Modern science, for Santos, is a prime example of the abyssal line (see below for further discussion).

Santos exemplifies non-hegemonic globalization with counter-hegemonic social movements and other forms of grassroots global exchanges; in these, collaboration and solidarity set the tone. Santos calls this **subaltern cosmopolitanism**. Given that established hierarchies of globalized power are unable to exclude the possibility of contact, exchange and collaboration between local (un-globalized) groups, it is this sphere of translocal exchange and solidarity that Santos defines as subaltern cosmopolitanism. Unlike liberal elite cosmopolitanism that emphasizes the individual and aims at the acquisition of social and cultural superiority through the accumulation of symbolic capital, subaltern cosmopolitanism aims at the creation of south-south dialogues and networks for mutual benefit and mutual emancipation.

Two features that highlight the horizontal nature that characterizes such networks and dialogues are an ecology of knowledges and the importance of translation. As an effort to deconstruct the hegemonic abyssal line that purports to separate the ‘global’ from the ‘local,’ the concept of an ecology of knowledges is based on the presupposition that no knowledge is total, complete and capable of everything. As Santos (2007) says, knowledge and ignorance are interconnected; a community’s

knowledge of something implies an ignorance of other forms of knowing; thus, this same community's ignorance does not invalidate the fact that it also knows.

The concept of translation comes into the picture in the wake of the same reasoning: The need for translation implies the need to know what one does not know. Translation, like the knowledges interconnected horizontally in an ecology, rather than signifying a total transference of meaning, implies incompleteness and ignorance and the need to overcome both; translation refers also to the fact that overcoming both of these in order to attain the desire of completeness is beyond realization. However, these difficulties in translation do not indicate incommensurability; they do indicate the need for constant exchange and for the persistence in the continuous work of translation.

These characteristics of a translocal ecology of knowledges and the unfinished work of translation add depth to Robertson's (1995, 2015) and Pieterse's (1995) descriptions (see below) of the complexity of globalization, beyond the standard reductive dichotomies of local-global and homogeneous-heterogeneous. However, it is essential to note that *unlike* Pieterse and Robertson, Santos is *self-consciously aware of his epistemic location* in the global south.

As we shall see below, the concepts of subaltern cosmopolitanism and the ecology of knowledge are relevant for a consideration of global languages from a southern perspective.

Glocalization

As we have seen, globalization, according to Santos (2002a), is necessarily also about localization, not only in the sense of the global forcefully affecting non-global locations, but also in how it involves the expansion from one local to other locals; it also involves, where necessary, the forceful returning of its competitors-in-the-process-of-expansion to their original locations. Globalization is then about the play of asymmetrical relations. *Glocalization*, as we shall see, is about how all these actions of localization play out at relatively non-hegemonic levels in the process of hegemonic globalization.

As my first epigraph says, a large part of the discourse of globalization is the story of the victors as told by them. If this is to change, it needs to go beyond substituting one story (the victor's) for another (the loser's). It needs to go beyond telling the story from a single perspective. Thus, besides troubling the singularity of the story, it is also necessary to "change the terms of the conversation" (Mignolo 2007) in order to 're-localize the global,' mark the unmarked and in short, 'provincialize' the apparently universal. In this process, the unmasking of one's locus of enunciation or that of other theorists and critics becomes increasingly significant.

Marking the unmarked and changing the hegemonic terms of the conversation is the strategy of epistemic reconstitution that various Latin American thinkers propose under the terms *decoloniality* and *coloniality*. It is a strategy of response to the singularity of perspective and to the predicament that the Brazilian social scientist Milton Santos (2007) describes in my second epigraph above.

Grosfoguel (2013) calls this predicament *epistemic racism*;² Santos (2014) calls it *epistemicide*.³ Given the significance of power relations and their unequal distribution in globalization, the manner in which globalization and glocalization are understood is inseparable from the *locus of enunciation* of the theorist or critic. This concurs with Santos' concept, mentioned above, that one's embedding in a specific local is inescapable. Similarly, in theorizing about language ideologies, whether to identify them, describe the practices and strategies through which they are manifested, or to undo their effects and transform them, one's locus of enunciation is crucial. It is in general what will situate the theorist on this side or the other of the abyssal line of modern science; it is what will deem certain knowledges as ideology and others as scientific fact.

For two theorists of globalization, Robertson (1995) and Pieterse (1995), for whom identifying their loci of enunciation is not significant, globalization is portrayed as a dynamic process more complex than that of a unified and unifying homogenizing force. They describe it as involving varying degrees of contact between the so-called *global* and the so-called *local*, including moments of convergence and divergence, interaction, interconnectedness and resistance. These complex moments of contact and their consequences are defined as *glocalization*.

Reading Pieterse and Robertson critically, Roudometof (2015) contrasts on the one hand Pieterse's conception of globalization as an integrative process of degrees of homo- and heterogeneity *convergently* integrating the global and the local in ever-changing patterns with, on the other hand, Robertson's conception of globalization as not only creating new, homogeneous units (albeit constructed from heterogeneous elements) but also initiating *non-convergent* processes of fragmentation.

Robertson, in a later discussion (2015), now in a post 9/11 frame, calls for a *critical global consciousness* and claims that a focus on *globalization as mere interconnectedness* has helped to hinder this consciousness. According to Robertson, such a global consciousness is of dire importance in light of some of the deleterious effects of globalization. An effect that he cites is related to one possible process of globalization as non-convergent fragmentation, often called *indigenization*; here, as in the localized globalism of Santos, elements absorbed from transnational global origins are integrated into local systems. However, their integration is forgotten and the local systems are seen as remaining unchanged, untouched by external influence and authentically local. As a conservative reaction of resistance to exogenous intrusion from the global, indigenization is seen

to propitiate cultural and religious fundamentalisms and foster violence and unrest. For Robertson, this kind of reaction highlights the critical importance of calling attention to the processes of *recontextualization* and *resignification* in globalization, lest they be forgotten.

In general then, for both Pieterse and Robertson the process of globalization involves *external* ('global') elements coming into contact with pre-existing *local* elements; these external elements, originating in different and distant contexts, are recontextualized as they are accommodated into local cultures, knowledges or beliefs. Globalization necessarily involves the re-contextualization and resignification of both external and local elements. This is not a simple top-down phenomenon in which the external global element remains intact globally and is only recontextualized and resignified locally; it is not simply a process of an external element imposing homogeneity and eliminating pre-existent heterogeneity or a reverse process of unleashed hybridization. As we shall see below in the case of perspective and locus of enunciation, in the construction of knowledge, as Santos reminded us above, the 'global' is always someone's 'local.'

