Culture versus globalisation in Europe: actual tension or possible dialogue?

Prof. Dr. Léonce Bekemans

(Article published in *Building Towers. Perspectives on Globalisation*, Luc Anckaert, Danny Cassimon & H. Opdebeeck (eds), Peeters, Leuven, okt. 2002, p. 191-211).

Introduction

The beginning of the new Millennium is characterised by crises and division, by global threats and an emerging recognition of a more qualifying impact of globalisation on communities, societies and persons across the world. At the global level, we live in a period of epochal change with conflicting and polarizing intellectual and political debates. Ulrich Beck refers to the emergence of a world risk society (1999) while Nicholas Negroponte writes of the existence of a digital world (1996). At the state level one talks about the crisis of democracy and politics (Jean-Marc Guéhenno1995; Jean-Françcois Lyotard 1994, etc.) and the need for global governance (Commission on Global Governance 1995; Report on behalf of the Commission of the Bishops' Conferences of the European Commission 2001). At a moral level, the individualising ethics of the present globalisation becomes criticized; Paul Ricoeur presents an ethical mediation for a more meaningful and solidary process[1]; some proclaim the need for global ethics (Ricardo Petrella 1997; Inge Kaul 1999; Jacques Baudot 2001, etc.) or recognise the appropriateness of cross-cultural judgements on a global level (Amitai Etzioni 1997). In reality universal values such as democracy, human rights, solidarity, tolerance and respect for diversity are often opposed by particularistic views that preach confrontation instead of dialogue, exclusion rather than cooperation, intolerance rather than solidarity. We have seen how dissent from tolerance has caused bloodshed, inter-communal violence, and ethnic hatred, embodied in massacre in recent years. Within this clash of ideas and practices Europe has a responsibility to favour a globalisation path that protects those universal values and to defuse the tension between universalism and particularism.

In this case study, I would like to touch on the relation between globalisation and culture from a European perspective and touch upon some of the issues related to this relationship, the challenges that are ahead and the possibilities to deal with it in a more sustainable and justified manner. The article is divided into three parts. I start with some thoughts concerning the concepts of culture and globalisation, their relation and impact and introduce some ethical considerations to the conceptual framework. In a second part I focus on the specificity of the European model of integration and cultural diversity, in particular on the existing European cultural practice and its prospects. In a last part, I try to give some tentative answers to Europe's challenges in the globalisation-culture debate and suggest some ways for re-integrating an ethical dimension in the debate and revitalising Europe's role as a global actor in intercultural dialogue.

I.   Reframing the conceptual framework

1.   Culture

The scientific development of mainstream economics has been one of clear separation between economy and society[2]. The Enlightenment of the 18th century provided the cultural and intellectual environment for modern economic theory[3]. This "Atlantic" tradition gave the basis for the rational choice model and methodological individualism of modern economic science. The loss of interest within the economic profession in the cultural matrix of its own discipline has been a continuous development since Adam Smith. Mainstream economics lost its original sense of culture and became an abstraction free of culture, less and less inspired by the effort of understanding reality and man's place in society. The pre-modern Mediterranean tradition of economic thought going back to Artistotle perceived the economy as embedded in a complex web of social and cultural institutions, regulated by religious and ethical norms (Louis Baeck 1994). Although the Mediterranean heritage never died out completely and not all schools of Western economic thought lost sight of the societal and cultural dimension (e.g. the German Historical School with Gustav Schmoller; the influences of Max Weber and Emile

---

1 An extensive overview of the ethical theory of Paul Ricoeur is given in Hendrk Opdebeeck, *Het probleem van de grondslagen van de moraal*, Kok/ Pelckmans, Kampen/Kapellen, 1995; and Ibid. (Ed.), *The problem of the foundations of ethics*, Peeters, Leuven, 2000.

2 A brief historical overview of the relation between economy and society and relevant literature is given in Léonce Bekemans & Pedro Lourte, *Economy and Society*, PIE, Brussels, 1995, p. 15-58.

3 A very good overview of the history of economic thought is presented in A Screpanti & S. Zamagni, *An Outline of the History of Economic Thought*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.

Durkheim on economic thinking; the emergence of economic sociology with Polanyi, Parsons and Smelser; the French economic historians, the institutionalists) it has been marginalized during the last three centuries. Only very recently this cultural and paradigmatic divide between economy and society is questioned in relation to the underlying assumptions as well as to policy relevance of both traditions[4]. Certainly in present days the Atlantic (Western) tradition seems increasingly criticized for its a-historical and purely analytical and monetized focus. This has become obvious in the present European integration/cultural diversity debate. Elements of the Mediterranean heritage are re-introduced to explain past developments of European integration and to prospect Europe's future.

