

**MUSIC AND HUMAN MOBILITY
REDEFINING COMMUNITY IN INTERCULTURAL CONTEXT 2016**

Guest edited by Maria de São José Côrte-Real & Pedro Moreira
"Henri Coandă" Air Force Academy Publishing House

HUMAN MOBILITY AND THE MEETING OF CULTURES

Maria STOICOVICI*

* Department of Foreign Languages, Military Sciences and Management, Military Technical Academy, Bucharest, Romania

***Abstract:** The profound changes that took place after the Second World War have been associated with a complex process of globalization, and caused, among other things, powerful social polarization both within states and between different regions or states. The "social decline" caused migration flows that had various consequences regarding the safety of the host countries and of the migrants themselves. But migration can also have its positive effects, as long as it facilitates the meeting of cultures and offers the opportunity to discover in what way they are different. That is why the twenty-first century cultural differences should not be a separation factor; on the contrary, they should encourage the discovery of "the Other", of its culture and identity, thus, enriching one another.*

***Keywords:** globalization, social issues, migration, culture, identity*

1. AN OVERVIEW ON GLOBALISATION

Everything changed in the aftermath of the World War II. The state strengthened its role as the main player on the social and economic stage (by establishing the Welfare State in the United Kingdom through then forcement of the Beveridge Plan in 1943 and that of *Sécurité sociale* in France, in 1945) in order to social achieve reconstruction, social reforms, and the transformation of the national consciousness. By intervening with a high authority in all fields and industries, the state was attempting to instil the idea that the nationalisation of the economic activities was the only solution able to lead to progress.

Later on, modernity, backed by the free enterprise and by the market, has helped reducing the role of the state, which used to be interventionist and has become one of a different type, while striving to attract foreign investments, to facilitate national exports, and to support the emergence of transnational companies associated to financial networks. In parallel, the new technologies have much helped this process by ensuring data travel in real time. The production turns international at the present and the exchanges are favourable to the economic globalisation.

The first step of the economic globalisation, which took place from the mid-70s until the 2001 terrorist attacks in New York (Touraine, 2005:36),

started with the oil crisis. That period was characterised by the development of all industrial and economic sectors, by the market globalisation, the emergence of transnational companies and of various Internet networks. The latter allowed the financial system to send information in real time, the broadcasting corporations could stream live, the media could broadcast faster, and the quality increased in the advertisements for mass cultural products, especially the American ones.

An influential opposing movement (the alterglobalisation) has been arising since the American cultural products were distributed throughout the world, insisting on the impossibility of generalizing the American model and providing the example of the stock exchange crisis and its serious consequences, triggered subsequently to significant speculations on the technological values (Touraine, 2005:39).

Globalisation imposed its own logic upon the states by means of its institutions (the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organisation), with no care at all for social and political goals. The researchers all agree, as a matter of fact, that this process would be just as difficult as the reverse one (the emergence of the national states) since everything occurred at international level, while the economic mechanisms were slow-paced and sometimes unsynchronised, which could lead to decline.

Globalisation can also have cultural or social implications. One of the cultural consequences is the creation of a mass society in which the same material and cultural products move freely in countries with extremely different life standards and cultural traditions. One may conclude that consumption gets standardised and that the entire world lives like the Americans do. It is false, because consumption in the richest countries gets more and more diverse, while the other countries try out ingenious schemes and manage to also vary their local productions.

As far as the social implications are concerned, it is enough to notice that the strength of trade unions worldwide gets weaker and weaker, and in case it still resists, it is at the middle class level, because the poor people “cannot fight anymore”. Taking into account that the global society (or the information world) is merely technological, it does not touch social issues. This fact has led to a “gap” in the society (Touraine, 2005:42). Class fight as a part of globalisation disappears, since conflicts do not concern the domestic production issues, but the world-oriented strategies of the transnational companies and of the financial networks.

