MULTICULTURALISM AND GLOBALIZATION: A COMMENT

Janja Žitnik

COBISS 1.02

MULTICULTURAL REALITIES AND GLOBALIZATION

The global reach of capital, science, technology, information, ideas, political and social activism and other spheres of activity has brought about several global processes in the domain of culture as well. In her contribution to this thematic section, Sladja Blazan points out: "While in North America and Western Europe cultural globalization has been viewed as a set of observed cultural streams and social processes moving outward from the center to the margins, in Eastern European countries globalization has been studied as a political, or 'ideological', project, led by the West." Actually, cultural globalization encompasses more than just a globalization of dominant cultures and languages. It turns out to be much more complex than that, as it has, on the other hand, also generated an international break-through of various hitherto secluded 'minor' cultures as well as a globalization of concepts relating to cultural equality.

Due to the fact that worldwide linkages in various spheres of activity were established centuries ago, scholars agree that globalization at large is a permanent process which has often been misinterpreted as a unique recent phenomenon. They believe it has been held responsible for more current issues than it should have been, and its allegedly dramatic current impact should be considered *cum grano salis*. Having put aside most of their possible disturbing emotions long ago, the authors of this thematic section have been given an opportunity to examine the interaction of globalization and multicultural development of individual countries and that of the world prudentially, and they did so. At the same time of course, they managed to expose their patriotic as well as cosmopolitan values to lead the discussion towards constructive future strategies. Owing to the nature of the problems discussed here, this comment though may fail to keep its emotional distance through and through.

The papers composing this section certainly show that when questions of multiculturalism[1] are involved, we can learn from the past and we can learn from each

[1] In this comment, the term multiculturalism is used in its broadest sense, embracing the concepts defined or implied within the 'institutionalized' or informally implemented elements of multiculturalism/pluriculturalism, cultural pluralism, interculturalism, cultural integration, constructive

other. The advanced communication technology has been removing the barriers of the time, the distance and the language, and it has been spreading the principles of cultural equality around the world. The effects of the resulting global intercultural permeability can be observed practically on all levels of private and public life, to a lesser extent – as we have learnt here – even on the level of the changing family patterns. The need of language transparency which is necessary to curb interethnic conflicts, and the need to protect language diversity have been discussed in considerable detail; and finally, the most practical ways of advancing a global multicultural peace culture have been suggested.

As much as has been done in terms of consolidation of concepts and principles relating to multiculturalism, there is a long way to go yet. In many countries, members of native minorities and new immigrants from low-income parts of the world are still too often subject to suspicion, mistrust and various forms of cultural and social discrimination. On top of a vast multitude of scornful words invented to exclude these people from society, the word immigrant itself (in general use) often obtains a pejorative meaning – an attitude which, of course, generates defensive reactions. A very similar emotional atmosphere is straining intercultural and socio-economic conflicts on a global scale.

The connection between migration and the advancement of multiculturalist[2] concepts is self-evident. What is the connection between these two processes and globalization? Should they be seen as reverse sides of the same shield? What is the role of migration in blazing the trail for an ever larger expansion of cultural and economic exchange, for a permanent increase in global mobility of goods, capital, ideas, social, cultural and human values?

Migrations have been part of human history ever since its beginnings. Ancient imperialism and – long before that – natural disasters, hunger, and tribal wars of conquest had caused massive migrations which always resulted in an encounter of cultures and their subsequent blending, with germs of interethnic tolerance, respect, intolerance, disdain and hatred. No later than in the age of the antique empires and even more so at the peak of the colonial age an unprecedented expansion of dominant cultures occurred. This had brought about the beginnings of (hardly ever mutual) interest in intercontinental cultural exchange, first based on general excitement and curiosity about exotic foreign cultures. On the other hand, it had also brought about most brutal symptoms of racial and ethnic discrimination with all forms of physical and cultural oppression related to it. As a rule, both types of reaction occurred simultaneously.

In historical perspective, rulers have dealt with ethnic diversity within their kingdoms and empires in various ways – from intruding the dominant culture, language and religion

---

interethnic or majority-minority cultural relations or, as I would prefer to call them, various co-cultural models. Perhaps two of their common features should be mentioned here: firstly, all of those terms indicate a goal, not the true bearing of the case; and secondly, the goal could be designated as cultural equality.

[2] In my writings, multicultural simply means consisting of several or many cultures, while multiculturalist relates to multiculturalism. Similarly, intercultural simply means between different cultures, whereas interculturalist relates to interculturalism.

to other ethnic groups, to a number of much more enlightened measures (such as edicts and proclamations of religious tolerance, general introduction of public schools and religious services in native languages, etc.). Historians can enumerate countless cases of ancient and medieval policies which contain earliest traces of modern multiculturalist or integration ideas, but a 'plain' citizen knows little about all that. Hence, the reverse of the medal – the fear and the rejection of the foreign – has remained almost as obstinate as ever until the present time.

As a result, people nowadays are generally surprised to learn that the slogan "Unity in Diversity" was not invented either in the 20th century or in modern times at large. In the United States though, it was probably first printed as a motto in the U.S. Foreign Language Information Service monthly called *Interpreter* (founded in 1923). Its successor, the quarterly *Common Ground* (1940–1942), which was "the first American literary periodical to be devoted entirely to ethnic and intercultural matters,"[3] brought articles in which their authors were suggesting possible ways for over sixty different nationalities living together on the common American ground to attain harmonious cultural coexistence; or in the words of its editor, Louis Adamic,[4] "... that we sink our tap roots deep into its [i.e. America's] rich and varied cultural past and attain national stability in place of emotional hysteria ..."[5] The core of the *Common Ground*'s message was that everyone should not only be allowed but also encouraged to be proud of what they are – racially and ethnically, religiously and culturally. Moreover, to compose a successful and contented heterogeneous society, each member should not only accept and respect the cultural diversity of that society but also gain from it. "While championing ethnic contributions and the value of strong group attachments, Adamic's farther-reaching goal is to build a nation energized by a dynamic interaction of cultural influences."[6]

Regardless of how premature these ideas seemed to be at that time it is obvious that up to this moment – in view of the present interethnic and international conflicts – they still have not been generally accepted. It may not be surprising that the ancient world and middle ages are often seen as the times of pure fear, hatred and violence among different peoples and nations. Just as the daily news generally give salience to conflicts, crime, war and aggression, the image of the ancient past that history textbooks have been offering to pupils around the world often tends to be selective in this respect as well.[7] I am pretty convinced

---

[3] John L. Modic, "Louis Adamic and the Story of Common Ground", *Louis Adamič – Symposium*, ed. Janez Stanonik, Ljubljana: Univerza Edvarda Kardelja, 1981, p. 241.