In mainstream economics, in particular in its most radical forms, the economy is seen in exclusively material terms as a wealth-producing system where values are almost totally ignored. Culture is seen as a nuisance intruding in the world of scientific objectivity and blurring the working of market economies. However, our value systems are increasingly confronted with specific cultural expressions of society that escape rational and quantifiable analysis. Culture, also in business economics, becomes again a shaping factor and added value in the societal process of creativity, institution building and market exchange. We sense a change from culture as mere material artefacts to culture as a process of shaping values, patterns and expressions of the human spirit. Accepting a more anthropological perspective, culture is defined as a set and carrier of values, norms and patterns influencing structure and human behaviour through a process of institutionalization. In this perspective the Mexican anthropologist Rodolfo Stavenhagen makes a very useful distinction between culture as capital, as creativity and as a total way of life[5].

This also applies to European culture, which is not a mythical or untouchable concept but rather an ongoing interaction of distinctive historical, spiritual, intellectual, material and emotional features and attitudes (Léonce Bekemans 1994). These features are expressed in language, images, sounds, symbols, life styles, etc. illustrating the pluriformity and richness of European societies. These diversified but shared cultural expressions finally make up Europe's social, cultural and human capital. Therefore, the embeddedness of culture in society implies introducing historical, social and ethical considerations into our analysis.

2. Globalisation as a phenomenon and a process

The concept: Globalisation is one of the most widely used and debated concepts in social sciences. It has been incorporated in journalistic, political, academic and intellectual discourse to encapsulate various trends that are shaping the political, economic and cultural dimensions of the way we live and think[6]. The blending together of local, national, and global dynamics is generating new paradoxes that are extremely difficult to conceptualise.

Globalisation is an elusive and multidimensional concept, characterised by an ongoing process of structural transformation with positive and negative globalising effects. The global intensification of political, economic, social and cultural linkages fundamentally alters the nature of interactions between people, nations and societies. From a fashionable start, embodying images of technological progress and economic dynamism, it has progressively become the object of a civil society backlash in a rather polarised debate. In short, it is a turbulent phenomenon that not only transcends but ignores boundaries and

---

4 Institutional economics, socio-economics, humanistic economics, moral economics, economic sociology, etc have expressed fundamental criticisms to the conceptual framework of economic liberalism. Authors such as Etzioni, Sen, Holton, Goodwin, Hodgson, Granovetter, Lutz, Lux and many others have tried to endogenize economic thinking in a wider context.

5 Rodolfo Stavenhagen classifies the usage of culture in three broad categories: a) cultural as capital, i.e. as an accumulated heritage, hence the right to culture means the equal right of access to culture and cultural development; b) culture as creativity, the processes of artistic and scientific creation, hence the right to culture means the right of persons to freely create their cultural expressions and products as well as to enjoy free access to cultural institutions; c) culture as a total way of life, hence the revendication to the recovery and recognition of distinct cultural identities, values and practices. (Rudolfo Stavenhagen, Cultural rights: a social science perspective, in *Culture Rights and Wrongs*, Paris, UNESCO, 1998.

6 Some general references of the extensive globalisation literature are mentioned in the bibliography.

that not only involves a radical reconfiguration of societies but also an even more radical reconstitution of concepts and mentalities of the modern world. We should therefore not argue so much about definitions, but more about managing its consequences. Far more fruitful than polarising the debate for or against globalisation, is the need to come to grips with its multiple aspects and consequences and to prospect novel ways of orienting globalisation to a culture of peace and development worldwide and a sustainable community of cultures.

The process: The vast literature on theory and practice of globalisation shows an extremely complex phenomenon, encompassing divergent and at times contradictory processes. It simultaneously establishes hierarchies, concentrations of capital, power, information and population, and spins out levelling networks. Along another axis, globalisation is homogenising and differentiating. It encourages economic, political and cultural activities that create convergence across all levels. But it unleashes and fuels heterogeneous forces that recreate differences, raises barriers and establishes new frontiers. These heterogeneous forces operate from the margins to the centre of the globalised world. Only if we understand the dynamic interactions of this process of hierarchizing vs. networking and homogenising vs. differentiating can we actually understand the societal impact of globalisation.

Globalisation, while creating opportunities for societies, is also the source of major stresses and unbalances. There is in fact a non-egalitarian dimension of globalisation especially with regards to the distribution of welfare and with respect to the capacity to seize global opportunities between developed and developing countries. It is straining the institutional fabric of societies affecting the relative significance of traditional structures of governance (states) and of orthodox concepts of authority (sovereignty) and legitimacy. In short, the process of globalisation is ushering a new phase of social change which exhibits great uncertainties about the future governance of societies. The global backlash against globalisation, from government's powerlessness to the proliferation of transnational actors, from financial volatility to social inequality, and from environmental degradation to cultural uniformity show common threats: predominance of economic thought and practice, the neglect of the cultural factor and a running process of individualisation.

Therefore, assessing globalisation as a concept and a process needs clarification. First of all globalisation as a dominant motif of current international relations assumes a reformulation in such a way that it does not automatically incorporate the ideological presuppositions of neo-liberal economics; and secondly opponents of economic globalisation should rather work toward the formulation and embrace of positive forms of globalisation that enhance the material, moral and spiritual well-being of people. For such an undertaking a sensitive and balanced critical discourse on globalisation is required rather than a collision of polar discourses between extremes of unconditional enthusiasm and uncompromising dislike. At a policy level, it is therefore important to strive for "globalisation with a human face" (Robert Falk 2000, p.162).

