GLOBALIZATION AND THE HEYDAY OF CULTURE

MIRCEA MALITZA

Member of the Romanian Academy

LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

Languages provide the first image of the world's cultural variety. Six thousand spoken languages are estimated to exist at this time, but their spread is unequal.[1] The intensive use of English as an international language by the intellectual elites appears as a dominant, homogenizing phenomenon. This is only true in appearance. There are languages much more in circulation on earth : numerically, the Chinese language outruns English. Yet more important is the fact that in the second half of our century, in parallel with the pre-eminence of a few privileged linguistic vectors of civilization, there occurred a recovering of languages of non-state human groups, a rescue of those in danger of becoming extinct, an introduction of anonymous ones into the circuit of radio and even TV communication.

One might say that the enthusiasm for languages as the main support of the cultures and the identity of human groups aroused by Herder at the border line between Enlightenment and Romanticism is reviving nowadays. Herder encouraged poets and linguists to re-establish the rights of the Lithuanian and Latvian languages, as well as the Czech, the Serbo-Croatian, and the Welsh. Once these were endowed with grammar books and dictionaries, they became shortly after able to express literary creations and philosophical meditations in cultivated forms.[2] In the 19th century the same trend which deplored the industrial modernity was the one that stood at the origin of the modernization of languages as an element of cultural identity.

Neal Ascherson relates a similar contemporary undertaking.[3] East of Trabzon in Turkey, on the Black Sea coast, there lives a Muslim population that speaks a nonTurkish language called Lazuri. It seems that one thousand years ago, this population migrated from the Caucasus, leaving behind the places where the

---

[1] Marius Sala, *Limbile lumii* ([The Languages of the World). Mică Enciclopedie, Ed. Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică,Bucureşti,1981; French translation *Les langues du Monde*. Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1984, estimates according to the data available at that time that the number of languages having more than 1,000 speakers is 3,400. Recent UNESCO publications give a figure of 6,000 without specifying the number of their speakers.

[2] For Herder's role in the history of culture, see Daniel Chirot, *Herder's Multicultural Theory of Nationalism and its Consequences*. East European Politics and Societies. Vol. 10, No. 1, winter 1996.

[3] Neal Ascherson, *Black Sea*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1995.

Argonauts had sought the Golden Fleece. Theirs is a pre-Indo-European language from the family of Kartvelian languages in which one distinguishes the Georgian language but also the Mingrelian and the Svometian languages. We continue being fascinated by the diversity of the groups of languages and cultures but they are survivors of a much greater variety: it is said that in the market place of the Greek colony of Dioscurias (today's Sukhumi) seventy languages were spoken. Wolfgang Feurstein, a German scholar, engaged himself to devise an alphabet for the Lazuri language and as a result they could publish school books, traditional poetry, folklore and a dictionary.

One cultural movement in Morocco tries to promote the Tamazigt language, whose defenders say that it is the oldest language and extends over an area of five million square kilometers, down to the Niger, Mali and Burkina Faso. Drawing it out of the stage of rural communication and bringing it to a more advanced stage of expression needs elaborating a unified graphic system and the standardization of its grammar. The efforts of its promoters are, moreover, focused on asserting the contribution of the Tamazigt culture to the pluridimension of the Moroccoan culture.[4]

Similar endeavours are characteristic of the intellectual picture of our times when traditions, languages, almost lost identities are studied and revived for the American Indians, the Eskimos of the North, for Africa's tribes and for those of the Pacific isles. They are all part of the big cultural revolution of the century, for, as the saying goes, "the tide rises all the boats".

It can be said that never before was the manifestation of the cultures so exuberant and flourishing as it is today. The world lives in music rhythms all present in the daily life, at home, in the earphones, at select concerts of classical music in concert halls but also in sports arenas. Pop music and its variants wrap up the planet. We may stroll with a computer along the halls of the Louvre, the National Gallery, the Hermitage, the Vatican or the secret palaces of the Chinese emperors. The production of books and of translations has increased. Encylopaedias are recorded on CDs. Would it have been possible for the cultures to disseminate, be known and appreciated had it not been for the support of the informational technology, which now is on the point of taking a new flight?