In the globalisation phenomenon, there is no notion of social class, because there emerge other very general categories, such as humankind, poor nations, and future generations. This process is characterised by the dominant role of the market, the competition, interest-based coalitions, and corruption. Competition is established between the developed countries which are more or less social – democratic, on the one hand, and the poor countries, where there are no trade unions, on the other hand. “This is one of the reasons for which it is impossible to coordinate the social and fiscal policies within the European Union”, noticed Alain Touraine.

2. “THE SOCIAL DECLINE”

If the social reality was before judged in terms of *politics* (nation, people, revolution, Republic) (Touraine, 2005: 43), the industrial revolution and capitalism replace the political paradigm by the *economic and social* one. The social classes, the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, the social inequalities, and the strikes have thus become the most important aspect of the society. At the present, some new revolution – the technological one – brings in its *cultural* paradigm (since its effects are social and especially cultural), while weakening the social links fostering the individualism.

If, in late 19th century, progress meant the transition of the communities towards an organised society, the trend nowadays is to have closed

communities lead by an authoritarian power and rejecting the others as enemies.

The individual denies the Other out of passion, yet without getting a conflict with them. People would rather take full responsibility, only to leave the boat in times of despair caused by poverty, violence, or wars, to go searching for a better world, by facing geographical and socio-cultural changes (which may sometimes ruin people’s life, rather than improve it).

The society is massively polarised both at the domestic level (irrespective is the country is rich or poor) and at the international level between rich and poor countries¹. Socio-economic disparities are destabilising, because those occur in the poorest countries, those lacking social security. The financial and moral despair pushes people towards extremism (such as the communism in a ruined Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War, the Marxist guerrillas in the developing countries in the 1960s and the 1970s, the radical Islam nowadays, among others)² or towards common law crimes perpetrated by isolated criminals and by members of the Mafia structures, as well as by those of the drug cartels in Latin America or Asia.

Human trafficking, as well as organ trafficking³ would be the first source of dirty income. The first type is mainly occurring through various forms of prostitution and clandestine immigration. The more the social side declines, the more the cultural aspects get accomplished.

3. HUMAN MOBILITY AND THE “CLASH” OF CULTURES

Our 21st century is conquered by technology and influenced by social and political turmoil, by increasing migration movements, by excessive urbanisation phenomena causing people from all over the world to live closer to each other. The meeting of various cultures may cause some “shocks”. The population movements have thus taken the Western Europeans by surprise. The latter had to adapt to repeated quick changes, considered as a clash of opposing norms and cultural values systems. Once they arrived in the Western world, individuals from other cultures were forced themselves to adapt and obey to the

¹ source [online], according to the EAPN (European Anti-Poverty Network) publications. See <http://www.eapn.eu/fr/qui-sommes-nous/eapn-cest-quoi>

² There are no less people who claim that they have joined terrorist groups not for murdering, nor for restoring the Caliphate, but for money, which is vital for them to be able to feed their families.

³ source [online], see Diploweb.com (the December 24th, 2015 issue)

norms of the hosting society, which was seeing itself as more civilised.

3.1 How to understand the Other? Nowadays, cultural relativism studies social interactions. It claims that to understand an individual, we need to take into account the historical aspects having marked them. We thus need to be aware of one's social and historical conditions, to render one to the context in which one has been developing, to understand one's own interpreting of one's own situation. In other words, we need to notice one's behaviour face to other people's behaviour.

The human being has therefore to be understood as a *cultural individual*: the product of a certain culture and a cultural producer. The society one lives in defines one's model of the individual one wishes to become.

3.2 A little bit of theory. Culture, perceived with these four dimensions (collective, cognitive, social, and descriptive) could have only existed as determined by the spirit of each and every people. It was the fruit of creation and the treasure collected in space and in time by various human communities. The closer people get to each other and better they know each other, the more they realise how different their cultures are. Let's not forget that culture as a sum of several sub-cultures (one of the concerns of the Anglo-Saxon and the American sociologies) promotes the importance of cultural diversity and the need to treat the various human cultures equally.

Culture has got several characteristics we shall be looking at in the further paragraphs.