3. Globalisation and Culture

The world at large is experiencing the effects of multi-facetted globalisation with varying degrees of impact on cultures and peoples. In Western and non-western societies seemingly contradictory tensions appear (modernisation vs. indigenization, universalism vs. particularism, homogeneity vs. heterogeneity, unity vs. diversity). Meanwhile the international community is searching for opportunities and structures which underscore a dialogue of cultures that may preserve and foster the paradigm of peace and development worldwide and replace a culture of confrontation, distrust and fear.

Besides its economic and political dimensions, globalisation is also a cultural phenomenon with profound implications on the daily life of society. If there is economic globalisation there is also cultural globalisation, often implying cultural imperialism of the West (i.e. remaking the world in a Western image). Intensification of communications systems and international mobility flows has triggered the emergence of a global culture, leading to cultural capitalism. The globalising culture industries are detaching people

from their historically developed local, religious moral and societal reference frameworks. Jeremy Rifkin argues in the "*Age of Access*" (2000) that the subsequent individualisation and commodification of values and human relations will lead to a creative destruction of solidarity ties and to societies only unified by commercial or contractual agreements.

Globalisation is a selective phenomenon with varying interpretations as to its impact on culture. The optimistic view identifies a world that is becoming increasingly unified. Many scientists are convinced that a global culture will help to create a more peaceful world. On the contrary, the pessimists prospect a return to a pre-ideological age where people were fighting over religion, values and culture (Samuel Huntington 1998). While globalisation has increased cultural assertivity and participation for some, the lack of understanding or respect for cultural differences by others has however led to distrust and confrontation between cultures and reinforced endemic tensions of multi-ethnic societies. Those who actively take part in global culture exchanges often experience culture as a process in which their own cultural identity becomes receptive towards other cultures, but those who experience globalisation as an alien process, often view cultural identity in a narrow sense that rejects diversity. This makes culture swiftly intertwined with conflict. My own assumption is that we're not moving into a unified and harmonious world culture, nor into an age in which cultures are in perpetual war with each other. The likely scenario might be a global culture, primarily western and spreading through the world through many channels, which interacts with indigenous cultural forces in a number of different ways. This would imply the active support of cultural differences as a source of creativity and wealth creation at a global level (Raj Isar 2001, p. 7)

In order to re-direct the asymmetrical, unequal and contradictory character of globalisation as regards cultural diversity various international organisations (UN, UNESCO, EU, etc.) propose a constructive dialogue between cultures and peoples. Such a dialogue could counteract the economic and political dominance manifest in current global processes. I concur with Charles Taylor (1994) that intercultural dialogue should be perceived as a path to conviviality and multiculturalism in which cultures influence each other without destroying them or entering in clashes of conflict. The UNESCO World Culture Report 2000 *"Cultural diversity, conflict and pluralism"* rightly proposes intercultural dialogue in the era of globalisation as an appropriate vehicle for respecting cultural differences without the domination or superiority of any one of the latter while recognising a global consciousness and multiple identities.

4. Ethical discourse of the globalisation/culture debate

The question remains to which extent a common world vision based on global common goods can be developed against the twin processes of globalisation and cultural relativism. In any case problems of social inequalities and poverty as well as the non-accessibility tot the benefits of globalisation have taken dramatic proportions, not only in economic sense, also in cultural perspective (Jeremy Rifkin 2000). The Copenhagen seminars for social progress, which took place between 1996 and 1999 following the UN World Summit for Social Development in March 1995, were spelling out an ideology for the pursuit of the common good in a globalising world (Jacques Baudot 2001). We fully agree that such a common horizon based on universalistic values, but in respect for applied diversification is more than needed in an era in which the nation state is becoming obsolete and the new geopolitical relations are drastically changing the world map of minds and governance.

The Western provenance of the process of global culture has given credibility to the frequent charge that it is part of Western imperialism, trying to force 'Western' values on societies with different traditions (Peter Berger 1997). The alleged difference between 'Western' and 'Eastern' values is centered in the understanding of the individual's place in society. The 'West' is interpreted as exaggerating the autonomy of the individual, as having institutionalised an abstract and mechanical concept of society, and as being taken by a spiritually impoverished materialism. Against this the 'East' is characterised as having a more correct view of the individual embedded in community, valuing tradition and hierarchy, holding an organic and thus more natural concept of society, and as retaining a spirituality that limits exaggerated forms of materialism. In this context intercultural dialogue becomes a necessity not only for overcoming conflict but also to

rethink and respond to global challenges faced by humanity. Ricoeur 's ethical principles, rooted in the personalistic perspective of J. Maritain and E. Mounier may offer a meaningful purpose to the globalisation process (Hendrik Opdebeeck 2000, p.202). Henceforth, the ethical discourse implies devising dialogues between cultures able to balance unity and solidarity with tolerance and diversity whereby the person as individual ànd social being is the guiding norm. Between the universalistic (euphoric) rhetoric of the Western cultural model and the post-modern discourse of cultural relativism some forms of cross-cultural judgements are appropriate worldwide (Raj Isar 2001, p. 9). In this sense cross-cultural moral claims are part of the intercultural dialogue, which is, as Amitai Etzioni (1997) argues, a point of departure radically different from that of the cultural relativist.