The mutual receptivity of cultures is notable. Motifs and styles are easily assimilated and transformed into new sources of inspiration. All the continents are found on women's scarves the world over. Specific customs and traditions of some societies are sought again, not only in art, but also, as can be seen, in the culinary domain as well as in the ornaments and clothing. In the developed countries, exoticism which has always functioned, and fascination for the remote cultures are fully demonstrated. It is wrong to say that values, tastes and styles go one way

[4] *Charte relative à la langue et à la culture Tamazighte en Maroc.* Le monde des droits de l'homme, juillet–août 1994, Bruxelles.

only, as those who are alarmed say, while they only see the expansion of Coca-Cola consumers or the ubiquitous presence of MacDonald's. In addition to those who drink Coke, there are youths who dance the samba. When reaching a different cultural ground, the foreign values, styles and customs are subjected to a phenomenon of indigenization. The local ingredient is being added without exception. Even in the technical field it is manifest in the oddest possible ways. He who sees in Central America or in the Middle East a bus wholly painted with the traditional motifs of the old horse drawn carriages will understand very well the need to add local colour to goods and thus to make them familiar and assimilable.

The blooming of cultures has benefitted from the great processes of our century, *e.g.,* the massive de-colonization and the birth of more than one hundred new states. One of the first effects of liberty and independence was the building of cultural identity, the recovering of the traditions and the assertion of one's own genius.

IDEOLOGIES

Yet, the widening of the cultural sphere through new functions is due to the decline of the ideologies that have exerted an oppressive, restrictive domination over the cultures. Ideologies are cultural systems, too. They may be viewed as internal totalitarianisms of the cultures. In his book *Ideology as a Cultural System*, Geertz recalls for us the list of the ideologies that had invaded the 19th and 20th centuries and which have collapsed, have become extinct or have weakened to near extinction.[5] Ideologies as belief systems are opposed to cognitive approach. Their pretended rationality is in fact rhetorical. One of their procedures is an extreme simplification but their main scope is an emotional one. Raymond Aron never shrank from denouncing their idolatry, mythology and attempt at masking fanatical religions under secular masks. Their seclusion from science is clear. According to Parson, the essence of ideology is the deviation from scientific objectivity. The divorce was masqued by Marxism's pretention that it was "scientific socialism" while other totalitarian ideologies desperately sought a scientific support, like the Nazi racial theories. One author described thinking based on facts as a transparent clean river compared to which the ideas of the ideologists were a dirty, polluted river.

But still, if we are looking back, what was the attraction that drew such big masses of people? Four factors are mentioned in the literature. One cathartic explanation lays stress on a discharge of emotional tension by designating a symbolic enemy. A "moral" explanation shows that ideologies presented themselves as rescuers in critical situations, as detainers of some miraculous solutions. "Solidarity" offered to disparate or marginalized groups is being further

---

[5] Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures,* Basic Books, N.Y., 1973.

invoked. Finally, the pretention that they are the advocates of certain claims of rights on the history stage, going so far as to try to impart them a universal dimension.

The First World War was a psychologic-strategic one. World War II had an important ideological component. The Cold War was predominantly ideological. When Huntington says that the ideological motive is fading in the contemporary confrontations he is partially right. Here we have a diminishing of the importance of one form of culture at the expense of other ones which are on the increase. The big ideologies have compromised themselves, and the concept is viewed with suspicion.

The literature devoted to the denunciation of the communist system in the way it functioned for decades in a number of countries starting with the Soviet Union and protracted by the painful testimony of those who have suffered because of that system, a literature penetrated by the emotions of the end of an aborted experiment of contemporary history, however vast, leaves room for some supplementary considerations regarding the civilization/cultures polarity. At first sight, one might believe that *Marxist ideology,* based on the prevailing role assigned to the forces of material production in triggering the change in the production relationships and hence in the social, political and intellectual life, was a support of civilization. That ideology considered such forces and relations as forming an infrastructure overlaid by a cultural suprastructure determined by the base. *Primum vivere deinde philosophari*. The total error of such an impression has several motives. Firstly, Marxism was built on Materialism but also on the Hegelian dialectics.The role of the latter was more important in articulating an ideology. Dialectics as a conception of the world, viewed as interdepending complex processes, is acceptable. But the Hegelian version adopted by Marx and Engels added an uninterrupted mechanism of the struggle of the contraries, the solving of contradictions through fight and the disappearance of the defeated. This kind of dialectics was translated into class struggle in which the proletariat – as the antithesis – was entitled to abolish the capitalists and take over their place in the synthesis: "expropriating the expropriators". The communist states have perpetuated this ideology of revolution through dictatorship of the proletariat over all the components of society. They suspended the laws of their own dialectics, freezing them into rigid structures inaccessible to change. Systems became dominated by ideology and therefore by the suprastructure, which wanted to create a "new man", a "new conscience" and a "communist civilization".