First of all, culture is *universal* and it is concerned by general topics. Yet every people has got its own culture, whose complexity level depends on the relation to those topics. The culture of each people is therefore selective and its cultural element distinguishes it from the other cultures.

Secondly, let's not forget "the cultural pattern", because "each behaviour, within a certain civilisation, is being shaped by that pattern" (Herskovits, 1950:117). For instance, the way of getting married. The pattern is not a constraint, it only points to the behavioural directions to follow, as a general rule. Culture is also *adynamic*, *expandable* process. The cultural evolutionism theory claims that to reach its present state, the individual has been going through different evolution stages going from an inferior to a superior one. The habits of the peoples considered to be "advanced" have survived, to witness their passage through previous stages whose remains can still be seen. Culture is a *living product* of the social players. The social life is a founding element of living beings. "Socialising" means integrating (completely or in a more or less harmonious way)

the individual in the social body. From the group perspective, this integration is mandatory. Without it, the individual is being marginalised or excluded. Culture *exists before and after the individual*. It is therefore somehow independent in relation to the individual which experiences it. Culture *is not completely owned* by any of the individuals distributing it, because each of them only owns a few elements of it, which are sex-, age-, profession-, and education-determined. Rarely do individuals experience their own culture *in a conscious way*. They are more or less determined or set by the environment in which they are integrated, which constantly pushes them to obey the norm. The personal reactions of the individual within its culture are determined to a great extent, which reduces what we call "personality". Culture is *experienced by each individual to a different degree*. The subjects receive and transform it. The individual *only experiences a fragment of its own culture*, on which he or she acts personally. We notice that one culture or another tends to change in one way or another. *This change results from the individuals' action*. No trend occurs randomly, but the individual variations make this trend evolve.

The cultural relativism approach claims that all value judgment depends on the cultural framework having produced it; similarly, any judgement rule is relative, since judgments depend indeed on norms, the latter varying with the groups which have produced them, therefore with the various cultures. The differences among cultures are seen in terms of the requirements to adapt the behaviour to the physical and social environment.

But irrespective of the way the social players contribute in the same society, *the individual variations fall into a pre-established matrix* to which everyone adapts. The coherent sum of these matrixes or "codes" makes it possible for subject from the same culture to "socially move" freely through the same system of typical circumstances.

3.3 So how to get along? People have always been different in terms of traditions, language, and ways of understanding the reality, the way of structuring the institutions. People have created many cultures, but have been bothered by their being different. Some individuals are mainly concerned by their close or large family, by their neighbourhood, their region or their country, while others are rather concerned by the social and ethnical, political and religious borders. All their life long, certain people are dominant in relation to others, while ignoring any barrier. Out of curiosity, the man has been exploring new remote worlds which they were not sure of. Man has gotten into contact with other cultures.

Culture is an innate element of the human behaviour (Vinsonneau, 1997, 2000), while education is a means of learning culture, an apparent factor, since it often triggers opposition, even defensive reactions. Education is the one which makes the difference between various behaviours, social relations, reactions to a certain number of set situations, precise gestures (the way of eating, of getting seated or dressed, of shaking hands...) which are directly transmitted.

Education is also the one allowing people to interiorise certain ways of thinking, of reflecting, of perceiving the world. It plays an essential role in the development of the intellectual, aesthetic, moral, and spiritual functions. Although the education models vary depending on the society, they still remain closely related to culture. Education is sometimes identified or mistaken for culture itself since it may indeed be considered as a purpose in itself. There is no such society without education. Any society proposes or enforces upon its members a certain number of rules, laws, norms, and know-how forming an education system which is more or less smooth, refined, or subject to either a conformist or a counter-conformist ethic.