In relation to the case of fundamentalism cited by Robertson (2015), though indigenization might, in practice, involve a large degree of recontextualization and resignification of extraneous elements absorbed into a local culture, in order to become 'fundamentalist' it must involve a simultaneous *denial* and *rejection* of such extraneous influence and adaptation. This denial and rejection are often *a posteriori* and mask the already occurred resignification of the new elements (now recontextualized and resignified as 'old' or pre-existing).

In light of this, Robertson proposes what he calls a critical perception and understanding of the processes of globalization—recontextualization and resignification—as possible *correctives* not only to prevent fundamentalism in such cases but also to minimize the homogenizing force of globalization in cases that don't involve fundamentalism but where there is little local resistance to the extraneous elements of the global.

Roudometof (2015) calls attention to the fact that in much of globalization theory, specific considerations of globalization remain largely *silent* and are rarely engaged with. On many occasions globalization is dismissed as being simplistic and dichotomous (Pennycook & Otsuji 2013), amalgamating an allegedly simple homogeneous 'global' with an allegedly simple homogeneous 'local.'

In the work of the theorists of globalization mentioned above, it is clear that though they alert one to the complexity of globalization, they do not distinguish between hegemonic and non-hegemonic forms of globalization. They seem to be analyzing globalization from the perspective of 'the winners' of the global north and not from its margins. Their concept of fundamentalism and the need for a critical approach to globalization hence become doubly flawed. First, what they identify as fundamentalism may be a legitimate (as seen from a counter-hegemonic perspective)

attempt to resist hegemonic globalization from a non-hegemonic locus. Second, the categories of analysis they propose—recontextualization and resignification—do not distinguish the complexity of epistemological perspectives involved and seem to analyze the phenomena from the purportedly neutral perspective of modern science on the hegemonic side of the abyssal line. 'Fundamentalism' or unquestioned truth-value could easily be attributed to such theorizing that delights in calling attention to the ignorance of others but not to its own ignorance.

In Santos' terms, rather than simply focusing on global-local contacts in terms of convergence or fragmentation, glocalization could benefit from a more complex analysis of globalization involving notions of emancipation and resistance, a multiplicity of knowledges and an ongoing process of translation.

The work of troubling the singularity of the narrative, changing the terms of the conversation, re-localizing the global, marking the unmarked and in short, provincializing the apparently universal must go on.

Glocal Languages

Theorizing language practices from the perspective of Santos' theories of hegemonic and non-hegemonic globalization, and situating such practices in the context of glocalization, Guilherme (2014, 2018) defines 'glocal languages' as products of processes related to Santos' second type of hegemonic globalization—localized globalisms. Like Santos in relation to globalization, Guilherme sees glocal languages as complex and promoting phenomena going beyond simple local-global and homogenizing-hybridizing dichotomies. They are complex because they involve active counter-hegemonic resistance to hegemonic globalized languages; they are promising because they do not simply reject but also transform global languages according to their own, local necessities. These transformations thus occur at the interface between the non-hegemonic local languages and the globalized hegemonic languages.

Glocal languages tend to be more commonly associated with hegemonic European languages now used in practices unforeseen in their hegemonic 'original' variants. However, non-European non-hegemonic languages may potentially also become glocal if transformed in contact with hegemonic localized-global languages. Guilherme calls attention here to the complex role of scale in such contacts: 'global' and 'local' languages may also exist and interrelate at the level of region or nation.

An important aspect of glocal languages is the role that local (non-hegemonically global) agency plays in their construction. In this sense, by 'answering back,' glocal languages represent a form of non-hegemonic resistance and blur the lines that separate Santos' terminology of hegemonic globalization and non-hegemonic globalization, globalized localism and subaltern cosmopolitanism.

In Brazil an example of how 'the' global language, English, has become a glocal language is how it is portrayed in local official documents (Brasil 2006)—the Orientações Curriculares do Ensino Médio (OCeM), a proposed national curriculum for the teaching of English as a Foreign Language at Secondary Level in the public school system. The OCeMs recontextualize and resignify English as a global language by making a distinction between the teaching of English as a *subject* in the school system and the teaching of English as a *language* for native-like competence in private language institutes.

Whereas, in the latter case, it is language competence that is the objective of teaching, in the former case, the objective is educational and does not include the aim of achieving language competence. The educational objective of English as a foreign language is stipulated as that of a means towards understanding and respecting difference. By appreciating how speakers of the foreign language use, for example, their bodily apparatus differently to produce different sounds, different intonations and different body languages; by appreciating how the foreign language organizes time in verb tenses differently to the mother tongue (Portuguese); by appreciating how written language is organized differently in English and in Portuguese, it is hoped that students will appreciate and respect differences in expression not only of foreign-speakers of English, but also of speakers of any language, including the mother tongue. Thus, from a global language with a globalized demand for native-speaker proficiency, the English language in the Brazilian school system is transformed into a subject that attends more adequately to local educational demands. Though in both cases teachers may be adamant that they teach English, and students may insist that they learn English, in fact, as a glocal language, it is used in the official school system more as a pedagogical device than as a natural language. In both cases the reason for this is the hegemonic and global nature of English in Brazil in relation to and in contact with the national language—Portuguese.

In terms of Santos' classification of globalization, we see in this example a localized globalism being transformed through local agency to attend to local demands. As a glocal language, English in this case serves the need for creating new knowledge, of greater local value—knowledge that can propitiate a respect for difference—rather than a reproduction, *in natura*, of a globalized localism that the English language effectively is in relation to Brazil. As a glocal language and through localized globalism it is 'translated' and, generating new knowledge through contact, it contributes to the ecology of knowledges characteristic of non-hegemonic globalization and characteristic of subaltern cosmopolitanism.

A second example of glocal languages in Brazil is the case of the interface between indigenous languages and Portuguese among indigenous communities in the Western Amazon in Brazil. Maher (1998, 2018) points towards the inseparability of the indigenous languages from Portuguese

in these communities and calls attention especially to the identity issues that emerge. She sees both the indigenous languages and Portuguese in these communities as *emergent*, as are the identities of these communities. Though their proficiency in Portuguese may not be that of an urban non-indigenous speaker, these communities, whether they maintain their indigenous mother tongues or not, see no clear separability between the languages. Those who have maintained their indigenous mother tongues recognize the importance of using Portuguese in official contacts with government officials, even though their proficiency in Portuguese may be limited. This perception of the necessity of Portuguese for their survival leads to their recontextualizing and resignifying of the language by inhabiting it as theirs, to be used as they wish and when necessary, without being limited to or hampered by non-indigenous 'standard' language norms.