Thus, dialectic materialism appears ever since its origin and through its implementation as a system of beliefs, a prevailing ideology. It thus contradicted the primacy of the production forces over conscience, as itself had asserted. In its turn, this kind of primacy was erroneous, because human action, even when oriented to ensuring material existence, is guided by thinking, reflection, ideas and

knowledge. The civilization/cultures polarity can be entered in the dialectical thinking but on no account in the Hegelian one. There exists no "primacy" between civilization and culture, nor struggle for supremacy or elimination, but continued partnership with distinct domains.

This ideology has stifled the cultures by attempting to break them from their social and historical grounds and change them into "class cultures". It annuled all their creative inner dynamics based on the variety of opinions and the freedom to express them. One can hardly imagine a bigger error than that of suppressing the source of one's own dynamics and improvement. The universality of science and civilization vanished. A divided society was the most nefarious starting point to achieve the modernization, a term which, in fact, was absent from the ideological program; this was reflected in the equalitarian utopia, rejected in all the former communist countries with an immense enthusiasm by those who were supposed to be its beneficiaries.

The ideas of Marx and Hegel are being recouped, processed and amended by many schools in the West and the Third World. Any simple confrontational scheme will always find adherents in the world divided into rich and poor. Marxism is not being judged after its deeds but after its simplifying utopian theory. A revolutionary left is persisting in the intellectual circles. Yet the resuming of the ideology and particularly its restoration become improbable in a world whose thinking has improved its methods for mastering complexity and is warned against the consequences resulting from false premises.

There is, however, one particular ideology which, during its existence has had a special relationship with the whole stock of beliefs and representations of the world and of cultures. This is *Nationalism*. The notion is a late concept, linked to Modernity. The French Revolution replaced the word "royal" from all the frontispices of institutions with "national". The equivalent meaning was that of people. The French Declaration of Human and Citizen's Rights speaks about the rights of the peoples. The equation nation = people = state has functioned almost unfailingly for the past two centuries. Still, the huge debate for finding a precise definition only led to the identification of differing meanings. In the tradition of the French Revolution, the nation comprised all the citizens, who become "abstract citizens" in the sense that their belongingness to ethnic, religious or linguistic groups was irrelevant since they lived on the same territory.[6] This was not the case for the German tradition which acknowledges a nation cemented by blood bonds, common territory, language and traditions, of course. When Adam Smith wrote "The Wealth of Nations" he was considering entities linked by economic interests and activities. His viewpoint has influenced modern Liberalism, which introduced the notion of "viability threshold" for the nations, eliminating from the race those

---

[6] Ernest Renan, *Qu'est-ce que c'est une nation?* Conférence, Sorbonne, Paris, 1882.

nations which, because of their small dimensions, would not have satisfied the criterion of economic viability. To a state that has solved early its unity problem, the concept is not as frequent as it is with the Italians and the Germans. The unity of these states was achieved at the middle of the last century by amply resorting to the nationalist argument. The 19th century is labelled as the century of the nations.[7] It was nationalism again which inspired the creation of the nation-states at the close of the First World War, when 17 new states were set on the map of Europe. Historians consider that nationalism changed during the period from 1870 to 1918 and reached its climax from 1918 to 1950. The great vocation of nationalism is the "shaping of states", a unifying and integrative undertaking. The liberation movements under colonialism called themselves "national movements". After gaining independence, the prevailing doctrines maintain the nationalism. When Sukarno launched the five pantja-sila principles, toward the end of the freedom struggle from the Japanese occupation, nationalism was number one, followed by humanitarianism, democracy, social development, and monoteism. For a long time this doctrine remained the official ideology. Should you ask a South-Korean which are the guiding ideas in his country, his answer is: nationalism and capitalism. It is noteworthy that nationalism has played a prevailing role both in the formative function of the state and in the strive to maintain its unity or in mobilizing the social forces for modernization.

Very little attention is attached to the composite structure of the nationalist movements and of the very diverse ethnical, linguistic, religious forces which worked together to create the independent nation. This characteristic continued even in the phase when unity was a necessary condition to achieve some major project for economic and social advancement.

All the Asian dragons are nationalist. This fact outlines two distinct aspects of nationalism: the use of the symbol of "nation" in political activity and its use as a popular feeling engendered by it. It is present in all important integrative processes like the shaping of states and the social mobilization for their modernization. But it may also take another direction, that of the separatist fragmentation and of conflict. When the foreign enemy, the colonialist no longer is there or when the fierce struggle against the new enemy, underdevelopment, could not start or did not yield fruit, there appeared a new enemy: the neighbour, the