Culture may be conveyed through imitation within the same society, among individuals of the same group or belonging to different groups, and even among several distinct societies. Thus marked by ways of living within their own group, the individual manages to “naturally” accomplish a task or another without knowing the reason for it, its meaning or even its usefulness; and their behaviour may become an automatic reflex, considered as “natural” and which finally does not need to be justified. Enculturation or the influence the society has over the individual is extended to all the life’s levels. The child thus acquires basic habits: this is the primary education, of an extreme importance. Enculturation lasts in adults for the rest of their lives, in an unconscious form (acquired and/or renewed habits) and in a conscious form: faced to new situations, they chose their behaviour and adapt it depending on traditions and social pressure.

3.4 How to perceive cultural differences?

Cultural differences concern very distinct phenomena, such as identities, cultural particularities, minorities, etc. To be able to distinguish various types of cultural differences, first we need to acknowledge that “cultural differences have been lasting for some time and that their members try to claim, to keep, and to defend”. Last, but not least, cultural differences are unceasingly renewed. A nation, a state, a certain society may aggregate different groups existing on that territory before its creation, such as the minorities (Wiewiorka, 2001:107),

which have their own social life, their political principles, their own institutions, and their culture. Belonging to a certain culture, language, or identifying oneself with a certain space prove the maintenance of local remote identities ignoring they belong to the political and cultural unit represented by the nation-state. Such separate entities may have two political approaches: either the separation, based on a nationalist ideology, or the pressure exercised to obtain collective rights and a certain acknowledgment within that state.

The modern times, through colonialism or the advancement of the borders, have determined migration waves putting the people having settled earlier on that territory on a lower position (the Aborigines in Australia, the Indians in the three Americas or the Maori in the New Zealand). The populations of these days are “relics of history” to the eyes of the conquerors, but seen from inside their community, that world “cannot but be altered by the contact with others”. This resulting in their reserve in relation to the multicultural policies placing them at the same level as the immigration-born minorities.

There are also various minorities which have been banned from building a cultural identity for themselves. The example here are the American black people who have been forcedly removed from their shores, taken away and settled far from their homes, deprived of their culture and of the means to recreate it in a new setting, uprooted against their will. Moreover, they have been alienated, discriminated for race-related grounds, dehumanised. They struggle to adapt to the values of the American society to be able to get integrated, but they lack the economic and material means for building a reinvented or a regained identity for themselves.

The *first-arrived migrants* come from very different communities. Their original culture is not necessarily a traditional one. Their culture is different from that of the hosting country, yet that difference could not be the cause for the people or groups being pushed away towards the ghettos and put in a situation where it is impossible for them to be integrated in the society. This situation can nevertheless turn into a ban if those communities feel indifferent towards the political life and if they get a distance in relation to any civic integration.

4. THE MIGRANTS’ IDENTITY

Migrants are progressively assimilated to the host society (they only preserve vague traditions reminding of their origins). Robert Park, one of the representatives of the Chicago School (Park, 1950)

was mentioning the four-phased migrant integration: arrival of the migrant (getting integrated by their work and getting into competition with the local populations on the employment market); approaching other migrants (which strengthens their social insertion); adapting to the civil and political operating rules of the host society; assimilating general values and the culture of the host society. According to this School, the assimilation process is quite similar to the socialisation one.

Yet Didier Lapeyronnie (Wiewiorka, 2001:251-265) also mentions a “second migrant’s portrait” – the one who, despite their full integration into modernity, in one or two generations’ time, in an individualist world, despite their assimilation or integration, “bears some difference individualising them from the rest of the population”: the physiological features of their name, of their parents’ religion, or of their national origin are the ones singularising them. Starting to exist by getting rid of what they or their parents are produced by, this second figure results from the society’s work upon themselves, as well as from their own work upon themselves. It is a complex figure which, in the same time, shows self-reflection and is willing to get involved in the modern life they entered.

In a host society advocating values of equality and brotherhood, the stigmata disqualifying some individuals on behalf of a cultural or natural identity (disease, phenotypic features) is rejected because it bans them from fully benefitting of those values. As a consequence, the individuals change their name or try to erase that stigmata (whiten their skin, straighten their hair, striving to melt into the environing society or at least claiming their “right to indifference”). There are also people who cannot free themselves from the dreamt identity and become ethnics, turning a deficiency into difference, appropriating the stigmata to turn it into an acknowledged identity.