[4] Louis Adamic (1898–1951) was the most prominent Slovenian emigrant writer as yet.

[5] From Louis Adamic's editorial in the first issue of *Common Ground*, 1940.

[6] Dan Shiffman, *Rooting Multiculturalism: The Work of Louis Adamic*, Cranbury, NJ – London, England – Mississauga, Ontario: Associated University Presses, 2003, p. 24.

[7] As Ada Aharoni also stresses in section Education and Multiculturalism, "Multiculturalism should be considered as a central educative value and should inspire and influence all aspects of education. Violence in schools and in the streets in most cases arises from the mistaken notion that force is the only way that can solve conflicts. The study of multicultural peace culture could demonstrate that it is otherwise, and new approaches should be adopted. In the teaching of history, for example, attention should be given to the policies and verbal diplomatic negotiations that

that there is not enough general knowledge and awareness of past human achievements pertaining to global intercultural linkages and to numerous attempts to secure and defend cultural equality at least on a national scale.

Does this mean that human society has been inventing more or less the same solutions over and over again, or is it true that with each moment and with every new experience mankind is actually given a better chance to resolve its differences? Both, I suppose. If people generally were more acquainted with human history, they could understand current state of affairs much better and it would be much easier for them to pick the right moment and bring their potential solutions to considerable effect. The question is of course, who controls educational contents. The tax-payers who provide for public educational system usually have little say in this matter. The concentration of capital has authorized a handful of people to run the states and the world in all spheres, along with culture and education. In a world of power, the only choice one has got often seems to be either to command or to serve; yet in fact, there is always a third option. But I shall return to this later.

MIGRATION AND GLOBALIZATION OF CULTURES

The interconnection between migration and world-wide diffusion of a particular culture is a matter of course. As soon as regular contacts between emigrants and their native land have been established, a basic condition for a global reintegration of that culture has also been fulfilled. Not all emigrants maintain regular contacts with their native land; but some do. And those who do are not only adding their specific cultural patterns to the patchwork culture of their new homeland but are also adding their more or less altered cultural patterns to their original home society. Thus, emigration of members of a nation to various parts of the world brings about a certain degree of cultural globalization which always has two sides: global spread of that particular culture as well as the return impact that emigrants' intercultural experience has had on their parental culture. The latter may be regarded as a reverse effect which fosters a global diffusion of (elements of) the receiving country's culture adopted by immigrants from different parts of the world, and mediated to the national cultures of their native lands.[8]

As Zvone Žigon vividly explains in his paper (in the section titled Diaspora, Homeland and Globalization), "globalization itself is not a threat to the ethnic identity of Slovenians abroad; on the contrary, it brings the Diaspora closer to its country of origin, and this is

lead to the successful conclusion of peace treaties, and not concentrate mainly on the waging of the wars, as is often the mode in schools in the present. The two sides of the conflicts should be presented in a lively and convincing way, and historical novels are a good means to present this duality."

[8] The transmigrant presented in Sladja Blazan's essay embodies a further stage in the changing cultural identity: "Pronek cannot be solely a mediator, his activity is wondering and dwelling, the mediation is being done on him and by him. He might be seen as the mediator and the mediated simultaneously."

becoming increasingly evident in recent years." Of course we must pay attention to other factors that have played an important role in this change, e.g. the democratisation of Slovenia and international recognition of its independence in 1991–92. Žigon writes: "With the change of regime, the number of Slovenians from abroad, willing to visit Slovenia increased rapidly, and at the same time, the standard of living in Slovenia rose so much that also travelling from this country to visit relatives in America, Australia etc. became much more accessible to everyone. This means that permanent physical contact between the homeland and the Diaspora was established. This fact is of great importance, since from that moment Slovenia is no longer an 'imaginary dreamland', but a real (although small) green piece of land in the middle of Europe and it can be touched, felt, experienced."

An encounter of two cultures is always the beginning of a mutual process which brings changes to both cultures.[9] In the case of return migration, mutual changes resulting from the direct intercultural contact are almost as obvious as those in the case of immigration of other ethnic groups. Slovenian ethnologists and sociologists have been examining cultural changes caused by return migration for decades, and reintegration of recent Slovenian returnees from Argentina is just being studied within a research project conducted by the Institute for Slovenian Emigration Studies. On the other hand, the blending or integration of immigrant cultures in Slovenia have not occurred as the subject of any comprehensive studies as yet, whereas research into questions such as the impact of Slovenian culture on (and general attitude of the authorities and of national majority towards) second generation immigrants from former Yugoslav republics to Slovenia, is still in an initial state.[10]

In countries with much more advanced multiculturalist awareness comprehensive studies of this kind have been made. Institutes and centers of migration and intercultural relation studies have been founded at a number of universities throughout Europe and elsewhere, realizing of course the indivisibility of migration and intercultural issues. It is surprising that in the midst of this rich tradition of intercultural studies, Slovenia is still reluctant to admit that the present share of first and second generation immigrants in this country (at least 14.5 %)[11] is substantial enough to start treating its population at large as a multicultural society.

---

[9] For more theoretical discourse on this see: Marina Lukšič-Hacin, *Multikulturalizem in migracije*, Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, 1999, p. 237 ff.