Furthermore, according to Maher, those who have lost their mother tongues but symbolically still identify with them see themselves as fully fledged members of an indigenous community *with an indigenous language*, even if they are not fluent in it. In these cases, both the 'global' national language, Portuguese, and the local indigenous languages are transformed in contact with each other.

By claiming ownership of the indigenous mother tongue even when it is no longer spoken, their use of Portuguese has undergone ideological transformation: Even if they are de facto monolingual speakers of Portuguese, it is neither their mother tongue, nor are they ideologically monolingual. At the scale of the nation Portuguese as a localized globalism has been recontextualized and resignified, and the force of local indigenous agency marks this transformation as counter-hegemonic.

As was mentioned above, Santos (2002a) cites the example of English as a localized global phenomenon of hegemonic globalization. As a hegemonic global language, English undergoes resignification and recontextualization in non-hegemonic locations when it is used between speakers for whom it is not a first language. We have seen in the example above how this occurs in Brazil.

Portuguese in Brazil is another example of a localized global phenomenon not only because it is, like English, a former language of foreign colonialism, but also because in relation to indigenous communities within Brazil, as the national language of Brazil, it moves from being a former colonial globalized localism to function in the context of contact between indigenous communities and the Brazilian state, as a localized globalism. Portuguese here suffers significant recontextualization and resignification in these various contexts to the point of undergoing syntactic, morphological and pragmatic changes, beyond the more commonly expected phonological changes (see Chapter 6, this volume). The indigenous languages also undergo change through this contact, albeit at the pragmatic level of use and at the ontological level of coming into being as written languages.

Although much of current research in Applied Linguistics on languages in contact resulting from globalization are conducted under the labels of *superdiversity* (Blommaert & Rampton 2011), *metrolinguism* (Pennycook & Otsuji 2015), *translinguaging* (Canagarajah 2011; Garcia & Wei 2015), *polylinguaging* (Møller 2008) or, more recently and more descriptively, *language practices in combinatorial spaces* (Arnaut et al. 2017), most of these remain silent to the term globalization or glocal languages, and few are aware of their loci of enunciation, and therefore of their role in constituting or maintaining hegemonic language ideologies.

Many of these theorists of language seem to agree that in the context of globalization, language study has moved away from a focus on *languages* as structured, independent units, linked to specific cultures and nations, to a focus on *language* seen as a set of resources of linguistic and semiotic features that can be assembled and reassembled into *registers* or *repertoires*.

In terms of Santos' terminology, this change of focus should be expected to reflect a change of perspective from that of *regulation* to that of *solidarity* or in other words, a move away from the perspective of the rule-maker to that of the user of language. If language is now seen as an open-ended set of linguistic and semiotic resources, one would expect that this change of perspective reflects a change in access to these resources previously controlled by the hegemonic rule-makers of language. However, the fact that only a few theorists of language (Makoni et al., Makoni & Pennycook, Canagarajah, Kubota, Flores, etc.) are self-consciously aware of their own language ideologies—and hence their loci of enunciation—seems to indicate that a change may have occurred at the level of conceptions of language but perhaps not entirely at the level of metadiscursive regimes; the latter may hide the subjectivity of the theorist from him/herself and hence maintain his/her genealogical attachments and entanglements with hegemonic metadiscursive regimes beyond critique and consequently hinder effective change. In short, whereas access to linguistic and semiotic resources by the user of language may have occurred, access to epistemological resources that theorize language and its ideologies may have not yet occurred.

Blommaert (2014) signals the importance of the issue of ideological perspective in relation to globalization (though he does not use the term) when he once more recognizes the relevance of linguistic ideologies and identifies a *paradigm change* in language study in contexts of globalization. Besides taking into account the above-mentioned move from a focus on *languages* to one on *language*, he sees this change as involving processes of *mobility* and *complexity* in language use in spaces of global-local contact: "Taking mobility as a paradigmatic principle of sociolinguistic research dislodges several major assumptions (of mainstream sociolinguistics) and invites a more complex, dynamic, multifaceted view" (8).

In this paradigm change where language is now taken to be a set of resources, mobility seems to refer both to people moving across the globe and also to features of language structure and use—the linguistic and semiotic resources—that undergo change under conditions of global-local contact. Blommaert further stresses the need to complexify previous notions of *context* in language analysis under these conditions and the need to take an *ethnographic stance* in the analysis of language use in superdiversity. This appears to be a methodological preoccupation for analyzing language under these complex conditions and approximates the kind of ideological preoccupation of perspective as imbricated in power and history that characterizes coloniality and is discussed below.

Related to Blommaert's proposal of an ethnographic stance, Arnaut et al. (2017) propose, in their analyses of language use in the *combinatorial spaces* (where global-local contact occurs, spaces of globalization) afforded by globalization, the concept of the *poiesis-infrastructures nexus*; this is described as "the double process of emergent normativities and sedimentations on the one hand and the creative and material production processes unsettling these, on the other hand" (15). The poiesis part of the nexus is clearly related to the processes of contextualization and resignification or to non-hegemonic resistance discussed above. However, the infrastructures part, said to refer to "myriad forms of organisation and institutionalisation" (17) could benefit from more reflection; though akin to Santos' concept of regulation that characterizes hegemonic action, in the theorization of Arnaut et al., references to metadiscursive regimes, power relations and the institutional context, though present, appear to function as explanatory devices for language use rather than as an object of critique.

Towards a Southern Perspective

Apart from significant exceptions, some of which have been already mentioned (Makoni et al. 2003; Makoni and Pennycook 2007; Flores 2013; Kubota 2014; Canagarajah 2017) much of the theorizing on language in globalization, and especially in global-local contacts, continues to take place from a *zero-point* perspective (Castro-Gomez 2005); such a perspective is one in which the locus of enunciation of the theorist and its genealogical entanglements with hegemonic regimes is seen as irrelevant and where the knowledge thus produced is considered to have universal valence. This seems to indicate that in studies of language in globalization and more specifically in globalization, a concern with epistemic or cognitive justice as emphasized by Santos, Grosfoguel, Dussel, Quijano and other theorists of coloniality is not a priority.

From my perspective, located epistemically in the global south, it is not without irony that I wonder: In which contexts and *from whose perspectives* are the concepts of local and global defined or dismissed?

From whose perspectives are heterogeneity and homogeneity, recontextualization and resignification, said to accompany globalization, defined or dismissed? If, as Santos says in my epigraph, globalization involves conflicts, winners and losers, on which side are the theorists that portray globalization and glocalization as if from a distant neutral standpoint?