5. LET’S TURN THE CULTURE “CLASH” INTO DESIRE TO KNOW AND TO SHARE NEW VALUES!

“The 21st century is the human mobility century”, announced in 2011 the High Commissioner of the United Nations for Refugees.

New travelling forms have emerged since 1951. It may happen that the demographical increase, the urbanisation, the climate changes, and the food, water, and power insecurity mutually worsen, leading to instability and conflicts, thus to forced movements⁴

Under these circumstances, nobody can stop or would stop human mobility. Massifs refugee flows like those Europe is experiencing at the present are difficult to manage, but serious measures must finally get enforced.

We know well that the European identity is based on the symbiosis of ethnical, cultural, and national elements, a “symbiosis which both makes distinctions and excludes” and which refuses to understand the new political model of the new structure of the world exceeding the national borders. The main threats for the Europeans are migration and the changes triggered by the integration process, as well as by the conflicts between the ethnical groups. These changes concern identity dimensions, such as: language, religion, and culture. From the old continent perspective, the nation keeps being the place for privileged identification and a regulatory engine. The nation goes beyond all types of differences (social, religious, identity-linked) among various populations and integrates them into an entity organised in a joint political project. The nation also created the political space or the framework for regulating relationships, rivalries, and conflicts between individuals and groups. For Europeans, belonging to their nation means belonging to their state. Accepting and helping the Other get integrated (though they do not share the same ethnical and cultural features) is being contrary to the identity construction approach, disorganising it. For all the European citizens, preserving their national identity means keeping some source against the impoverishment of their existence. The identity crisis is revealed through the negation of the Other and the lockup (cessation of any form of communication). Moreover, there is “an inferiority complex hidden by a superiority complex that nobody admits, manifested by reactions of frustration, despair, and helplessness anger”.

Under these circumstances, *can European identity still be interested in finding ways of getting into contact with the Other?* One fact is certain: it is too late. In the European society, cultural diversity has already become a daily reality, thus respecting it means respecting fundamental rights, it is a multitude of consciousness, wisdom, dynamism, it is a collective force of humankind acknowledged by more and more international forums. When the second generations of migrants settled on the European soil are already European citizens, help creating European values, observe

⁴ A report of the High Commissioner of the United Nations for Refugees, called *Questions relatives aux réfugiés, aux* 112

rapatriés et aux déplacés et questions humanitaires in <http://www.un.org/press/fr/2011/AGSHC4024.doc.htm>

the requirements of those states, and speak European languages, not only do they want to be acknowledged, but they also want to get “roots” on the European soil.

The settlement of various populations with different cultural and political traditions needs the Europeans to adopt new policies to control and reduce the differences brought by these foreign populations settled here for the rest of their life. Several causes will accentuate migration and an increasing number of people of different origin are to live on this territory in the future. Moreover, the increasing dependence of the states on each other places their inhabitants within a worldwide integration process. Certain thinkers consider we are in a first stage of a worldwide integration process (Norbert Elias). This phenomenon shall require the dialogue between cultures and civilisations, otherwise no peaceful life can exist.

There is a solution to everything. One of them is introducing the idea of citizenship in the definition of identity. Since the citizenship allows communication, it is to also determine the process of adapting and renegotiating one's identity, to help reducing the identity crisis.

Another solution may be the Manuel Castells's concept of “projected identity” (Boacă, 2007). It helps the social players build their new identity using the cultural materials at hand, thus backing the transformation of the overall social structure.

Since the cultural diversity may block communication, the people need to be made aware of the difference by means of the intercultural education, which aims to cultural interaction. Schooling shall therefore bring people closer to each other. Education is being delivered through a certain language. The difference must not be perceived as a menace, but as a possibility of cultural and spiritual enrichment. Education and the philosophy of several new trends such as the interculturalism (making aware of cultural diversity) and the transculturalism (or equal rights to develop transurban, transregional, transnational, and transcontinental relations) become more and more visible and prove the contemporary world's tendency of moving, of getting transformed, of getting closer. It is obvious that the social aspects are more important than the political ones and that the social grounds ask the political ones to regulate. We cannot leave culture, religion, or languages at the reach of those wanting to turn them into conflict and hatred vehicles!