II. Culture and globalisation within a European setting

The 'cultural factor' of the European construction has become a fundamental and necessary condition for its further development. Many agree that the European model of market integration and societal diversity should keep its specificity by combining further economic and political integration with the maintenance and respect of its cultural diversity. The scientific ("Atlantic") paradigms based on functional and deterministic thinking and acting are being challenged by the complexity of the multi-faced European realities. Moreover, the speed of economic and political globalisation raises issues about identity and culture within and beyond European boundaries (Wintle 1996). As local, regional and national cultures interact, individual and social identities are searching for new European settings to respond to the process of globalisation.

1. A dynamic historical process of integration and diversity

European history is the result of two seemingly contradictory tendencies, from one side attempts to create sustainable European structures of co-operation, and on the other side attempts to destruction based on the principle of exclusion and separation. From a reading of the European cultural history, a European framework culture emerges in which different specific cultures have developed. Hendrik Brugmans (1985) identifies Europe as a geographically vaguely defined macro-structure, characterised by permanent interaction between common and diversified historical, intellectual and artistic experiences. Its common values concern universal values inherent to its cultural heritage as well as values rooted in a wealth of cultural differences. Against this more open view a more particularistic orientation developed. It focussed on specific forms of cultural identity and on a diversity of religions, ideologies, cultures, artistic styles and traditions It is this complexity of various developments and experiences throughout history which constitutes the bearing forces of European identity and building-stones of European integration.

Many examples of a search between integration and diversity have been institutionalised in broad economic, political, legal or cultural settings (Louis Baeck 1994). However, the long European tradition of common experiences does not guarantee a further smooth process of integration and diversity. The current intensity of technological modernisation and globalisation of economic and cultural processes does challenge the European societal model. Still there is widespread agreement that Europe's future, probably within a renewed setting, will be based on commonly shared values of democracy, human rights and solidarity[7]. The protection and development of these principles were the points of departure of European integration and are still accepted as the common norms for defining Europe's role in the world. A sound and reflective universalism pleas for the maintenance of the very character of Europe, being a plurality of cultures and identities within an acceptable Community structure. This is the pluralistic framework in which the relation between culture and globalisation in Europe should be set.

2. The existing European model of convergence and diversity[8]

Similar socio-economic systems, the positive impact of economic integration and a common cultural heritage strengthened the trend towards convergence, uniformisation and homogenisation in the early period of European integration. Diversity was often ignored by considering the states as the only

---

7 The Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union calls for Europe's new role in a globalised world: "A power to set globalisation within a moral framework, in other words to anchor it in solidarity and sustainable development."

8 See Léonce Bekemans & Robert Picht (eds.), European Societies between Diversity and Convergence, Vol. I (1993) and Vol. II (1996), P.I.E.: Brussels.

Culture versus globalisation in Europe: actual tension or possible dialogue?   5
 Prof. Dr. Léonce Bekemans (Article published in *Building Towers. Perspectives on Globalisation*, Luc Anckaert,
Danny Cassimon & H. Opdebeeck (eds), Peeters, Leuven, okt. 2002, p. 191-211).

legitimate actors of European life. In the later integration phase the European debate became confronted with different expressions of national and regional identities. Today internal and external challenges (i.e. the crisis of the welfare state; the deepening/widening debate; the problem of legitimacy and democratic deficit, the technological revolution, the protection of global commons and the variety of global actors, etc.) are straining the European model. They question its unity in diversity globally and seem to indicate that Europe cannot any longer remain the prisoner of a mere functional and technocratic approach. More and more attention is being given to striking a new balance between diversity and convergence trends in European societies. Convergence trends now seem to provide the common platform that allows states, regions and communities to live their diversity. A reading of the Treaties on European Union of Maastricht (1991), Amsterdam (1998) and Nice (2000) underscores the double preoccupation of the European Community in strengthening economic and social cohesion by emphasising convergence between its Member states and in simultaneously preserving diversity by respecting national and regional identities.

3. The European cultural practice
At the time of its foundation, the European Community was not competent in the field of culture. Economic (and eventually political) integration was to be achieved without standardisation or homogenisation of cultures. The uniqueness of the European model implied economic and political integration with maintenance of cultural diversity. With the Treaty of Maastricht culture has been for the first time integrated in the formal competencies of the Community. Articles 128 (art. 151 in the Treaty of Amsterdam) and 92 (art. 87) provide the legal basis for EU support in the cultural sector.[9]