As we have seen, even when echoing Blommaert's concept of a paradigm change in language study and his proposal for greater ethnographic focus, many applied linguists often seem not to have noticed the need to critique metadiscursive regimes. Even when the agency and subjecthood of users is taken into account, it is largely as subjects of local relevance for the study of the data at hand. Their complex socio-historical constitution as subjects entangled in wider historical, ideological, racist, cultural and linguistic issues often tends to be reduced to generalizing notions of globalized mobility.

It seems that a globalized epistemic posture, possibly involving the "story of the winners as told by the winners," may have escaped the critical gaze of many thinkers of globalization and glocalization. In spite of their sensitivity to context, the question as to *where they are thinking or speaking from* in relation to the rest of the world seems not to be an object of relevance or critique. There are historical reasons for this *disembodied, un-self-conscious* and *universalizing* gaze, and they have to do with globalization and global-local contacts; they pertain, however, to a much older phase and locus of globalization.

Denouncing the restricted universalizing gaze that is blind to and actively (though not necessarily consciously) engaged in perpetuating its own privilege, Connell (2007 p. 226) critiques what she calls *Northern* social theory. She claims that, given its hegemonic position, such necessarily located social knowledge refuses to locate or contextualize itself and hence uncritically assumes universal value for its claims. By *Northern theory*, Connell refers to theory produced in the Eurocentric metropolitan West (or Global North)⁴ and self-portrayed as *mainstream*:

On close examination, mainstream sociology turns out to be an ethno-sociology of metropolitan society. This is concealed by its language, especially the framing of its theories as universal propositions or universal tools [. . .] its theorising is vitiated whenever it refuses to recognise its ethno-sociological being—[. . .] its situation in the world and its history in the world.

Against this universalizing gaze, in this chapter we engage in what Connell (2007) describes as *dirty theory* or theory intimately connected to specific situations: "The goal of dirty theory is not to subsume, but to specify, not to classify from outside but to illuminate a situation in its concreteness." This involves, not slimming down, but multiplying theoretical ideas and the local sources of one's thinking.

Theorists like Connell and the previously mentioned Santos, Grosfoguel and Mignolo are critically aware of their *locus of enunciation*, or the historical and ideological context from where they are speaking and from where their knowledge is being produced. They see themselves as *epistemically* located on the *margins* of hegemonic ('metropolitan,' 'northern,' 'Eurocentric', etc.) centers of economic, cultural and knowledge production, defined as the *South*. It is crucial to note that this location need not be *geographical or literal*; it may be *metaphoric*, but it is *always epistemic*.

In terms of the processes of recontextualization and resignification as characteristic of contact through globalization and the emergence of global languages, the calling of attention to one's epistemic location on the margins of the supposedly universal hegemonic episteme demands that all language and meaning-making seen as transparent, neutral and universal be recontextualized and resignified. Metadiscursive regimes need to be disclosed, and their roles in hegemonic or non-hegemonic regimes and their affordances for regulation and/or solidarity need to be considered.

Grosfoguel (2011), epistemically located in the South, defines fundamentalism as the premise that there is one sole epistemic tradition from which to achieve truth and universality. Fundamentalism may be hegemonic or marginal. Most of the theorizing of globalization that does not critically take into account its own epistemic location and relate it to epistemically different accounts of the phenomenon ends up performing what Santos called the *globalization of localisms*. According to the definition of Grosfoguel, such theorizing would be *hegemonically fundamentalist* in nature.

Speaking from a distinctly Southern perspective, on the margins of hegemonic globalization and located epistemically in Latin America, Grosfoguel emphasizes the problematic *insufficiency* of speaking of *the south and from the south*. He sees neither of these as guarantees that one is speaking *epistemically* from the south. To do so, Grosfoguel suggests that one speak *from and with the south*. Such is the perspective pursued in this chapter.

Speaking then from a Southern perspective, and avoiding the risk of falling into the trap of either marginal or hegemonic fundamentalism, Grosfoguel and Castro-Gómez (2007) propose the critical strategy of *border thinking from the perspective of decoloniality*. This does not amount to simply reaffirming the tiresome adages that "knowledge cannot be separated from social context and the ideologies inherent in the latter," or that, as a consequence of this, "knowledge is always partial in both senses of the word." The focus of decolonial border-thinking, according to Grosfoguel, involves engaging with and attributing to oneself and to others with whose epistemologies one engages, the crucial significance of the epistemic *locus of enunciation*. This identification of one's locus of enunciation is defined by Grosfoguel—and other Latin

American thinkers, such as Quijano (2000), Mignolo (2007) and Castro-Gomez (2005)—as the *geopolitical and body-political location of the subject that speaks*.

For Grosfoguel (2007, 2009, 2011, 2013) in the hegemonic, Cartesian, Western tradition, theoretical discussion tends to focus on *what is said* and not on *who is speaking*. This in general holds true as long as the speaker speaks from an *unmarked* (from the Western perspective¹) locus, as white, male, heterosexual, Christian and as a speaker of a hegemonic language. The unmarkedness of the speaker affects the import of what is said, permitting it to be understood in positive and authoritative terms (e.g. true and of universal value). This tradition of presupposing the unmarkedness of the speaker and the resulting focus on what is said characterizes what the thinkers of decoloniality refer to as an *ego-politics of knowledge*. This ego-politics is enacted by hiding the subject that speaks and hence his (yes, historically, *male*) body-political (the ascription of hegemony to race, gender, sexuality) and geopolitical (the ascription of hegemony to an epistemic location in the North) characteristics. For Grosfoguel, this is the basis on which Western science and modernity are constructed. Like Santos, as we have seen above, Grosfoguel connects the purported neutrality of modern science with the ideological project of modernity. Globalization is seen as a continuation of this hegemonic onslaught of the West and its knowledges disguised behind apparently perspective-less theorizing unanchored from their loci of enunciation.

According to Castro-Gomez (2005), it is through the ego-politics of knowledge of concealing the speaking subject that the *zero-point hubris* is also enacted. Like the ego-politics of knowledge, the zero-point refers to a point of view that 'zeroes' or conceals itself as a point of view in order to create the illusion of an objective, neutral, all-seeing, 'god's eye' point of view. The *zero-point hubris* refers to the hegemonic colonial insistence on not only propagating the illusion that there is no other knowledge but Western knowledge but also by hiding all influences from and exchanges with other epistemic traditions that Western knowledge may have had.

From the Southern perspective located in Latin America, both the ego-politics of knowledge and the zero-point hubris are integral parts of the epistemic continuation of the colonial experience in the region; this persists long after the declared end of colonization. Current globalization, then, is seen as the continuation of the colonial process that began in the sixteenth century.