[10] A recent study has though been published: Bojan Dekleva and Špela Razpotnik (ed.), *Čefurji so bili rojeni tu: Življenje mladih priseljencev druge generacije v Ljubljani*, Ljubljana: Pedagoška fakulteta in Inštitut za kriminologijo pri Pravni fakulteti, 2002. This research was done on the initiative of the Institute of Criminology, Hannover, Germany, and was part of an international research project. In the same year, three other monograph studies were published: two on the problems of refugees in Slovenia (Mojca Pajnik, Petra Lesjak-Tušek, Marta Gregorčič, *Immigrants, who are you? Research on immigrants in Slovenia*, Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut, 2002; Uršula Lipovec Čebron (ed.), *V zoni prebežništva: Antropološke raziskave prebežnikov v Sloveniji*, Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, 2002); the third on the aged immigrant population (Alenka Kobolt, *Zdej smo od tu – a smo še čefurji?*, Ljubljana: I2, 2002).

[11] My estimation is based on the statistics from the 2002 census results: www.stat.si/popis2002.

Considering the present flood of migration, interculturalist[12] and globalization studies we can only agree with Susan Ziehl, who – at the beginning of her paper – seems to be a bit surprised by the lack of discourse between the globalization and the family researchers, a lack for which she finds a credible explanation though. Her thorough and detailed study of any possible impacts of migration and globalization on family patterns in Europe, especially in Britain, and in South Africa certainly represents an important step in this field of research. Drawing on Giddens, Ziehl briefly compares three most distinct positions in the globalization debate, and discusses the permanently changing identity of the "global citizen" (section 2). She goes on to examine if the thesis implying that modern migration and globalization have brought about an increasing diversity in family patterns, which allegedly constitutes an increasing deviation from the nuclear family pattern, can be actually supported by statistics. She underlines the relevance of the fact that the nuclear family household is only one of those phases in the domestic life cycle which make up the nuclear family *pattern*. On this basis Ziehl uses the same statistical data that other authors have used to show a decline in nuclear family pattern, to prove – in certain cases – the opposite. She draws the conclusion that "family sociologists have been trying to seek support for their view that non-conventional family structures *ought* to be accepted as legitimate or 'normal' (a moral stance), in empirical data showing how common or uncommon different household structures are (statistical frequencies)," and that their reasoning is "an attempt to deduce a moral position from an empirical claim about how frequently something occurs. Even if it were possible to show that the majority of a population does not follow the conventional nuclear family pattern, that is not evidence for the claim that it should lose its position as the moral norm or as legitimate." (Section 4.3.) Whether explicit or implicit, a moral stance obviously is present in Ziehl's own paper, a factor which certainly adds up to the functional relevance of its contents. The study shows that intercultural influence and the impact of either migration or globalization on traditional family patterns are actually much more gradual than we have been led to believe. In other words, the traditional prevalence of particular family patterns, characteristic of a particular culture, persists in spite of the unifying component of globalization, and these characteristic patterns have been relatively well preserved even in immigrant communities, which, on the other hand, mirrors to some extent the diversifying component of globalization on modern multicultural realities, although it has not crucially affected the predominance of either the nuclear or some other family pattern typical of a country, region or larger part

[12] For those who do not engage in this kind of studies, let me mention one example that perhaps will give an idea about the multitude of literature in some of the European languages relating to only one of the many specialized fields of interculturalist research: a published collection of post-graduate studies on intercultural education of adults (Maria Beatriz Rocha-Trinidade, ed., Maria Luísa Sobral Mendes, ed., Educação intercultural de adultos, Lisbon: Universidade Aberta, Centre for the Study of Migrations and Intercultural Relations, 1996) contains a 100-page bibliography, consisting of an analytical bibliography of 57 selected works, and a list of 219 studies, mostly Spanish or French, on the intercultural education of adults, published before 1996. The list contains only those titles which are available in the Documentation Centre of the Universidade Aberta and in one of the departments of the Spanish Ministry of Education.

of a continent. If we went a bit further, we could speculate that globalization – if seen as a complex process of both, divergence and convergence – is simply bringing changes to human life and space just as any other social or human process has done in the past, and that these changes are generally believed to be more dramatic than they actually are.

CULTURAL EQUALITY AND WORLD PEACE

In terms of family patterns, it would be hard to object to the author of the well-argued study discussed above. Yet, when the questions of human equality are involved, be it in terms of social conditions, race and ethnicity, religion or culture, it seems that the harder we try to resolve them separately from investigating the manifold impact of the global concentration of capital – a concentration to the benefit of the financial elite, the more complex and remote the solutions will appear. It is self-evident though that a culture with a weak economic basis does not have the same prospects as a culture with a firm economic basis. Furthermore, cultural equality is not in the interest of those who want to preserve or increase the existing degree of social inequality. The questions of xenophobia, the resulting discriminations and the undesired or even aggressive reactions to these seem to be closely related to the question of socio-economic order and stratification of a society. When an immigrant or a native minority represents a specific social stratum, the extreme upper or the extreme lower one, the national majority is encouraged to put the blame for their disappointments with their own social system on the nationality or religious structure of those social strata which stand out most from the average.[13]

An analogy with the psychological background of the world tensions is obvious. The feelings of national, religious, social and cultural insecurity have always been liable to demagogical abuse. If this circumstance was sufficiently exposed and recognized, people could resist such abuse. As it is not, the policy of turning public attention away from the fact that the public itself is being taken advantage of, continues to be the most frequent conservative strategy. The easiest way to keep the population busy with other problems is to stir their national or religious feelings. How often do teachers discuss this aspect with their pupils? How frequently does it occur as a subject of debate in the mass media with highest ratings? The state-financed education and media reflect government-supported capitalist control, and the vicious circle seems to be unbreakable. Public manipulation by way of patriotic or religious feelings is easily sustaining itself. Thus, in multiethnic countries political parties are still using these effective, yet humiliating tools to consolidate their own political power on a national scale, just as the world superpowers are still using the same methods to consolidate their global influence in order to protect the capital they represent. Can the issues of multiculturalism and global peace culture be discussed separately from the issues of socio-economic abuse, national or international?

[13] Cf. Michael Haralambos and Martin Holborn, *Sociologija: Teme in pogledi* (1st edition, 2nd reprint), Ljubljana: DZS, 2001, p. 726.