Indeed, the early years of European integration were dominated by a mainly political-rhetoric discourse. The preamble of the Rome Treaty refers to a closer union between the European peoples, the quality of life and a guarantee of freedom and peace. From the end of the sixties the plea to go beyond the mere economic dimension was made explicit in many solemn declarations of European Summits (The Hague 1969, Paris 1972, Copenhagen 1973 and Stuttgart, 1983). This finally led to the concept of a truly European Union, which contained not only an economic, but also a political, social and cultural dimension and found its legal context in the Treaties of Maastricht, Amsterdam and Nice. Terms as European identity and consciousness, Community cultural heritage, Europe of the citizen and culture entered into Community language. Still the actual result was meagre: the adoption of a rather minimalist approach with modest Community action in the cultural sector and even smaller budget.   In reality, between the rather utopian political-rhetoric discourse and the very limitative formalistic discourse EU interventions in the cultural sector did follow a more pragmatic, fragmented ad hoc policy, applying a subtle mixture of cultural, economic and legal arguments (e.g. the Year of Music or Film, conservation of architectural heritage, cultural action programmes such as Ariane, Kaleidoscope and Raphaël, the European cultural cities, etc.).

The predominant objective of the cultural programme of the EC has been focussed on the elimination of (national) obstacles against free flow of cultural goods and services and on the stimulation of the free movement of "cultural operators" within the Community's territory. Formal interaction of culture was set within an economic framework and the emphasis was on the economic dimension of the creation of a European cultural space, i.e. a common market for cultural goods, activities and persons. Within this perspective national and regional cultural policies were governed by market integration rules. Possible conflicts between the open border's economic objectives and cultural policy priorities were understood in view of the impact of integration policies on the cultural sector. From this originally negative integration intervention of the EU, a move was made to more positive integration activities, referring to the economic benefits of the cultural sector through harmonisation of legislation or the launching of Community action programmes. The expansion of the legal competence of the EU in the cultural sector was also favoured by Community integrism of the Court of Justice, by adjudging exceptions on the basis of cultural considerations such as common interest, language, and cultural identity. In fact, actual European cultural practice has always been confronted with the ambiguous task of combining economic competence with cultural ambitions in a strict legal framework.

9 Article 151: (1)"The Community shall contribute to the flowering of the cultures of the Member States, while respecting their national and regional diversity and at the same time bringing the common cultural heritage to the fore". (2) "Action by the Community shall be aimed at encouraging co-operation between Member States and, if necessary, supporting and supplementing their action..." (3) "'...the following areas: improvement of the knowledge and dissemination of the culture and history of the European peoples; conservation and safeguarding of cultural heritage of European significance; non-commercial cultural exchanges; artistic and literary creation, including in the audio-visual sector". (4) "The Community shall take cultural aspects into account in its action under other provisions of this Treaty". "... in particular in order to respect and to promote the diversity of its cultures ".

Culture versus globalisation in Europe: actual tension or possible dialogue?   6
 Prof. Dr. Léonce Bekemans (Article published in *Building Towers. Perspectives on Globalisation*, Luc Anckaert,
Danny Cassimon & H. Opdebeeck (eds), Peeters, Leuven, okt. 2002, p. 191-211).

The EU also changed the discourse on legitimisation of its cultural activities, less focus on European cultural identity and unity and more on cultural diversity. Cultural diversity was set in an institutional and legal context, stressing subsidiarity, autonomy of cultural policy as well as integration with Community policies. In other words, the cultural objective has been formally recognised as a Community preoccupation, although with strong legal procedures, a weak legal instrument and a very modest budget. In short, a new synthesis between economic and political integration on the one hand, and preservation of cultural diversity on the other hand is being developed whereby the EU attempts to preserve the specificity of the European model with a formal and legal anchorage of Community action in the cultural field. The actual challenge is therefore the creation of a more genuine link between culture and integration in a broader and more open context.

The first framework programme (2000-2004) in support of culture[10], which combines the old "Raphaël","Kaleidoscope" and "Ariane" programmes, is an opportunity to implement such a new approach to Community cultural action, by clarifying the role and the place of culture in meeting the great challenges now facing the European Union. The programme identifies the broad scope of the European project extending it to the entirety of European society and its citizens; it integrates the cultural dimension into other Community policies and recognises the role of culture as an economic factor but also as a factor in social integration and citizenship. The programme's objectives are achieved by specific innovative and/or experimental actions, integrated actions covered by structured, multi-annual cultural cooperation agreements and special cultural events with a European and/or international dimension. It is a single programming and financing instrument for Community measures in the field of culture; only 167 million Euro has been assigned for a 5-year period. The budget clearly illustrates a discrepancy between the plurality of policy objectives and the modest means available on Community level and subsequently the still rather symbolic value of Community action in the cultural field.

As to the prospects of the European model of (cultural) diversity and (market) integration, theory and practice indicate that diversity is more and more perceived as a source of complementarity and creativity in a unifying and integrative structure. The recognition of a link between culture and development becomes an important element for further European integration. Moreover, the growing interaction between local and regional economic development and culture implies a clear link between identity, citizen's participation and economic development. Social integration is therefore seen as a condition for further economic integration and crucial for sustainable development. The UNESCO Report on "Creative Diversity" (1996) stressed the importance of cultural factors for development. Also other scientific studies have illustrated the positive correlation between the economy and its social-cultural environment, identifying institutional, social and human variables as shaping factors of economic development. The Culture 2000 programme already presents a more structured, integrated and outward looking approach anticipating a potentially more powerful role of Europe in the ongoing globalisation/culture debate.