---

[7] E. J. Hobsbawn, *Nations and Nationalism. Programme, myth, reality*, Cambridge University, 1997. Also see Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Oxford 1983; A.D. Smith, *Theories of Nationalism,* London 1983; Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Socialism Communication*. An Enquiry into the Foundation of Nationality, Cambridge MA, 1983; Fred Van der Mehden, *Religion and Nationalism in Southeast Asia*, Madison 1963; Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities.* Reflection on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism, Verso, London 1983; *Reconstructing Nations and States*, Daedalus, Summer 1993; Roger Brubaker, *Nationalism reframed*: nationhood and national question in the New Europe, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

brother, the co-existing man. A trend associated, likewise religion, to great moments of history has become the battle standard against other nations or nationalities, majority or minority groups having different cultural characteristics. Nationalism has come now to be mentioned as a source of contemporary fragmentarism or isolationism. The most various authors manifest a justified but not alarming concern, considering that this is a temporary phenomenon, which belongs to the transition period initiated by globalization.

Nationalist intellectuals have inscribed in their tools, in the era of the building of nations, the argument of culture. It is said that their revolutions were not only political ones, but also cultural and epistemological, in the sense that the symbolic framework within which peoples used to perceive the social reality, was changed. Their conception of the world is a cultural one, too.

RELIGIONS

If nationalism, as a system of beliefs and cultural values knows only outbursts under masked forms, religions as systems of culture undergo revival phenomena of impressive and unexpected proportions.

The ascent of religions represents a major cultural flow. Many writings were devoted to contradicting the old Enlightenment thesis according to which the progress of science, knowledge, rationality has, as a pendant, the recoil of the religious faith. A century that had started under the aegis of secularization is ending by being deeply religious. But we can distinguish between, on the one hand, religion as a political vector, which is conspicuous in the Muslim countries and in their assertive efforts at proselytism and expansion (hundreds of mosques were built in Africa with funding from the Sultan of Saudi Arabia), and, on the other hand religion as the individual's and the groups' need to define their identities and obtain response to the meaning of existence, where the offer of science proves to be deficient.[8] More clearly, one might say that where religion cultivates its own area of spiritual beliefs there appear no conflictual sources, but the moment it transgresses the line, attempting to take over political and ideological roles, conflicts are imminent.[9]

Inter-religious conflicts can reach extreme intensities. Tensions in the Indian subcontinent have a long history, but the sparkle which flared up mutual hatred (perhaps so utterly as to lead the two neighboring countries of India and Pakistan to produce atomic weapons) might be (symbolically) found in the fact that a temple to

[8] Ernest Gellner, *Postmodernism. Reason and Religion*. London, Routledge, 1992.

[9] Mark Juergensmeyer, *The Worldwide Rise of Religious Nationalism*. Journal of International Affairs, Columbia University, NY, Summer 1996. The whole issue is dedicated to Religion: Politics, Power and Symbolism.

the Hindu god Ram was built on the grounds of a demolished mosque in the northern Indian town of Ayodhya.

Some authors observe that the great official Churches are loosing audience, mostly in the developed countries. The same does not happen with regard to the religious feelings. In the rest of the world, too, the great institutionalized religions see themselves contested by the fundamentalist trend which demands the return to the sources, to the direct and pure message of the original texts, unfalsified by the doctrinary evolution and political compromise, a trend that is combined with anti-West rhetorics. The immediate target of fundamentalism is revolution inside the states, either in view of their de-secularization, or for amending the official religions. The fundamentalists have become an object of general concern because they encourage terrorism.[10] In the West, fundamentalism is also present, with similar programs of direct faith in the sense of the letter of the sacred texts, but with all the noise of its extremism, it is far from enjoying wide support.

For millennia, religion occupied the focal point in cultures. In Europe alone, it proceeded to the decisive action of integrating dozens of migratory populations, tribes and clans in a more articulated, generous and humane culture. It was a huge continuous melting pot for their successive waves. No nations are mentioned during the first millenium but, nevertheless, Christianity was the integrated community of a vast expanse. On reading the Merovingian Chronicle, one may see the *forma mentis* of the military elites with whom the bishops had to cope and by whom they were more than once sacrificed. After the fall of Rome, it was the Church, not the state, that preserved universalist vocation and the taste for imperial order. It had the merit to separate the powers (Give Caesar what is due to Caesar and God what is due to God), which led to the modern state and offered it the key to success consisting in lay civilization. Historians note that during the big migration transition the Church preserved the crafts, continued through its cloisters and possessions to cultivate large farmlands, offered the Latin language as a means of communication beyond the linguistic barriers, and developed arts and a civilized behavior.[11]

---

[10] Regarding Islamism, see Bertrand Schneider, *Discussion Document on Moral Values in Islam*, Club of Rome, April 1996; Louis Baeck, *La pensée économique islamique: un lien créatif dans la tradition méditerranéenne*, Conseil de l'Europe 1991; Roxane L. Euben, *Premodern, Antimodern or Postmodern? Islamic Critiques of Modernity*, The Review of Politics, Summer 1997; Gilles Kepel, *Revenge of God: The Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World*, Pennsylvania University Press, University Park, PA, 1994. *El Islam. La filosofía y las ciencias*, UNESCO, Paris, 1981.