A multicultural coexistence and world peace are not in the interest of those 6 % of the world population who – under the protection of their own legislation – have taken possession of 59 % of the world's goods.[14] If the world wants to start making its own decisions, it should probably crack this nut to begin with. These simple statistics point to the worst form of discrimination that has ever taken place anywhere. Three (3!) richest individuals possess a wealth which is greater than the sum of the gross domestic product of 48 poorest countries together.[15] To compare the GDP per inhabitant of five richest and five poorest countries in the world, the difference between them tripled in four decades (1950–1992). The income of the richest 20 % of the world population was multiplied by 2.5 between 1960 and 1998, whereas the income of the poorest 20 % has remained unchanged. The number of those who earn and can spend less than a dollar a day (1.2 billion people) has not changed in the last decade either – not to mention the share of those who have got nothing at all. The number of the most discriminated people, those with less than a dollar a day (to use one of the most arrogant 'official' thresholds of poverty), jumped in East Europe and Middle Asia from 1 million in 1987 to 24 million in 1998 (a result of the 'democratization' of the former socialist countries). Their share in Central and South Africa and in South Asia has been slightly below half of these countries' entire population. In countries like Burkina Faso, their share is more than 60 %.[16] And we should pay attention to the absurd misconception which may be deduced from these statistics as soon as they are displaced from a broader realistic context – namely, to assume that anyone who earns at least slightly over a dollar a day, is not poor. Basing one's estimation on this kind of criterion, and stating that the share of the poor in the world population is one fifth, is therefore not only a sheer lie but also a mockery.

Another factor that contributes to the acceleration of social divide on a global scale, is the increasing inequality in terms of human mobility. Massey points out: "For it does seem that mobility and control over mobility both reflects and reinforces power. It is not simply a question of unequal distribution, that some people move more than others, and that some have more control than others. It is that the mobility and control of some groups can actively weaken other people. Differential mobility can weaken the leverage of the already weak. The time-space compression of some groups can undermine the power of others."[17] Birkett clearly illustrates the result of this: "Jumbos have enabled Korean Computer consultants to fly to Silicon Valley as if popping next door, and Singaporean entrepreneurs to reach Seattle in a day. The borders of the world's greatest ocean have been joined as never before. And Boeing has brought these people together. But what about those they fly over, on their islands five miles below? How has the mighty 747 brought them greater

[14] Statistics from: Jean-Louis Laville, Humano gospodarstvo jutrijšnjega dne, *The Unesco Courier*, Slovene edition, Vol. XXXI., No. 68, Dec. 2001, pp. 13–14.

[15] Ibid.

[16] The statistics are taken from: Neenaki zaslužki, *The Unesco Courier*, Slovene edition, Vol. XXXI., No. 68, Dec. 2001, pp. 14–15.

[17] Doreen Massey, A global sense of place, in: Stephen Daniels and Roger Lee (eds.), *Exploring Human Geography*, London – New York – Sydney – Auckland: Arnold, 1996, p. 240.

communion with those whose shores are washed by the same water? It hasn't, of course. Air travel might enable businessmen to buzz across the ocean, but the concurrent decline in shipping has only increased the isolation of many island communities ... Pitcairn, like many other Pacific islands, has never felt so far from its neighbours."[18]

When economists become cynical enough to develop one of the neo-liberal share-holder-value theories which argues that if there is more bread on the table, there will be more crumbs on the floor to keep the vermin happy (which, sadly, has proved false as well), it means that we are facing not only economic cannibalism but also an ultimate and unprecedented decadence of human values on a largest scale. History has verified that whenever decadence reaches a critical point, radical changes take place. I am convinced that the aspect of the shareholder-value theory in which the only relevant factor concerning work is its immediate effect on the shareholder value, is unethical. I believe greed is the core of all national and world conflicts.

As I said, a multicultural coexistence and world peace are not in the interest of those 6 % of the world population. If they were, we would not be having this discussion. The 'new economy' which, in terms of the standard of living, has divided the countries of the world to a higher degree than any previous economic processes, needs economic inequality of countries as well as international economic migrations because it needs superfluous and therefore inexpensive labor to sustain itself.[19] It needs both, immigrant workers and their underdeveloped homelands which virtually have no other choice than to open their doors for foreign investment to enter their territory in order to make a greater profit there than it could back home. If the countries of the world were more equal in economic respect, they would be more equal in social and cultural respects, there would be far less international economic migration, migrants would not constitute extreme social strata, and their national affiliation would not be such a controversial issue as it is now. Of course, not every one who falls under those 6 % willfully supports conflict and war; but peace and equality are obviously not their priority. Again, I believe greed is the core of all national and world conflicts.

A new concept of human equality and democracy must be developed. Instead of protecting the interests of the few, the legislation and the diplomacy, as well as culture policies, science, education and economic policies must represent general interests. A culture of dialogue is essential. But perhaps we may all agree that a proper dialogue can hardly be started unless the parties involved are equal. And since most people are not equal, they can probably be expected to support aggression on their behalf for as long as they are kept, with their hands tied, in a place where no one can hear them.

As I see it, global multicultural coexistence and peace can never be achieved unless they are based on a just socio-economic world order. If we want to choose peaceful dialogue and co-cultural symbiosis instead of war, terrorism and crime, the underprivileged must be set free in the first place – not by means of aggressive interventions but by means of a new

[18] D. Birkett, *New Statesman and Society*, 15 March 1991, p. 38, in Massey, 1996, pp. 238–239.
[19] Cf. Haralambos and Holborn, 2001, p. 726.

perception of our common goal, and of a peaceful way that can lead us there. Public opinion represents one of the two world's greatest powers. The Internet offers an opportunity for public opinion to be expressed and registered in the widest platform that has ever existed – at least potentially – out of control of those who stand on the opposite side of mankind. The problem is that only 0.2 % of the Internet users are those from the poorest 20 % of the world population, whereas 93.3 % of the Internet users are those from the richest 20 % of all people.[20] This means that the world is still having a very hard time trying to speak up. And if anyone should help it in its utmost endeavors to be heard, I believe it should be the people working in social and human sciences, the people who have learnt from the history. They may be the only ones who can look inside the hearts of the underprivileged as well as inside the heads of the overprivileged, and invent a language understandable to both parties. I also believe multicultural and peace studies should be an equal choice among major school subjects; as such they should be offered at every existing faculty of arts and social sciences, and intercultural contents should become a regular constituent part of educational contents at all stages of schooling.

DIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES AND CULTURES VS. GLOBALIZATION

In section 2.2, Peter Graf quotes Goethe's words: "To tolerate means to insult."[21] Many other prominent authors have shared this view, and one of them was, again, Louis Adamic. *Tolerance Is Not Enough* is the title of his famous speech presented on a cross-American lecture tour soon after World War Two. Cultural diversity, the importance of ethnic roots, ethnic discrimination and forced assimilation were central topics of his books *Grandsons: A Story of American Lives* (1935), *My America* (1938), *From Many Lands* (1940), *Two-Way Passage* (1941), *What's Your Name?* (1942), and *A Nation of Nations* (1945); his lectures and pamphlets *Plymouth Rock and Ellis Island* (1940), *On Unity and Uniformity* (1941) and many others; as well as *The Peoples of America Series* (1947–1950), of which he was General Editor.[22] Among other related issues, Adamic discussed the manifold impact of the language barrier that immigrants to the United States had to face at that time. The fact that most of the questions he posed sixty years ago are now still as timely as ever, sounds a bit pessimistic although it cannot be denied that much has been done in this respect (either

[20] Neenaki zaslužki, *The Unesco Courier*, Slovene edition, Vol. XXXI., No. 68, Dec. 2001, pp. 14–15.

[21] Sladja Blazan introduces an even more radical view: "The romanticization – in this case eroticization /.../ – of the 'simple' other disguises xenophobic notions. In both cases the 'approval' of the existence of the 'other' merely emphasizes 'Western' superiority."

[22] Adamic was editor of nine books within this series: *Americans from Holland; Americans from Hungary; Americans from Japan; Our English Heritage; They Came Here First: The Epic of the American Indian; North from Mexico: The Spanish-Speaking People of the United States; Americans from Sweden; Americans from Norway; They Came in Chains: Americans from Africa* (cf. Henry A. Christian, *Louis Adamic: A Checklist*, The Kent State University Press, 1971, pp. 67–76).

in America or elsewhere) since the '30s or '40s of last century. Yet, whenever we come across the question of the minorities' right to have their children educated in their mother tongue, the problem of an optimum primary school language-learning system arises every time again.

In section 3.0, Peter Graf proposes solutions that certainly deserve our special attention. Starting from the recognition of the facts that "more attention is to be put on the languages of the minorities ... (which) have to be recognized as a cultural resource and are to be promoted at school," and that we should "develop a concept of intercultural language education that is suitable for all pupils without causing any inequalities or overcharges, to be offered at regular schools and to be integrated into the general school system," he presents a model according to which, "All schools together will be joined in a coordinate network which will reflect the language landscape of the city or town. Thus, families of language minorities will have the opportunity to select a school for their children where their own first language is offered together with the national official language." (Section 3/3; in other parts of the paper this model is presented in detail.)[23]

Although it may not be faultless, an accomplishment of this model would be a huge step towards a more vital co-cultural link-up within a multiethnic country. A problem could arise though with the fact that English has already exceeded the usual function of a *lingua franca*, and is becoming a dominant language not only of international communication in the so called "world of western democracies", but also of global communication. Therefore it has to be recognized that the knowledge of English is becoming increasingly inevitable for young and middle-aged generations in Europe and elsewhere. If children in Germany should learn one of their minority languages as a second language at primary school – without being offered an equally accessible possibility of learning English (by "equally accessible" I mean without being additionally charged), they may feel handicapped in relation to children from those European countries where English is taught at most primary schools as a second language.[24] The latter have the advantage of being able to communicate with youngsters from any part of the globe, and they can perhaps identify themselves with their geographically remote mates just as closely as with the country of their origin or residence. The assumption that our European (and hopefully some day our global) identity will be gradually equilibrated with our national identity, is probably

[23] Let me draw the reader's attention to the different perceptions of the term 'integration' in the context of migrant situations. As many other German authors do, Graf also uses this term – throughout his paper – more or less synonymously with 'assimilation', whereas most other authors use it in a much different sense. The complete opposite of 'assimilation' is probably 'ghettoization', while in cultural studies the most widely established meaning of the word 'integration', I believe, is an active inclusion of minority cultures in the multicultural network within a multiethnic country, which not only allows successful preservation of authentic features of each co-culture but also implies their equal status as well as their vivid interaction.

[24] When Slovenian children apply for international (leisure or research) camps or summer exchange of pupils, they expect to be able to communicate with children from other countries. As English has been taught as a second language for decades at most Slovenian primary schools, the selection of applicants needn't be based on their knowledge of a foreign language.

somewhat premature; but on second thought this prospect may not be quite as far-fetched as it seems to be at the moment. A global identity of those Slovenian children who master English well enough to surf and chat on the Internet on daily basis, is already supplanting their national identity to some extent – and of course, it worries us. In countries where the majority of population has no access to the Internet, this process is not so fast, which can be seen either as an advantage or a handicap.

But those of us who are becoming more and more equally involved as constituent parts of either co-cultural, economic or political actuality on a national and on a global level, are facing a more or less urgent demand of our contemporary reality: to attain a balance between the national and the global. And this demand applies to language learning as well. For many years now, other major European languages (e.g. French and German) have been trying to achieve equal position in global or at least in European communication as English has attained, and they are doubtlessly entitled to and justified in doing so. But the fact remains that in daily international use they have not been able to attain quite the same position and that, on the other hand, the need of a global communication language has become unquestionable. Maybe it is no use persisting in denying this need. What helps develop an awareness of being not only a citizen of one's country but also of the world, is not one's knowledge of English but one's knowledge of a language in which one can communicate with the rest of the world.

What are then the options?