Quijano (2000) uses the term *coloniality of power* to describe the continuing *persistence of the episteme* first established by the European colonizers in the sixteenth century in Latin America. On contact with the Amerindian native, the white Christian Iberian male instituted a self-image as *modern and superior* and constructed a discourse of superiority founded on the initial perception of the *race* of the Amerindian as being inferior. This initial *racial* superiority founded a *semiotic economy of*

inferiority that productively extended beyond race to include religion, culture, gender, language, sexuality and modes of production, and characterized all ensuing relations until today. This produced the rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and epistemic racism.

Coloniality contains no small degree of irony.⁶ As the founding myth on which the rhetoric of European modernity is established, the Amerindian and his deemed inferiority, says Quijano, *are constitutive of and necessary* for the maintenance of coloniality, the ego-politics of knowledge and the zero-point hubris; without the primitivity or color ascribed to the native, the European cannot be modern or white. This may be a prime example of the complexity of the dynamics of glocalization, often simplistically reduced to dichotomic local-global, homogeneous-heterogeneous or authentic-hybrid dualities. In the case of the *coloniality of power* each of the parties (hegemonic and marginal) in contact are *constitutive of each other*.

A perception of the mutual interconnectedness between the superiority of the European and the inferiority of the Amerindian is critical for the strategies of *border-thinking* or the *decolonial option* as a means of transforming the coloniality of power and avoiding the trap of falling into *either* a marginal *or* a hegemonic fundamentalism that affirms one or other element of the hegemonic-marginal coupling that holistically constitutes coloniality.

Border thinking involves, first, taking stock of one's epistemic locus and the multiple discourses that constitute it and, second, working through the limitations of each of these discourses in order to transform them into something more productive. In terms of using border-thinking as a critical strategy for glocalization, the entanglement of multiple epistemes in one's epistemic locus of enunciation may require no small amount of critical creativity.

Similar to and related to border thinking is the *decolonial option*. Mignolo (2017) defines this as to detach

from that overall structure of knowledge in order to engage in an epistemic reconstitution. Reconstitution of what? Of ways of thinking, languages, ways of life and being in the world that the rhetoric of modernity disavowed and the logic of coloniality implement.

This means *questioning the terms of the conversation*, that is, "questioning the structures of knowledge and subject formation (desires, beliefs, expectations) that were implanted in the colonies by the former colonizers" and continue till the present.

For Grosfoguel, like Mignolo, the decolonial option involves the decolonization of Western epistemological canons. This involves constructing a broader canon of thought than that imposed by the Western canon; it involves working towards a 'truly universal' perspective; not one which

is abstractly universal (a globalized local) such as that of the Western canon, but one that may arise from a critical dialogue between diverse critical epistemic/ethical/political projects; finally, the decolonial option requires the consideration of epistemic perspectives located in and thinking from the global south. The objective of the decolonial option for Grosfoguel, the need to dialogue with and relate to other perspectives and those located in the global south is to constitute a pluriversal and not a universal world.

The relevance, for a Southern perspective of glocalization, glocal languages and the concepts of the coloniality of power, its ego-politics of knowledge and zero-point hubris, is to raise questions such as: Located as I am, in Latin America, within the rhetoric of modernity and the logic of coloniality, how does globalization relate to me and my context? How does it affect what I consider to be global and local? How does it affect how I see myself? Am I local or global? For whom? How does it affect what I consider to be knowledge and what isn't? How does it affect the descriptions and analyses I read about globalization and glocalization? How does it affect what I consider to be language and what isn't?

Santos (2007) further contributes to the debate of interconnectedness, mutual constitution and attempts at mutual exclusion by means of the already mentioned concept of *abyssal thinking*. Santos describes the existence of an epistemic *abyssal line*, originating in colonial times and persisting under the current conditions of globalization. On *this* (hegemonic) side of the line, lie the values, cultures, languages and knowledges of metropolitan societies, whilst on the *other* side of the line lie the values, cultures, languages and knowledges of colonial societies. *Abyssal thinking* refers to a hegemonic form of thinking that values and makes visible what is on *this* side of the line and intentionally *produces the invisibility* of what lies on the other side:

Today as then, both the creation and the negation of the other side of the line is constitutive of hegemonic principles and practices. Today as then, the impossibility of co-presence between the two sides of the line runs supreme.

(Santos 2007 p. 53)

Like the complex mutual constitution and exclusion of the subjects of coloniality as seen by Quijano, the knowledges of both sides of the *abyssal line* constitute each other. However, the exclusion of one by the other is not symmetrical. The hegemonic *this side* of the line *constructs more actively the invisibility* of the other side and could be associated with the strategies of the ego-politics of knowledge and the zero-point in the sense that it seeks to declare itself as *unmarked*.

As a rejection of, and a desire to control difference and impose itself, *abyssal thinking* closely resembles what Robertson, in relation to

glocalization, called the fundamentalism present in indigenization, where newness is either rejected as undesirable and reduced to invisibility or translated into the already known and declared to be the same as what there was before.

Glocal languages as parts of an ongoing process of resistance to and transformation of hegemonic imposition, as examples of the unforeseen use of unauthorized non-hegemonic agency, are not only examples of actions indicating a decolonial option but also examples of a quest to establish co-evalness between both sides of the *abyssal line*. Glocal languages from this southern perspective are products of hegemonic globalization forcibly submitted to its canons; at the same time glocal languages are indications of the transformation of a purportedly universal and imposed monoculture into a diversity or pluriversity of knowledges.

A concept of justice that separates Southern perspectives from metropolitan or hegemonic ones is *cognitive* or *epistemic justice*. Whereas, from the metropolitan hegemonic perspective, *social justice* based on largely economic and political considerations tends to be the goal, from the Southern perspective of both coloniality and *abyssal thinking*, the quest for critique goes beyond social justice and aims at *epistemic and cognitive justice* (Grosfoguel & Castro-Gomez 2007, Mignolo 2011, Santos 2007, 2010b, 2010c), which value knowledge, culture and language as being equally necessary for social well-being. Besides the transformative strategy of border-thinking that Grosfoguel proposed above, Santos proposes the strategy of *post-abyssal thinking* or thinking beyond the divide.

Like border-thinking, which takes stock of the constitutive epistemic complexity of the subject in order to go beyond established exclusions, *post-abyssal thinking* values what Santos calls the *ecology of knowledges* as a means to dissolve the *abyssal line*; this consists of opening up established knowledge systems to new ones, thus introducing dynamic incompleteness and plurality without aiming at an ultimate complete totality. According to Santos (2007 p. 10), this move in *post-abyssal thinking* “defends the fact that the understanding of the world by far exceeds the Western understanding of the world and that therefore our knowledge of globalization is much less global than globalization itself.”