Every one of us can speak two or several languages. Multilingualism may be an individual or a collective phenomenon, a layering or an exclusion factor. Several languages may coexist or get into conflict on the same territory. Those

conflicts may be regulated by linguistic policies. Each of us has an external, as well as an internal multilingualism. Each of the languages we can speak expresses us one way or another. We can speak several languages or several variations of the same language. We have got a group language, a family language, a state language, and one or several international communication languages. Each of these languages changes the data on one's identity, thus proving that unique identity is utopia. We protect our own identity which protecting the others' one.

A multilingual world must be educated in the sense of respecting the Other. The intercultural education has got a crucial role to fight the reactions of rejecting the Other and it happens by means of the language, which is the privileged way of reaching a different culture. Each and every one of these matters makes us consider the migrants' adaptation issue in a different light. By knowing them, we realise the significant role of fair, coherent, right, and systematic policies to be enforced in order to reach the desired goal: mutual understanding.

To be able to educate, the teachers need to be taught themselves. Then, the essential mission of schooling is to provide all the students (local or migrants) with the necessary tools to effectively master the language of the destination country both in terms of its various oral forms, and its written code, in order to get integrated properly. Today's intercultural teaching needs to set as a target to succeed, at least partially, to overcome prejudice, national stereotypes, and the conflicts which might arise from that – all this to enforce a feeling of identity and European community. The goal is to create some active multilingual and multicultural citizenship. All these aspects have already been included in the Common European Reference Framework for Language Learning, which has started to be implemented throughout the Union.

We do share so many things, such as the taste for art. What human being does not love music? Each and every people has got its own traditional music, each generation has got its favourite rhythms. We love music more or less with all its aspects, all its genres, **but the fact is we simply love it** because, first and foremost, music **is** for everybody and “its role is to reconcile the individual with his or her own” (Plato) and “to deeply change, according to several dimensions, our self-consciousness in relation to ourselves and to the world” (Gilbert, 1990). The acknowledgement of other cultures is a must in a fast-pace world. The Other must be acknowledged as such, as being different; but only if they accept, as I do, the universal principles defining the modernity, that is

the belief in the rational thinking and the assertion that there are personal rights which any state and any society is not entitled to breach.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Boacă, Margareta. (2007), *Identitatea europeană între deziderate și iluzii*, dans "Dinamica mediului european de securitate" Session scientifique de CSSAS.
2. Herskowitz, Melville J. (1950), *Les bases de l'Anthropologie culturelle*, 2^e partie: La structure de la culture: Le phénomène du modèle (pattern), p. 117 dans http://classiques.uqac.ca/classiques/Herskovits_melville/bases_anthropo/bases_anthro.pdf.
3. Lapeyronnie, Didier. (1997). Les deux figures de l'immigré. In Michel Wiewiorka (ed.), *Une société fragmentée? Le multiculturalisme en débat*, Paris: La Découverte. 251-265.
4. Park, Robert, (1950) *Race and Culture*, Glencoe: The Free Press.
5. Rouget, Gilbert, (1980) *La Musique et la transe*. Paris, Gallimard.
6. Touraine, Alain. (2005), *Un nouveau paradigme. Pour comprendre le monde d'aujourd'hui*. Paris: Fayard.
7. Vinsonneau, Geneviève. [1997], (2000), *Culture et comportement*, 2e édition. Paris: Armand Colin.
8. Wiewiorka, Michel. (2001). *La différence*. Paris: Editions Ballard.
9. Wolton, Dominique. (2003). *L'autre mondialisation*. Paris: Flammarion.
10. Wihtol de Wenden, Catherine. (Mars 2007). Politiques migratoires injustes. *Ceras - revue Projet*, nr.297.