- One option is to keep on fighting against the functional dominance of English, by promoting at least several other languages as a means of global communication that should be no less frequently used than English. Choosing this option means that English would be an equal choice among several possible second languages at primary school, which offers enough space for us to give priority to our own national co-languages, i.e. our minority languages, from which each primary school could choose its second language. In this case, learning English at primary school would actually mean extra work in dislocated classes for many of the interested children.
- Another option is to recognize the advantage of the fact that we have actually already been using one language as the predominant universal language, and that the fact itself that it happens to be English does not necessarily constitute any kind of threat to any other language. In this case we can choose to teach English as a second language at primary schools generally, in order to make global communication easier for our children. If we presume that a generally acceptable number of languages a child should learn at primary school is two, we come to the following situation: English, of course, cannot be taught at the cost of the national official language but it can (and very often is) taught as a second language at the expense of one's first minority language, which contradicts the minorities' right to have their children educated in their mother tongue and, on the other hand, the right of the ethnic majority to get to know their co-citizens, their closest neighbors at first hand, to understand the language they speak at home just as those neighbors can

understand the language spoken in a family that belongs to the majority language group. And these rights represent only one aspect of the necessity of much more advanced co-cultural policies than those which have hitherto been promoted in most European countries. As I myself have been zealously advocating the need to secure proper conditions for a much more interactive and much closer co-cultural interconnectedness within individual multiethnic countries, I find this second option, namely to give priority to learning English at primary school at the expense of the minority languages, unsatisfactory.

- A third option is general introduction of multilingual primary school education instead of mono- or bilingual. By reason of psychological and practical obstacles that a general obligation of all primary schools to teach, e.g., at least three languages would bring forth, professional pedagogical circles might object to the rigidity of this option.
- There are of course a number of other options but they all more or less fall under a fourth option – a liberal language-teaching system for primary schools, favoring and facilitating multilingual education. If we should realize that learning the 'global' English from earliest school grades on does not necessarily mean submitting to the supremacy of the Anglo-American cultural, ideological, etc. influence but that it also means getting a chance to take most active part in building up a global co-cultural network, in promoting our own personal, national and other identity-related values on a global scale, we might feel that we actually have the right to obtain this chance for ourselves and for our children. For this reason I believe that English should be offered as a second language in as many primary schools in Europe as possible, along with the closest minority language. Children, together with their parents, will then be able to make their own choices.[25] The obstacles implicated in the third option (overcharged school curriculums, lack of interest, lack of teachers in individual schools, insufficient classroom capacities, etc.) can be surmounted by means of various solutions, such as visiting teachers, compound language classes (i.e. pupils from different classes joining in a language class), cooperation of schools and foreign-language teaching-centers, including perhaps the option of learning two second languages at the expense of one other school subject, or the option of allowing a reduction of the extent of several other subjects in favor of a third language.[26]

Preservation of language diversity constitutes only one aspect of the maintenance of cultural diversity promoted by integration theories and policies. According to Ada Aharoni,

[25] In the past three years, Slovenian primary-school system has taken another step to approach this goal: of all immigrant minorities' languages, at least Croatian has been included in the list of the subjects from which pupils have to choose an obligatory number of subjects.

[26] Before Slovenian independence, two second languages had been taught in all Slovenian primary schools: English (or German in some cases), and Serbo-Croatian. Yet the obstacles mentioned above were successfully surmounted, and even the school curriculum was no more overfilled than it is now.

"The multicultural approach in education is also an important factor as a means of fostering consciousness and sensitivity to lacks and deficiencies not only in one's own society but also in the world at large. It moreover has the ability to promote willingness to take creative action in the building of a better world. The subject of multiculturalism in general, has received relatively little attention in education, and it should be more encouraged. Ministries of education and culture regionally and globally should correct this, and should attempt to include multicultural and peace studies as required subjects at all levels of schooling."[27]

Thus, the final goal of cultural integration policies is not only to curb cultural convergence and assimilation but also to curb interethnic or intercultural conflicts. This task though is a complex one: it exceeds the range of either education or culture policy and cannot be fulfilled without a close co-operation of social and human sciences, non-government organizations, tutors, policy-makers, and opinion-makers in all spheres of public life.

A MOTLEY CROWD, YET ONE WORLD: AN ILLUSION OR A GOAL?

In section 2.1 Peter Graf points to one aspect of the psychological background of intercultural conflicts. There is no need to stress that differences between cultures are problematic primarily because there are wide gaps of ignorance and false pictures between them, gaps that have been so often politically abused. Our children should learn that these cultural misperceptions have been constructed to be used as mere tools for convincing masses of people to enter regional or long-distance interethnic conflicts and wars which have been (economically) profitable to those who have started them.

The need of a new orientation in education is, as I pointed out before, further supported by the fact that the 'new economy' is spreading its tentacles through all public spheres including primary and secondary education, and that this has gradually begun to show in an obvious wrench of human values promoted at school – e.g. early segregation of less successful pupils by means of various hierarchical secondary-school systems (such as exclusive grammar schools for brilliant students, very good students, average students and the least gifted ones), or giving an exaggerated priority to personal success over solidarity. As intercultural differences very often underlie grave learning difficulties among minority children, ethnic chauvinism can be further manipulated for the purpose of raising future generations of 'natural' adherents to the success-oriented philosophy and practice of the new economy, which implies a doctrine of power and constitutes an extreme deviation from the values of human equality. This philosophy and its operating machine have already divided the world in terms of social inequality and the resulting intercultural irritability to a larger extent than any previous clash of ideological or religious interests. As a result, more and more young people realize that

[27] Quoted from section Education and Multiculturalism.

the doctrine which preaches competition, winning and success before everything else, and divides people, nations and countries into the successful and the unsuccessful, the advanced and the underdeveloped, the powerful and the powerless, the winners and the losers, is not the only option.