[11] One of the creators of European integration explicitly confesses the value of tradition to the modern values: "Democracy owes its existence to Christianism. It was born the very day man was called to accomplish in his temporal life the dignity of the human person in individual liberty, according to everyone's rights and to the practice of fraternal love for everyone. Never before Christ have such ideas been formulated", Robert Schuman, *Pour l'Europe*, Nagel, Paris, 1990.

All the elements defining culture, *e.g.*, schemas of meanings incorporated into symbols by which people communicate and develop beliefs, values and life attitudes, are met in the core of religion which, in addition, has the ritual, the sacred and the connexion with the Supreme Being. The natural and the profane are different from the supranatural and the sacred. They are two separate worlds, religion concerning itself with the transcendental order. As the rest of culture, religion synthetizes a human ethos of character and morals. But it aims at a congruence between a lifestyle and a metaphysics. "Religion tunes human actions with a certain cosmic order and projects the images of the cosmic order on the plane of human experience".[12] Taylor said plainly that religion is the faith in spiritual beings. It is not culture's belief opinion but the firm, absolute, indisputable faith, substituted for knowledge.

Since prince Siddharta, who as a child had met along his way an old man, a sick man, and a dead man, and starting from those experiences he developed the Buddhism, all the religions have focused on suffering, on the world as a "valley of the sorrow" and on the attempt to cope with it. Eradicating the suffering is the subject of civilization, while enduring the suffering and how to make it endurable is a matter of religious morals. Human solidarity in this continuous trial is manifest in billions of people who go to mass, participate in the rituals and plunge into prayer. Movements that rally, as was the case in 1997, one million people in Washington at the call of the "Keepers of the Promise" sect, leave the area of official Churches and enter a vast zone of spontaneous, informal religiousness.

The great appeal of religions nowadays derives from the unrest and disappointment provoked by the chronic failure of the explicative apparatus available to us (through the ways shown by Geertz: common sense, science, philosophical speculation, myth) to represent and explain the empirical world. It is the thirst for the absolute and the hunger for certitude. The suspicion that the individual is being dragged into an absurd world has its effects. The world's complexity and contradictions push the individuals and the collectivities toward the moral and firm support of the apodictic answers of religion.

From suffering, one must continue to define "the evil" and then the morals of goodness. One cannot deny a certain taming of the mores, but when it comes to the sins of arrogance, wealth, greed and other ones blamed by Christianity, the simple reading of the news in brief reveals their noisy persistence. The preachers of Christian love and of the love for the fellow man were those who invented the Crusades, the ravaging religious wars and the Inquisition. Mohammad's successors created the sacred war, the sect of assassins and nourish terrorism, to which religions lend the sacrality of the supreme sacrifice.

But the fatal deviations of institutionalized religions that joined the zone of the political causes do not wipe out their merit for viewing, without exception, the

---

[12] Geertz, *op. cit.*

human beings as equal, made by the Creator without discrimination, their precepts being essentially universal calls. Hence their globalizing vocation.

THE EUROPEAN CULTURES

A continent with such a rich culture and the burden of a history that was researched to the minutest detail is like an overloaded ship that needs powerful engines so as to be able to navigate. Without the civilizing project of its unification, Europe would remain a mosaic of diverse languages and cultures. Monnet, one of the architects of Europe's unity, is cited as having said, toward the end of his life, that he regretted to have started with coal and steel instead of with culture. Yet, had he done that, the European Union would not exist. The splendor of cultures resides in their variety, and their amazing tapestries emerged from each one spinning one single national or local spindle, no matter whence the thread came from. We understand the dilemma of this united Europe that tries to create a "European identity" but considering that it is its cultures that secrete identities, one wonders if one can talk of a "European culture" and in what this consists. Eventually, the answer was that the only unifying trait of Europe's culture is the diversity of its components.[13] We also find new elements: alongside with national cultures a blooming of the regional cultures is mentioned, these being viewed of equal importance, and the common patrimony well preserved in the museums of Europe, well kept, visited and appreciated. The "blooming" part is easy to achieve and one can see how Europe's cities become every year "cultural capitals of Europe", to which one can add the exhuberant list of art and literary events, exhibitions and debates of ideas, all of which are heralded and open to all West Europe. One difficult problem to decipher is, however, that of the "unity through diversity". This problem is equally essential for geomodernity. First, it requires changing the "either/or" logic with a logic based on "and/and".[14] It is really a challenge for our