This opening up to a plurality or ecology of knowledges, located in but not limited to the margins of hegemonic globalization, aims at promoting epistemic plurality that in fact constitutes, but is unrecognized by, the hegemonic episteme: “The more non-Western understandings of the world are identified [...] it becomes more evident that there are still many others to be identified and that hybrid understandings, mixing Western and non-Western components, are virtually infinite” (*ibid.*).

For Santos, this infinity of the epistemological diversity of the world, at the interface of contact between ‘both sides of the *abyssal line*,’ or ‘across the border of border thinking,’ or in the various global-local

interconnections of glocalization, is a form of *globalization from below* in the sense that it challenges any attempt at establishing divisive lines or totalizing shapes imposed by hegemonic forces. In this sense, glocal languages represent a move that may also be called 'globalization from below.'

The multiplicity of the ecology of knowledges was always there, but the rhetoric of modernity, Western science and the logic of coloniality, like the 'story of the winning told by the winners,' imposed singularities. Once again, the alleged simplicity or dichotomic nature of the global-local encounter in glocalization does not hold.

The concept of the existence of an ecology of multiple knowledges made invisible by the abyssal line of the rhetoric of modernity becomes clear when glocalization is seen to refer not just to the encounter between the (singular) global and the (singular) local but to several globals (e.g. the current global, the historic, colonial global, a regional global etc.) and several locals. As in the case already mentioned of global English, what of the use of Portuguese in indigenous communities or in official indigenous educational policy in Brazil?

A Southern Perspective: A Brazilian Indigenous Contribution

In the wake of the Southern strategies of decoloniality, border-thinking and post-abyssal thinking, and their proposed dynamics for challenging metropolitan or hegemonic impositions, two indigenous cultural tropes from Brazil have the potential to contribute to an understanding of the global-local dynamic of glocalization and its processes of recontextualization and resignification: the trope of *familiarizing predation* (Fausto 1997) and the trope of *equivocal translation* (Viveiros de Castro 2004).

Both tropes refer to the fact that a large part of indigenous cultures in Amazonian Brazil value otherness and newness; both of these aspects are seen as essential for the survival of a community. In other words, for these communities, knowledge-production is inseparable from a firm and conscious anchoring in one's context; the curious aspect here, relevant to our consideration of glocalization and glocal languages is that in spite of the priority and significance given to one's local context, it is still seen as insufficient. One's local context can only exist and survive if in the context of other local contexts. However, probably in order to preserve themselves from self-extinction, the openness to and quest for alterity of these indigenous cultures is highly codified culturally and linguistically. This codification involves processes of resignification and contextualization.

In the trope of *familiarizing predation*, in order to maintain the psychic and physical health (and therefore develop the personhood) of the male individual, this individual must engage in a war of predation that

involves putting oneself at risk and capturing a life-threatening enemy. This *predation* of the enemy involves capturing the animating force or 'soul' of a powerful enemy, thus appropriating the lethality of the enemy and reducing him (culturally it has to be male) to the status of a slave; hence the *familiarizing* or taming of the enemy. The predation and familiarizing of the enemy is done ritually and symbolically through codified dreams and chants. The enemy is encountered and captured in a ritualized dream. If the enemy is captured and familiarized, he delivers a chant to his captor; the symbolic *death* of the captured enemy is resignified into the *production of a chant*. This chant is seen to have an intense healing power that may be used to heal or strengthen the captor or any other member of the community. However, once the healing force of the chant has been used, both the enemy and the chant cease to exist, and a new enemy has to be captured in the exterior to guarantee the well-being of the male member of the community. Thus, male members of the community have to continuously engage in ritual predation and familiarizing.

This trope can be fruitfully read in the context of glocalization and glocal languages as relating to the contact between the exterior and the interior, the unknown and the known, the global and the local, framing this contact as necessary, life-giving and fruitful. Though necessary, the contact, if not controlled and codified, is also threatening. In other words, in terms of glocal languages, this trope warns that the new threatens continuity if it is not familiarized or made recognizable. Familiarization here involves recontextualizing and resignifying the new into something *apparently already known*, even though it is the category (the familiarized, the chant) that is known and not the content. Thus in glocal languages, even though transformation occurs and changes the language from its original form, the *appearance* of formal continuity needs to remain in order for the glocal language to be considered part of or related to the hegemonic global language from which it emerged.

In short, relevance of this trope for the dynamic of glocalization and the emergence of glocal languages lies in the complexity involved in 1) desiring the new; 2) the new, in order to be desirable, has to be life-threatening; as such, it has to signal discontinuity (in order to be new) at the same time as it offers the promise of continuity and stability through resignification and recontextualization; and 3) the paradox between the new and the old, continuity and discontinuity, life and death, is resolved only *formally* through the process of *familiarization* but maintained in practice.

Given that only the strange can be made familiar, the ambiguity and irony is maintained beneath the illusory appearance of reducing the new to the old (chants as a category are pre-existing and 'old' even though each specific chant has to be captured anew and is therefore 'new'). The self-esteem and sense of stability of the community needs to be preserved; Nothing has changed; nothing is therefore under threat; continuity

prevails, yet all *has changed*. With the introduction and processing of the new input, nothing remains unchanged; what was before is now no longer, yet the illusion of stability and continuity is maintained.

Connections may be clearly and productively drawn between this indigenous cultural trope of familiarizing predation and the concepts of coloniality of power, a body-politics of knowledge, a zero-point hubris and post-abyssal thinking. The most important aspect of this trope for our purposes is that it refers to cross-epistemic contact that is seen as simultaneously necessary and dangerous, and performed through a strategy of border-thinking as explained above.

Continuing with our process of *dirty thinking* (Connell 2007), the second trope, of *equivocal translation* (Viveiros de Castro op. cit), also originates in the indigenous cultures of Amazonian Brazil and refers again to the high value attributed to the new and the unknown in these cultures and the necessary interconnectedness between these. In the so-called *perspectival* indigenous cultures of Amazonian Brazil, each species of living being is seen to be *culturally* (where culture refers to the perceived capacity to think and communicate) equal to every other species.

However, each species occupies a different *nature* or form (human, animal, plant, etc.). Though there may be contact between different natures or forms, their difference, if erased in contact, results in the symbolic 'death' of the previous form and possibly in physical demise. What one sees, knows or says depends on where one is located in relation to one's interlocutor. Thus, while a human may see a jaguar drinking the blood of its prey, the jaguar sees itself as a human drinking beer and sees the human as a jaguar. If however, the jaguar sees itself *and* the human as jaguars, this indicates an erasure of formal difference between the species and is an indication that one or both have 'died', that is, one or both have abdicated from or lost their original form.