III.   Europe's social and cultural challenges in the globalised world

At present, Europe is at the crossroads of its future: we detect many expressions of a crisis of meaning of the European project, despite the unifying symbol of the Euro and the prospect of a European Constitution. The need for trust building between institutions and citizens of the EU as well as for a more outward-looking approach towards other macro-regions is felt. Europe is confronted with the challenge to rethink its diversified but coherent societal model of market integration and cultural diversity and to develop a new equilibrium between converging and diverging tendencies. The process of globalisation is now forcefully drawing Europe into a wider and more fundamental debate of economic, political and cultural governance. It will require imagination, innovation, vision and creativity at different levels of political decision-making.

---

10 The aim of the Culture 2000 programme, is "to encourage creative activity and the knowledge and dissemination of the culture of the European peoples, notably in the field of music, literature, the performing arts, the fixed and movable heritage, and the new realms of culture, by fostering co-operation between cultural organisations and operators and the cultural institutions of the Member States, and by supporting measures which, by their European scope and character, promote the spread of European culture both inside and outside the Union." (Decision No 508/2000/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 February 2000). The programme is open to participation by the countries of the European Economic Area, Cyprus and the associated countries of Central and Eastern Europe. It also allows co-operation with other third countries that have concluded association or co-operation agreements containing cultural clauses. In addition, the programme allows joint action with international organisations, which are involved in the field of culture, such as UNESCO or the Council of Europe. By end 2002, the Commission will present to Parliament, the Council and the Committee of the Regions a detailed assessment report comparing the results of the action programme with its objectives.

1. Building-stones of understanding European societies: The present globalisation/culture debate calls for a conceptual framework that deals with diversity on a European and global scale; requires a socio-cultural setting that combines globalisation with cultural assertivity and assumes a moral dimension that favours commonly shared values world wide. The way policy responds to this structural and intellectual challenges will finally shape Europe's future role in the world.

Changing conceptual context: Fundamental values are at the base of paradigms that relate the individual citizen to the wider society. The process of globalisation is causing profound changes in the relation between the individual and the society at different policy levels. This implies a maximum respect for ethnic, social, cultural, linguistic and religious characteristics of societies within and beyond Europe. The construction of a culturally driven European Union and the introduction of a new societal paradigm represent the two faces of the emerging conceptual framework. Within the context of multicultural Europe we propose a cultural paradigm that takes into account the societal diversity and makes culture a shaping actor in societal developments. "Thinking Europe" in this sense implies the recognition of a radical increase in the level of complexity of societies and in the quality of intercultural dialogue within and beyond Europe. It would require promoting the political project of "*compassionate globalisation*" (Robert Falk 2001, p. 164) whereby the individual as a person within a community setting is the norm.

Socio-cultural setting: In the first part of the paper we identified contradictory trends in the interaction between globalisation and culture. The confrontation of global economy and policy with diverging and conflicting cultural values calls for "glocal" settings that allow societies to be better equipped to understand and capitalise on available human, social and emotional capital. As to cultural policy objectives, Europe should therefore provide a favourable socio-cultural environment, protecting the diversity of cultures in the face of a growing market integration, but at the same time increasing the public awareness of a common cultural heritage and a shared future. In the present globalising but fragmented world Europe will need to re-assess and strengthen its contribution to genuine intercultural dialogue, while respecting cultural diversity but preserving its fundamental values. This policy of cultural (inter) action should be out-ward looking, decentralised and positive. It should have a multi-dimensional perspective and a multi-layer practice.

Ethical dimension: The conflicts between individual and collective needs in societies should neither be rejected nor exaggerated. Tension exists between the recognition of collective identities and the ideal of individual authenticity and survival of cultures. Therefore, the terms of reference for understanding the relationship between culture and globalisation should include an ethical dimension. And the changing process in European societies should be guided by purpose and meaning which exceed mere socio-economic explanation. The European citizen should therefore be stimulated to participate in the civic society with an enhanced citizenship and an increased moral responsibility. In short, there is a need for a return of the ethical discourse in economy and politics on all levels of human exchange to respond to the moral threats of the ongoing globalisation. The moral questions often address fundamental issues of societies, which go beyond the limitative and instrumental character of economic and societal objectives. Trust, solidarity, respect for difference and tolerance are therefore values which are not to be ignored. This third building stone assumes a plural postnational citizenship in Europe, underlying a *"bonum commune europaeum"*. Only the acceptance and promotion of such a "common European good" characterised by commonly shared values will give meaning and purpose to the European integration process in the emerging global setting.

2. Points of departure
Culture as a driving force in intercultural dialogue: It was stressed in part II of the paper that cultural pluriformity is the main character of European civilisation. It is a source of wealth and strength. Not any culture can be missed in the European cultural mosaic. However, protection of cultural diversity does not imply nationalistic or regionalist isolation or a European fortress. On the contrary, a culturally driven Europe offers opportunities for open and tolerant exchange between different cultural communities. It is also assumed that a dynamic cultural sector helps to ensure real democracy and activates democratic empowerment, by inspiring citizens to become active, creative and responsible. This is the dynamic and pluralistic framework in which cultural diversity will flourish in a globalising world.