---

[13] In the recommendations for the framework of a cultural policy, between 1988-1992, it is said: "The unicity of European culture, reflected by the history of the diversity of regional and national cultures, forms the indispensable foundation of the project for an ambitious development which has as final target the European Union." Art. 128 of the fundamental document stipulates only the community's contribution to "the flourishment of the member states' culture respectful to the regional and national diversity and the bringing forward of the common cultural legacy." For an ample discussion of the subject, see: "*Culture: Building Stone for Europe 2002*", Ed. Leonce Bekemans, European Interuniversity Press, Bruxelles, 1994; *L'Europe sans les Européens*, Temps Européens, La Revue du Centre Européen de la Culture, printemps 1997.

[14] The future cultural paradigm of Europe will demand from us to learn how to leave aside the Cartesian logic of "either/or", through which our scientical minds were used to surpass the contradiction (which politically speaking led to the nonsense of ethnic purification) in favor of an "and/and" reasoning which should lead us to the reconciliation of the differences and diversities without refusing any of the divergent individual parts", Gabriel Fragnière in *Culture: Building Stone*, *op. cit.*; see C. Noica, *The European Cultural Model*, Humanitas, Bucureşti.

minds to think and accept simultaneously the contraries. But it is not impossible, as show the evolutions of the logics that have left the axioms of identity and of the third excluded (*tertium non datur).*

One valuable example demonstrating the feasibility of the undertaking is the example of Switzerland. Paradoxically, she does not belong to the community of the united Europe and has rejected by popular referendum this belongingness. And yet, she is the most live model for the European project. Switzerland is a country with a unique civilization, having simultaneously four cultures and four official languages. She is made of cantons, each one with its own personality, culture and customs. She is divided into two by Catholicism and Protestantism. It started some 700 years ago as a rural and urban alliance around a project of survival, defining its niche in civilization "thinking with the hands" in Denis de Rougemont's formula. She built roads and tunnels linking the other centers of Europe and, placed in the middle, began perceiving transit taxes which gradually engendered her financial vocation. On the chapel in Hospental, near the St. Gotthard, the fronton reads: "Here the roads part. Friend, whither do your steps go? Will thou go downwards to eternal Rome, to the German Rhine and Cologne the sacred or farther yet to the West, to the country of France?".[15] Nature was her ally, not with resources but with chances. She made her vocation of hospitality by harbouring all the persecuted thinkers and craftsmen, stayed in contact with all the cultures and let herself be influenced by them, reciprocating with peace messages, neutrality and humanitarian action. It hosted international bodies and culture congresses and created global institutions such as the Red Cross. Its unity was put to trial many times and confronted with all the schisms and wars. And "yet Switzerland exists" as Jacques Freymond entitles one of his books.[16] Swiss thinkers that reflected on the history of their country have projected their own experience over Europe, as did Denis de Rougemont, the moral author of a European Federation based on regions. When asked what is "the unity of ground, origin, and target, what is the common mettle which outlines and preserves our identities" he answered: "It is nothing else but Europe in its entirety, the only cultural, organic and complete unity to which we may connect directly." According to the Swiss philosopher, Switzerland's cultures can relate to Europe because, historically, it was the European cultures which were the first to enter into the composition of the Swiss ones. The same applies to the other countries. "Is there anything in all that you have that was not something you have received?" might tell the European culture to each one of the twenty-five Nation-States that have shared Europe between themselves after

---

[15] Alfred Berchtold, *Aspects d'une aventure culturelle. La Suisse*, l'Europe et le Fédéralisme, Cadmos, été 1991.

[16] Jacques Freymond, *700 ans + 4 et pourtant la Suisse existe*, Centre Europeéen de Culture, Genève, 1995.

tearing, for a long time, at one another".[17] Describing the citizen Helvetus as participant in a large cultural area reaching out of the borders of his country, one author finds that "the European dimension is contained in the bud in Helvetus' cultural conscience, who adopted the universal posture" and reaches the remarkable formula: "Europe is, independently of the linguistic solidarities, contained in the bud in the cultural space of each one".[18]

In other countries some of the features of the development of cultures may be traced down to the variety of their sources. For a long time Vienna played the role of an influent center of the continent. Her cultural history can be read in the terms of the present, appraised diversity.[19] Here, again, one can see how by intensive use of various sources one can join the diverse family of cultures.