Increasing demands for bridging intercultural gaps thus call for our laying greater stress on more vital co-cultural rapprochment, multicultural and multilingual education from earliest stages on, and a global link-up of those who have come off this world-dividing process empty-handed and are trying to find a peaceful, yet efficient way of standing up against the discriminative rule of power. Active co-existence and peaceful co-existence[28] are terms which came out of fashion with the death of the founding fathers of the non-aligned movement (started in the Brioni, Croatia in 1956). The terms may be obsolete but the notions and the vision they stand for are not. I believe the basic concepts of this vision need to be revived, modified, expanded and applied to intercultural, political and economic relations within each multiethnic country as well as globally. A most productive introduction field for this, is education. Let me quote Aharoni once again: "Schools and colleges are suitable forums where culture, values, ideals and identity, as well as worldviews, are formed. Curricula should pay attention to the power of the multicultural trends and teachers should be trained to teach it. Educators need to carry out programs that would give young people a vision of what could be, a future view that would draw on their imaginations to create new visionary dimensions of a world beyond war, terror, famine and poverty."[29]

As Rey von Allmen takes it for granted, "In western Europe and with the Counsel of Europe we have been developing the intercultural since the 1970s in a context in which the cultural plurality essentially generated from migrations, and it was from the sphere of education that this concept has been diffused."[30] The concept itself has certainly been diffused to other spheres, but mostly in terms of academic discussion. In most countries, the links between academics and policy-makers (and opinion-makers) are still much too loose. In Slovenia for example, general public opinion relating to ethnic equality in terms of the immigrants' legal status – at the moment I am writing this – still tends to be inclined to the logic of the lynch law.[31] The hate speech of those who aim at stirring national feelings whenever they find it convenient, usually occurs during a pre-election time. Is there a psychologically relevant argument that could shatter the triumphant magic of that nation- and world-dividing rhetoric?

Even if identity (by definition) is based on the feeling or awareness of NOT being something else than you are, it obviously can also include the feeling or awareness

[28] Peaceful co-existence may be a pleonasm. Co-existence is generally understood as peaceful (and sometimes also as mutually beneficial) common existence.

[29] Section Education and Multiculturalism.

[30] Micheline Rey von Allmen, Une éducation interculturelle: défi et nécessité pour nos société pluriculturelles, *Migracijske i etničke teme*, Zagreb, vol. 18, 2002, no. 1, p. 87.

[31] I am referring to the current opinion polls and local incidents concerning the so called 'deleted residents'.

of being just another human being, not essentially different from others – as opposed to more exclusive identities. Therefore we should perhaps bear in mind that either a national or a global multicultural community functioning in terms of those multiculturalist policies which are currently operating, may not be the ultimate objective.

When different cultures existing side by side define and start pursuing their common goals, they cross the line of any currently operating multiculturalist model (as each of those models turns out to be generally misperceived as a mosaic of sovereign, yet disconnected or only loosely interconnected particles), and become co-cultures. When they have reached their common goals, they can become a free community of sovereign individuals. Nationality, culture, religion and ideology can then become inclusive, not exclusive attributes of their identity. This means, in short, that I CAN identify with you because I AM conscious of my nationality, culture, religion or any other link of my manifold group identity, just as you ARE conscious of yours. Furthermore, as soon as you and I feel or understand that I am a bit of EVERYTHING you are and vice versa, and as soon as we can both accept this fact, we can co-ordinate our different expectations in a constructive way, without communication blockades caused by emotional or rational exclusion. One's attitude towards the family, towards the distorted criteria of social equality, towards the environment and health are already becoming more essential factors of one's identity than those which have so far been used to disguise the actual background of the militarist ideology. The color of one's skin can then soon turn out to be no more controversial than the color of one's hair, and one's mother tongue or religion no more irritant than the color of one's voice.

Can we afford to consider this vision an obsolete illusion, and do away with it? Judging from the increasing number of people and groups engaged in peaceful conflict-resolution activism, I understand we are not ready to give it up yet. With the strain of growing intercultural tensions, more and more efforts are being focused on seeking optimum solutions and optimum steps necessary to reach them, including potentially an essential reform of the self-image of mankind as well as perhaps a thorough re-definition of human rights and equality. Another kind of power may grow stronger than what has been forced upon humanity as the supreme authority for thousands of years. A more natural worldview that needs no persuasion because it dwells more or less suppressed in every human being, may shake the fortress of capital, military force and political strategies designed to conceal the fear, the emptiness and self-alienation behind its walls, and fly its gate wide open. Wherever this inherent worldview has been regaining its strength, new criteria of the meaning, the purpose and the quality of life are being shaped. With a redemptive help of our human nature which leads us, in critical moments, to give priority to our common survival and to get more actively involved in questions crucial for us to outlast the self-destructive turbulence of our prolonged social infancy, I believe the option indicated throughout the papers of this thematic section is bound to prevail.

POVZETEK

MULTIKULTURALIZEM IN GLOBALIZACIJA: KOMENTAR

Janja Žitnik

Globalni doseg kapitala, znanosti, tehnologije, informacij, idej, političnega in socialnega aktivizma ter drugih dejavnosti je sprožil nekaj globalnih procesov tudi na področju kulture. Med njimi so globalizacija dominantnih kultur in jezikov, mednarodni prodor doslej manj znanih kultur, predvsem pa globalizacija načel kulturne enakopravnosti. Ker pa je znano, da so bili zametki svetovnih povezav na najrazličnejših področjih dejavnosti vzpostavljeni že pred stoletji, se humanisti in družboslovci večinoma nagibajo k mnenju, da sedanjim oblikam tega trajnega procesa pripisujemo večji pomen in bolj dramatične posledice, kot pa jih kažejo rezultati raziskav. Kljub temu je očitno, da moderna komunikacijska tehnologija vse bolj razblinja časovne, prostorske in jezikovne pregrade, s tem pa tudi ideološke in kulturne. Glede na dejstvo, da samo 2 % uporabnikov interneta pripadata najrevnejšim 20 % svetovnega prebivalstva, kar 93,3 % uporabnikov pa najbogatejšim 20 % vseh ljudi, je razumljivo, da trdovratnih socialnih pregrad ta proces doslej še ni mogel učinkovito omajati. Vsekakor pa tudi za to ponuja vrsto posrednih možnosti, saj omogoča hitro nastajanje in širjenje debatnih, iniciativnih in akcijskih omrežij, ki so posvečena prav temu vprašanju.