In this sense, though necessary, all communication across species can only be *equivocally translated* because there can be *no shared perspective* from which one can see 'the same thing': "Equivocal translation is not to find a 'synonym.' [...] Rather, the aim is to not avoid losing sight of the difference concealed between our language and that of the other since we and they are never talking about the same things" (Viveiros de Castro 2004 p. 7).

In relation to glocal languages, this trope suggests that as sites of contact between different languages and knowledges, these languages need to mark their difference from both the hegemonic and the local languages from which they emerge. As in the case of the trope of familiarizing predation, equivocal translation refers positively to the need for contact and exchange between different communities, seen to be different at one level (the cultural) but similar at another (the natural). Because of this, the exchange can never result in *convergence*, in total translation. The contact or translation will always be partial or *equivocal*. In

other words, though the same and the different need to *attempt* approximation and contact, their difference will persist in keeping them apart. Resignification and recontextualization of elements in glocal languages in situations of contact can never occur to the point of eliminating the markedness of these elements.

In terms of the abyssal line proposed by Santos, equivocal translation clearly separates the parties involved but does not produce the invisibility of the Other. In fact, in relation to the concept of the abyssal line, equivocal translation, in emphasizing the equivocal, maintains symmetry between both sides of the abyssal line. Therefore, there is and there is not an 'other side of the line,' if by 'other side of the line' is meant 'all that is seen as being of lesser value.' In this case, the 'invisibility of the other' is constantly and necessarily attempted rather than actually produced. Neither side eliminates *de facto* the other; both sides of the line remain clearly visible to each other; it is the line itself that gains prominence as uncrossable and unerasable.

The relevance of this trope to global-local contacts in globalization is that, though total convergence is deemed to be impossible in such contexts, convergence nonetheless *needs* to be attempted. Furthermore, it signals situations in which the resignification of elements of contact will always remain marked.

Concluding

In a world saturated by globalization, the age of the phenomenon suggests that it may no longer be worthy of interest; the work of critique, however, must persist. Here critique was not intended as a quest for a purported 'true' or 'right' way of knowing. As the discussion above attempted to show, such a concept of unchallenged truth only makes sense in fundamentalism. As academics, we know that knowledge arises from and cannot be separated from social context and that, because of this, knowledge is necessarily ideological and partial. However, as in the Brazilian expression *pimenta nos olhos dos outros é refresco* (*pepper in someone else's eyes is cooling*), unless one has felt the brunt of an ego-politics of knowledge, the import of these expressions remains innocuous. Unless one has been told that the language one speaks is not language or that the knowledge one has inherited from generations before is fiction, an *ego-politics of knowledge* that empowers such statements by transforming them into science seems little more than a phrase invented to confound.

If globalization is concerned with global-local contact and if by globalization one means the *localizing* of a phenomenon in all the senses (including the localizing of globalisms) this chapter began with, one needs to be critically aware of the import of one's locus of enunciation. The perception of 'global' and 'local' and the need or not for contact and exchange are inseparable from one's histories and one's epistemologies.

If glocalization involves seeking out and understanding change, we have attempted to show that there is no simple process of change: It can be desirable or not, ethical or not, regulatory or solidary. Hence the necessity of confronting the loci of enunciation of all those involved, not only of those undergoing change but also of those perceiving and reflecting on the change. Working through these loci, reading them against their histories, their epistemologies and the power relations in which they are immersed, and confronting them with one's own histories, epistemologies and power relations is what decolonial border-thinking is all about. Having one's perspective and knowledges marginalized and learning to see oneself as Other is what makes us South and apparently impotent; hence the critique that we need to engage in. This includes a reappraisal of glocal languages formerly seen, like knowledges and peoples from the South, as lesser phenomena.

The critique that we have sought to develop in this chapter consists, then, of unlearning learned ignorance. I began with an epigraph from Santos (2002a p. 41) and will end with words from Santos (2010a p. 116), where he defines the ignorance of one's locus of enunciation and the consequence of this ignorance: "The less a given way of knowing knows the limits of its knowing about other ways of knowing, the less aware it is of its own limits and possibilities."

Notes

1. The de-regulation of neo-liberalism is self-serving and refers to the interests of the dominant, not to the interests of the subaltern who must forcibly submit to hegemonic interests.
2. In Dussel's (1995) and Quijano's (2000) considerations of coloniality in the Americas, they identify race as primordial and the basis on which other aspects of the hierarchy of coloniality are constructed. Once alterity has been racialized, all other social aspects of that alterity—culture, language, class, gender and sexuality—are subsequently classified as lacking. Thus, in the specific case of the Americas, where the Other was indigenous, the cultures, languages, class, gender and sexuality of the indigenous Other would always be worth less than that of a white.
3. Santos is here referring to his concept of the hegemonic abyssal line on which modern science is established and on which the invisibility of other knowledges and sciences is produced.
4. For the purposes of this discussion, whose intention is to give importance to one's locus of enunciation, the difference between the use of Eurocentric, Western, metropolitan, northern, North or Global North is of little significance.
5. Markedness or unmarkedness is always a question of presupposition and perspective.
6. Several post-colonial thinkers, such as Bhabha (1994), define irony in terms of its duplicitous "janus-faced" ambiguity. In order to be irony, it must refer to two things at the same time, one deemed to be more visible than the other. Irony however depends on previous knowledge. If the observer of irony does not identify *both* things referred to the user of irony, the force of the intended irony is lost. In the case of coloniality, the native victim of coloniality is as important to its maintenance as the white perpetrator of racism.