After the above incursions we tend to believe that "variety" alone is not a ground for unity. The root of a European culture must be sought in the high degree of interaction. All European cultures have gone through the common waves of some trends like the Enlightenment, the Classicism, the Romanticism, the Modernism which they lived intensely, distilled in their retorts at home and expressed in their own styles. "The ideal of the state being linked to a project of cultural uniformity" presupposes "the illusory homogenization of cultural identity

[17] Denis de Rougemont, *Elveția sau istoria unui popor fericit* (Switzerland or the History of a Happy People), Ed. Univers, București, 1996. The following paragraphs from Denis de Rougemont, *inédit*, La Baconnière-Neuchâtel, 1988, are relevant: "It is about the *unity of a culture* in which participate all the Europeans, well-educated or not, conscious or not of what they owe to culture. A nonhomogeneous unity which does not result from a forced uniformization process, of leveling or of exclusion of what is different, but which, on the contrary, broadly incorporates and composes, in an evermore complex community, during the centuries, values often antinomical, having various origins, the contrasts and combinations of which maintained continuously renewed tensions." For the European "masterpiece" of Denis de Rougemont, one should remind his initiative for convening the European Conference for Culture, Lausanne, 8–12 Dec. 1949, and the activity of the European Center for Culture that he directed until he died. *Sources et actualité de la première Conférence Européenne de la Culture*, Lausanne 1949, by Marlise Giarini-Roguette, published at CEC, forty years after this event took place (1989). Also see François Saint Ouen, *Un sens pour l'Europe. L'héritage de Denis de Rougemont*, Temps européens, automne 1996.

[18] Hugo Loetscher, *La culture comme champ de tensions transeuropéennes*, Centre Européen de la Culture, Genève, hiver 1995/96.

[19] Karl R. Popper, *În căutarea unei lumi mai bune* (In Search of a Better World). "Old Austria is a European replica: it sheltered almost innumerable linguistic and cultural minorities. And these people, to whom country life seemed a little boring, came to Vienna, where some had to learn some German. Many were influenced by a great cultural tradition, and some were able to bring new contributions to it. We know that Haydn and Mozart were influenced by German, Italian and French masters, but also by the Hungarian and even Turkish popular music. Haydn and Mozart were immigrants in Vienna, and Beethoven, Brahms, Bruckner and Mahler came to Vienna from outside. The genius of musicians remains unexplained, as the "divine spark" – acknowledged by Beethoven himself" – "in Schubert", certainly the greatest of the native inhabitants of Vienna.

with political identity".[20] Interaction, confluence and mutual resonance of cultures are thus the factors to be retained for the process of regional integration as well as for the process of globalization. They must be added to the simple variety which cannot be alone the base of unity.

THE UNIVERSAL CORE OF THE CULTURES

Having noted the tendency of cultures to look inside them, which, their local roots helping, pushes them toward localism and fragmentation, in opposition with the prevailingly universalist vocation of the civilization, we should go back now to the legitimacy of the syntagm: *universal culture*. Indeed, the great religions have also tended to universality, introducing the term in their own name, like for Catholicism (katholikos = of universal extension). Islam and Buddhism knew no borders. One talks of universal literature and art. The literary and artistic trends have comprised large dissemination areas. Philosophical works were translated, and penetrated powerfully into all the cultures. Ideologies and doctrines were developed in view of a large dissemination (both Liberalism and internationalist Socialism). When we read the writings of Plato, Homer, Horatius, Shakespeare, Goethe, or of the northern playwrights, the Chinese authors and the Latin-American novelists, we forget about the cultural matrices that shaped them. This is the deed of a remarkable thing: digging in depth, the geniuses of the different cultures have reached the layer of the human permanences, *i.e.*, the man of the suffering and creation, of the everlasting unrest and common aspirations, who is actually universal, pleading for the unity of our planetary species.

Eckermann reports that Goethe was impressed by a Chinese novel and afterwards started to talk about universal literature, a change that is significant in a writer who had shared the romantic ideal of culture sprung from the specificity dictated by the language and traditions of each people.

If cultures are the melting pots where values, in the sense of preferences that each collectivity aspiring to self-identity place on an original scale, are being fashioned, then can we go on and speak of universal values? Suffice it to compare the moral precepts of the great religions, to understand that there exists a common fund of reprovable deeds (murder, theft, and others) but also other noble ones (respect of the human being, compassion, solidarity, assistance to the destitute) to give an affirmative answer.