It is Europe's responsibility to favour a dialogue between diverse cultural discourses in the present globalisation/culture debate. It is Europe's challenge to play a proactive role in defusing the tension

between universalism and particularism, combining difference and identity in novel ways of dialogue and cooperation. Away from the Western sense of superiority and the rise of cross-cultural relativism there is indeed a growing recognition that some forms of cross-cultural judgements can be appropriate worldwide. Within this unfolding process Europe is called upon to meet the challenge of crossing its boundaries, respecting the right to diversity and difference but preserving fundamental values. Concrete action programmes to transmit these shifts have therefore to be elaborated in well-integrated partnerships between market, political and civil society forces on various levels of action and exchange. The actual realisation of such partnerships requires an imaginative and courageous approach to Europe's destiny in the world.

Need of a vision: The major challenge for further European integration is the search for a new equilibrium between diversity and unity in a completely changed global environment. The innovative vision of the European societal model has to take into account the historical, social and political changes, which are taken place on the international scene as well as the respect for internal and external diversity. Diversity can however not be an excuse for fragmentation or unification. Similarity of habits and values can not lead to cultural reduction or cultural arrogance.

New political, legal and social structures have led to a unique form of integration with different levels and depths. The European reality shows a development to a structure sui generis with federal characteristics, to be further elaborated in the recently created European Convention. Such a Community structure will be characterised by a shared sovereignty, replacing exclusive national sovereignty in a number of policy areas, as well as by greater responsibility for the different actors involved. Only a vision that links a common normative consensus with cultural diversity can inspire the European citizen and will give Europe its proper place within the variety of governance levels. Such a vision requires an institutional reform with structures and competencies, which are better equipped to respond to the European reality of unity and diversity in the globalising context.

The elements of such a vision should include: a broadening of the societal perspective of culture, a full integration of the role of education, an emphasis on human security and the recognition of a plural identity. An enlarged perspective includes issues such as the development of a sustainable environment, the impact of new technologies on societies and persons, the consequences of growing urbanisation on the quality of life, the role of culture in social and economic integration, etc. Secondly, in the process of socialisation and identification of an individual with his environment education plays a fundamental role[11]. It should transmit common history, collective memory and shared values and stimulate an open and tolerant attitude towards other cultures. Thirdly, human (economic and social) security has become a priority of the European societal model. It is an intellectual challenge, which consists of looking for equilibrium between changes and continuities; a challenge for Europe to give meaning to its own future and that of its citizens and a challenge to keep the specificity of its societal model in the global economy by linking cultural values to economic growth. At last, the Treaty of Maastricht introduced a citizenship of the Union adding another dimension to an already existing plural identity. This assumes a new equilibrium between the need for solidarity and the existence of a multiple identity within a Community structure, based upon universal basic principles of ethics and law. The acceptance of such a plural identity makes cultural diversity a source of enrichment to the citizen and responds to the internal and external challenges Europe is facing.

Conclusion: thinking multi-cultural Europe with multi-dimensional identities
Culture and integration are inherent characteristics of European developments. Still, more than ever, we have to be careful not to turn Europe into a global cultural area, which resembles a Melting Pot in which all diversity would be lost. Throughout the paper I clearly stressed the surplus value of cultural diversity in the ongoing globalisation debate. Different cultures should not be separated; but enter into dialogue, influence each other and transform themselves while remaining diversified. Tu Weiming introduces the term of mutual learning as an agenda for intercultural dialogue (2001). It would be a grave mistake to save the originality of particular cultures by isolating them from the dialogue with other cultures or to accept a cultural relativist approach on global scale. Europe as a culturally driven society should therefore create a space and a platform of positive communication between different cultures, large and small, and speak out with a moral voice on cross-cultural judgements.

---

11 The UNESCO Report (1996), Education: un trésor est caché dedans clearly states the objectives of education: "to learn to know", education has to

transmit values; "to learn to do", education must provide skills to allow to participate in the knowledge society; "to learn to live together", education is based

on respect for the other; and "to learn to be", education must identify the wealth and opportunities of each other in order to stimulate them.

In view of the process of globalisation and its consequences on cultural exchanges and cooperation world wide, Europe is required to take up its moral responsibility to contribute to a strengthening of a intercultural dialogue among equals in a globalising world, while firmly supporting its commonly shared values at all possible policy levels The maintenance and promotion of the global common good of a culture of peace and development worldwide, the common practice of mutual learning and the centrality of the individual citizen as a person within a Community structure are to be Europe's guiding principles in promoting globalisation with a human and cultural face.