Posledice globalne medkulturne prehodnosti se kažejo praktično na vseh področjih zasebnega in javnega življenja; v manjšem obsegu, kot smo lahko tu prebrali, celo na nivoju spreminjajočih se družinskih vzorcev. Zato so avtorji tega tematskega sklopa osvetlili različne vidike sodobne multikulturne realnosti, od potrebe po jezikovni prehodnosti, ki lahko bistveno prispeva k obvladovanju medetničnih konfliktov, do zaščite jezikovne raznolikosti in ohranjevanja narodne identitete in končno do otipljivih predlogov za uspešnejšo svetovno promocijo zamisli o razvoju in uveljavitvi multikulturne mirovne kulture. A bolj ko poskušamo obravnavati vprašanja rasne in etnične, verske in kulturne enakopravnosti ločeno od vprašanj koncentracije kapitala v korist svetovne finančne elite, bolj zapletene in nedosegljive se zdijo rešitve. Verjetno bi bilo odveč dokazovati, da kultura s šibko ekonomsko osnovo ne more imeti enakih izgledov kot kultura z močno ekonomsko osnovo. Rasna, etnična, verska in kulturna enakopravnost ne morejo biti v interesu tistega 6-odstotnega deleža svetovnega prebivalstva, ki ima v lasti 59 % vseh svetovnih dobrin in ki želi ohraniti ali povečati sedanjo stopnjo socialne neenakosti. Rasizem, ksenofobija, kulturna in verska diskriminacija so oblike nasilja v obrambo nepravične koncentracije lastnine, porušenega globalnega ravnovesja v uživanju naravnih virov in rezultatov dela. Zato je diskusija bodisi o teh oblikah nasilja ali o onih, ki se porajajo v reakciji nanje, vsakokrat, ko poteka mimo obravnave svetovnega socialno-ekonomskega režima, jalova.

Vrednost lastnine treh najbogatejših posameznikov na svetu presega vrednost bruto domačega proizvoda 48 najrevnejših držav. V Srednji in Južni Afriki ter Južni Aziji je delež prebivalcev, ki razpolagajo z manj kot enim dolarjem dnevno, le nekaj manjši od polovice tamkajšnjega prebivalstva, v nekaterih deželah pa celo presega 60 %. Mnogi ekonomisti in družboslovci nasploh imenujejo neoliberalna načela nove ekonomije, ki so privedla do takšnega stanja, gospodarski kanibalizem. Kadarkoli doslej je dekadenca človeških in

družbenih vrednot dosegla kritično stopnjo, so nastopile korenite spremembe. Zdi se, da se svet prav zdaj bliža takšni kritični stopnji. V Vzhodni Evropi in Srednji Aziji je v obdobju 1987–1998 (predvsem po razpadu socializma) število prebivalcev, ki razpolagajo z manj kot enim dolarjem dnevno, poskočilo z enega milijona na 28 milijonov ljudi. Prav te spremembe pa so omogočile še bolj pospešeno poglabljanje prepada med bogatimi in revnimi, saj so se ljudje iz osiromašenih predelov prisiljeni množično izseljevati v države, ki so jih voljne sprejeti kot najbolj podcenjeno delovno silo, hkrati pa so njihove revne domovine prisiljene odpirati vrata tujim investitorjem, ki lahko v teh deželah s pomočjo najcenejše lokalne delovne sile poslujejo z večjim dobičkom kot doma. Z vzpostavitvijo gospodarskega ravnovesja v svetu bi bili vzpostavljeni tudi socialna in kulturna enakopravnost, ekonomskih mednarodnih migracij bi bilo bistveno manj, migranti ne bi več tvorili skrajnih družbenih slojev in njihova nacionalna ali verska pripadnost nikomur več ne bi vzbujala občutka ogroženosti.

Vse več mladih ljudi se zaveda, da doktrina, ki postavlja tekmovalnost, zmago, uspeh in dobiček nad vse druge vrednote in ki je razdelila ljudi, narode in države na razvite in nerazvite, uspešne in neuspešne, močne in šibke, vladajoče in uklonjene, zmagovalce in poražence, ni edina možnost. S porajanjem globalne pripadnosti postajajo nacionalnost, vera in kultura vse bolj vključujoče in vse manj izključujoče prvine človekove identitete. Z drugimi besedami, s tabo se lahko istovetim prav zato, ker čutim močno narodno, jezikovno, versko ali kakršnokoli drugo pripadnost, tako kot jo čutiš ti. Prav to naju združuje, ne pa ločuje. Barva kože zato že marsikje postaja toliko sporna kot barva las, materin jezik ali vera pa toliko kot barva glasu. Odnos do družine, do izkrivljenih meril socialne enakopravnosti, do okolja in zdravja ponekod že postajajo pomembnejši dejavniki človekove identitete kot tisti, ki so doslej služili za lažno utemeljevanje militaristične ideologije in maskiranje njenega dejanskega ozadja. S tem pa se počasi, vendar korenito spreminjajo tudi kriteriji pomena, smisla in kakovosti življenja.

Ob vseh razdorih, ki jih prinaša to, kar danes imenujemo globalizacija, nam prav ta proces prinaša tudi vse jasnejši izhod iz njih. Postopoma nastajajo obrisi nove samopodobe človeštva in novega pojmovanja človekovih pravic in enakopravnosti. Zanašajoč se na odrešilno pomoč naše človeške narave, ki nas vodi, da v kritičnih trenutkih vendarle damo prednost svojemu skupnemu preživetju, s tem da se dejavneje vključimo v reševanje vprašanj, ki bodo odločala o tem, ali bomo preživeli to že kar predolgo obdobje svoje globalne adolescence in samouničevalne socialne nezrelosti, sem prepričana, da opcija, ki jo ponujajo prispevki tega tematskega sklopa, navsezadnje pač mora prevladati.

Janja Žitnik je doktorica literarnih znanosti, zaposlena kot znanstvena svetnica na Inštitutu za slovensko izseljenstvo ZRC SAZU v Ljubljani. Težišče njenih raziskav v zadnjem času je na pripravljalnem delu za umeščanje književnega ustvarjanja slovenskih izseljencev in priseljencev v Sloveniji v širši kontekst medkulturnih odnosov znotraj posamezne države priseljevanja.