References

- Arnaut, K., Karrebaek, M. S., Spotti, M. & Blommaert, J. (eds.). 2017 *Engaging Superdiversity: Recombining Spaces, Times and Language Practices*, Bristol, Multilingual Matters.
- Bhabha, H. 1994 *The Location of Culture*, New York, Routledge.
- Blommaert, J. 2014 From Mobility to Complexity in Sociolinguistic Theory and Method. *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, paper 103, Tilburg University, Tilburg.
- Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. 2011 Language and Superdiversity. *Diversities/UNESCO* 13: 2, pp. 1–21.
- Blommaert, J. & Verschuren, J. 1992 The Role of Language in European Nationalist Ideologies. *Pragmatics* 2: 3, pp. 355–376.
- Brasil. 2006 *Orientações Curriculares do Ensino Médio: Linguagens, códigos e suas tecnologias*, Brasília, Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2017 *Translingual Practices and Neoliberal Policies*, Cham, Springer.
- Canagarajah, A. S. 2011 Translanguaging in the Classroom. *Applied Linguistics Review* 2, pp. 1–28.
- Castro-Gomez, S. 2005 *La Hybris del Punto Cero*, Bogota, Universidade Javeriana.
- Connell, R. 2007 *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Dussel, E. 1995 *The Invention of America; Eclipse of 'the Other' and the Myth of Modernity*, trans. Michael Barber, New York, Continuum.
- Fausto, C. 1997 *A Dialética da Predação e Familiarização entre os Parakanã da Amazônia Oriental: Por uma Teoria da Guerra Ameríndia*, Doctoral Thesis. Rio de Janeiro, PPGAS/Museu Nacional/UFRJ.
- Flores, N. 2013 The Unexamined Relationship between Neoliberalism and Plurilingualism: A Cautionary Tale. *TESOL Quarterly* 47: 3, pp. 500–520.
- García, O. & Wei, L. 2015 *Translanguaging*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2013 The Structure of Knowledge in Westernized Universities: Epistemic Racism/Sexism and the Four Genocides/Epistemicides of the Long 16th Century. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge* 11: 1, Article 8, pp. 73–90.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2011 Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking and Global coloniality. *Transmodernity, Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1: 1, pp. 1–38.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2009 A Decolonial Approach to Political Economy: Transmodernity, Border-Thinking and Global Coloniality. In *Epistemologies of Transformation*, Kult 6 Special Issue, Roskilde, University of Roskilde, pp. 10–38.
- Grosfoguel, R. & Castro-Gomez, S. (eds.). 2007 *El giro decolonial Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*, Bogota, Universidad Central.
- Guilherme, M. 2018 'Glocal Languages': The 'Globalness' and the 'Localness' of World Languages. In Coffey S. & Wingate, U. (eds.) *New Directions for Research in Foreign Language Education*, New York, Routledge, pp. 79–96.
- Guilherme, M. 2014 'Glocal' Languages and North-South Epistemologies: Plurilingual and Intercultural Relationships. In Teodoro, A. & Guilherme, M. (eds.) *European and Latin American Higher Education between Mirrors; Conceptual Frameworks, and Policies of Equity and Social Cohesion*, Rotterdam, Sense Publishers, pp. 55–72.
- Joseph, J. 2006 *Language and Politics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Kubota, R. 2014 The Multi/Plural Turn, Postcolonial Theory, and Neoliberal Multiculturalism. *Applied Linguistics* 33: 1–22, August, pp. 474–494.

- Maher, T. 2018 Shifting Discourses about Language and Identity among Indigenous Teachers in Western Amazonia in the Wake of Policy Change in Cavalcanti, M. & Maher, T. (eds.) *Multilingual Brazil: Language Resources, Identities and Ideologies in a Globalized World*, New York, Routledge, pp. 41–56.
- Maher, T. 1998 Sendo índio em português. In Signorini, I. (ed.) *Lingual(gem) e identidade: elementos para uma discussão no campo aplicado*, Campinas, São Paulo: Mercado de Letras, pp. 115–138.
- Makoni, S. & Pennycook, A. (eds.). 2007 *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Makoni, S., Smitherman, G., Ball, A. & Spears, A. (eds.). 2003 *Black Linguistics: Language, Society and Politics in Africa and the Americas*, New York, Routledge.
- Mignolo, W. 2017 Interview with Alvina Hoffman. *E-International Relations*, January 17. www.e-ir.info/2017/01/17/interview-walter-mignolo-part-1-activism-and-trajectory/ (accessed January 5th 2018)
- Mignolo, W. 2011 *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W. 2007 Delinking. *Cultural Studies* 21: 2, pp. 449–514. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09502380601162647> (accessed January 18th 2017). DOI: 10.1080/09502380601162647.
- Møller, J. 2008 Polylingual Performance among Turkish-Danes in Late-Modern Copenhagen. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 5: 3, pp. 217–236.
- Pennycook, A. & Otsuji, E. 2015 *Metrolingualism: Language in the City*, New York, Routledge.
- Pennycook, A. & Otsuji, E. 2013 Unremarkable Hybridities and Metrolingual Practices. In Ruby, R. & Alsagoff, L. (eds.) *The Global-Local Interface and Hybridity: Exploring Language and Identity*, Cleveland, Multilingual Matters, pp. 83–99.
- Pieterse, J. 1995 Globalisation as Hybridization. In Lash, S., Featherstone, M. & Robertson, R. (eds.) *Global Modernities*, London, Sage, pp. 45–68.
- Quijano, A. 2000 Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America. *Nepantla* 1: 3, pp. 533–580.
- Robertson, R. 2015 Beyond the Discourse of Globalization. *Glocalism: Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation* 2015: 1, pp. 1–14.
- Robertson, R. 1995 Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity/Heterogeneity. In Lash, S., Featherstone, M. & Robertson, R. (eds.) *Global Modernities*, London, Sage, pp. 25–54.
- Roudometof, V. 2015 Mapping the Glocal Turn: Literature Streams, Scholarship Clusters and Debates. *Glocalism: Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation* 2015: 3, pp. 1–21.
- Santos, B. de S. 2014 *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*, Boulder, CO, Paradigm Publishers.
- Santos, B. de S. 2010a A Non-Occidental West: Learned ignorance and an ecology of knowledges. *Theory Culture Society* 2009: 26, pp. 103–123.
- Santos, B. de S. 2010b *A Gramática do Tempo: para uma nova cultura política*, São Paulo, Cortez Editora.
- Santos, B. de S. 2010c *Para além do pensamento abissal: das linhas globais a uma ecologia de saberes*. In Santos, B. de S. & Meneses, M. P. (eds.) *Epistemologias do Sul*, São Paulo, Cortez Editora, pp. 31–83.
- Santos, B. de S. 2007 *Beyond Abyssal Thinking: From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledge*, Review XXX-I-2007, pp. 45–89.
- Santos, B. de S. 2002a Towards a Multicultural Conception of Human Rights. In Hernandez-Truyol, B. (ed.) *Moral Imperialism: A Critical Anthropology*, New York, New York University Press, pp. 39–60.
- Santos, B. de S. 2002b *A Crítica da Razão Indolente: contra o desperdício da experiência*, São Paulo, Cortez.
- Santos, M. 2007 *Encontros*, São Paulo, Saraiva.
- Stroud, C. 2015 Linguistic Citizenship as Utopia. *Multilingual Margins* 2: 2, pp. 22–39.
- Viveiros de Castro, E. 2004 Perspectival Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Equivocation. *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America* 2: 1, Article 1, pp. 3–22.