Bibliography
- Louis Baeck, *The Mediterranean Tradition in Economic Thought*, Routledge, London, 1994.
- Ibid. *"Etapes historiques et perspectives sur l'intégration dans la penseé économique"*, in: P. Roggi (ed.), *Quale Mercato per Quale Europa*, Franco Angeli, 1994, pp. 13-32.
- Jacques Baudot (ed.), *Building a World Community, globalisation and the common good*, Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and University of Washington Press, 2001.
- Ulrich Beck, *World Risk Society,* Bladewell Pub. 1999.
- *Ibid., What is Globalization?*, Bladewell Pub., 2000.
- Léonce Bekemans, 'European Integration and Cultural Policies: Analysis of a Dialectic Polarity'*, EUI Working paper in European Cultural Studies*, No. 90/1, European University Institute: Florence, 73 p.
- Ibid., 'Economy and Culture in European Society: Methodological considerations', in *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 19, p. 1-3, 1994a.
- Ibid. (ed.), *Culture: Building Stone for Europe. Reflections and Perspectives*, P.I.E.: Brussels, 1994b, 400 p.
- Peter Berger, 'Four Faces of Global Culture', in *The National Interest,* Issue 49, fall 1997, p. 23-29.
- Hendrik Brugmans, *La Cité Européenne*, PIE, Maastricht, 1985.
- Manuel Castells, *The Information Age, Economy, Society and Culture (Vol. 1 The rise of network society; Vol. II The Power of Identity; Vol. III End of Millennium)*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1998.
- Commission on Global Governance (ed.), *Our Global Neighbourhood*, Oxford, London, 1995.
- Commission of the Bishops' Conferences of the European Community (COMECE*), Global Governance. Our Responsibility to make globalisation an opportunity for all*, Brussels, Sept. 2001.
- Amitai Etzioni, 'Cross-cultural Judgements: the next steps', in *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol. XXVII, Number 3, winter 1997.
- Robert Falk (ed.), A *New Europe in the Changing Global System*, UN UP, Tokyo/New York/Paris, 1997.
- Ibid., 'Realising the Copenhagen Vision, the political imperative', in *Building a World Community*, Jacques Baudot (ed.), Washington UP, 2001, p. 156- 166.
- *Leonard Duhl (ed.),* 'The Common Good: Futures of Community', in *Futures*, Vol. 31, No. 5, June 1999.
- Jean-Marc Guéhenno, *La fin de la démocratie,* Editions Flammarion, Paris, 1995.
- Sven Gustavsson (ed.), *The Future of the Nation-State. Essays on cultural pluralism and political integration*, London, Routledge, 1996.
- Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of the World Order*, Touchstone books 1998.
- Yudhishthir Raj Isar, Human Rights and Cultural Rights: Tension or Dialogue, paper presented at the 4th International Conference *"Quali regole per la globalizzazione? Diritto, diritti e ordine mondiale",* Istituto Internazionale Jacques Maritain, 12-14 Dicembre 2001, 9 p.
- Frank Lechner & John Boli (eds.), *The Globalisation Reader*, Bladewell Pub., 1999.
- Jean François Lyotard, La *condition postmoderne*, Minuit, Paris, 1994.
- Inge Kaul, Isabelle Grunberg, and Marc A. Stern*, Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Nicholas Negroponte, *Being Digital,* Vintage Books, 1996.
- Hendrik Opdebeeck, 'Het discours van de mondialisering en de verschraling van het ethisch streven', in *Communio*, Jrg. 25, nr. 3/2000, p. 198-209.
- Ricardo Petrella, Ecueils *de la mondialisation, Urgence d'un nouveau contrat social*, Editions Fides, Montréal, 1997.
- Ignacio Ramonet, Géopolitique *du chaos*, Editions Galilée, Paris, 1997.
- Jeremy Rifkin, *The Age of Access: The New Culture of Hypercapitalism where all of life is a paid-for-experience,* Putnam/Tarcher, April 2000.
- Charles Taylor, *Multiculturalism*, Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1994.

Culture versus globalisation in Europe: actual tension or possible dialogue?
Prof. Dr. Léonce Bekemans (Article published in *Building Towers. Perspectives on Globalisation*, Luc Anckaert, Danny Cassimon & H. Opdebeeck (eds), Peeters, Leuven, okt. 2002, p. 191-211).

10

- Emmanuel Todd, *L'invention de l'Europe*, Seuil, Paris, 1990.
- Ibid., *L'illusion économique, Essai sur la stagnation des sociétés développées*, Gallimard, 1998.
- Alain Touraine, *Critique de la modernité*, Fayard, Livre de poche, Paris 1992.
- Helen Wallace, 'Europeanisation and globalisation: complementary or contradictory trends?' *in New Political Economy*, Vol. 5, No 3, 2000, p.369-382.
- Marc Wintle, *Cultural identity in Europe: perceptions of divergence and unity in past and present*, Aldershot, Aveburry, 1996.
- Tu Weiming, 'Mutual Learning as an Agenda for Social Development', in Building *a World Community,* Jacques Baudot (ed.), Washington UP, 2001, p. 253-260.

Culture versus globalisation in Europe: actual tension or possible dialogue?   11
 Prof. Dr. Léonce Bekemans (Article published in *Building Towers. Perspectives on Globalisation*, Luc Anckaert,
Danny Cassimon & H. Opdebeeck (eds), Peeters, Leuven, okt. 2002, p. 191-211).