In the modern age, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights reveals a consensus on a handful of principles of general applicability. At the core of the pyramid of values which each culture arranges according to its own seal defining

---

[20] Jacques Lenoble, *Political and Philosophical Reflections on Cultural Models of Society. Culture: Building Stone, op. cit.*

its personality, there are a few that have shed away the shirt of subjectivism and have or are on their way to obtaining universal recognition. A survey made by the Institute for Global Ethics has interviewed individuals from 16 nations, who mentioned the following common pre-eminent values: love, honesty, equity, liberty, unity, tolerance, responsibility and respect for life.[21]

The cultures/civilization polarity pushes some features to the limits, which are found at the ends of an axis. But between the two poles there are resonances, known interferences and confluences. These are the areas where cultures tend to universality and values are invested with that quality. The apparent contradiction born from attributing to culture some characteristics opposed to those defining the civilization do not hinder cultures, vested in their own garments, to initiate their own universal message that facilitates their dialogue and interaction while not changing in any manner the plural to which they are destined. Thus, universal culture can be more than a collection of cultures or an anthology of the meritorious ones, apt to address and be received beyond their borders, which they do not surrender in order to preserve their identities. We may speak unreservedly of universal values, because they transgress such borders, being absorbed by the needs of civilization, which transforms them from values into rules and institutions.

The older problem of a universal culture is being raised again in the light of the globalization process. Many studies are devoted to it. While not all the authors acknowledge the existence of a global culture, they discover the existence of a globalization of culture. But the interpretation varies from one author to another. Some consider it like a battlefield of the world system, others outline its new features, postmodernism tries to claim it, and some view it as a new cosmopolitanism or as a parallel to economic integration.[22] Then, there are vehement critics who denounce the imperialism exerted by the media and the crushing of native cultures.[23] In special domains of culture such as music and clothing it is emphasized that far from bringing homogeneity, globalization encourages indigenization and a "flourishing creativity". Pop music has become "the most universal medium".[24]

[21] Rushworth M. Kidder, *Universal Human Values*. Finding an Ethical Common Ground, The Futurist, July–August 1994

[22] See: Ashis Nandy, *The Future of Cultures*, coordinator Eleonora Masini, vol. 1, UNESCO, Paris, 1991; *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone, Sage Publ., Newbury Park CA, 1990; Immanuel Wallerstein, *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1991; David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1989; Marlin Albrow, Elizabeth King (eds.), *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*, Sage, London, 1990; Louis Baeck, *The Brave New World of Cultural Asserivity*, Congress toward a New Civilization, The Gorbachev Foundation, Moscow, 1992.

[23] John Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction*, John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1991.

[24] Michael Marien, *Cultural Trends and Transformation*, Futuresco, No. 4, Culture: UNESCO, Paris, 1994.

Those who lay the accent on culture's function to confer self-identity ("tell the people who they are") are wondering whether we have attained a large scale globalist identity or those who live "globality" possess a coherent corpus of values to rally them in cultural solidarity. One thing is to be connected to the global networks and quite another to be unified with them. Yet the fact that such networks exist and communicate values and beliefs, culture's ideas and products, is conclusive enough of a framework that prefigures a future where the "meanings and identities shall not be linked to location or limited in chronological time".[25] In some instances, such products are developed for the local tastes while in others the public convert them to their style; this led to a funny name that combines global and local: the glocal. Another idea is that global culture, being "universal, out of the time and technique", "without roots and situated in the panoramic space", will not be able to sustain authentical identities.[26] Global space would thus construct only senseless identities in the hypertechnological world denounced by Baudrillard.[27]

Faced with so many opinions, skeptical or negative, let us try to make a few observations.

Together with information, cultural ideas also flow through the global networks. But since in Marshall McLuhan's terms "the medium is the message", messages are mostly global as is the medium.[28] The values circulated are twofold: they either support and assimilate the ideas presiding over the computer science, economic, managerial and political revolutions (horizontality, knowledge, new modernity, welfare, etc.) or they are openly or in a dissimulated manner opposed to this march of civilization.

Cultures are not static, they change as any other social phenomenon. It is obvious that they become unrecognizable from one century to another. However, in any phase they could be distinguished by their attitude toward civilization: favor or obstruction. The flexible ones accept the change, the frozen ones oppose it violently. If globalization has a beneficial effect, those who accept it are certainly less susceptible of confrontation and war. The wind of globalization brings peace although at this time it is blamed for having revived traditionalism, fragmentation and localism, these being at the roots of cultural and identity conflicts in the world.

A less frequent observation is that globalization encourages the ludic vocation of cultures. Man has a strong propensity for the game, and cultures offer a vast range of entertainment. Suffice it to watch the World Football Championship

[25] Axford, *op.cit.*

[26] Smith Anthony, *The Suppression of Nationalism?* International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 31 (2), 1990.

[27] Jean Baudrillard*, Simulations*. Semiotext, New York, 1983.

[28] Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.

(Paris, 1998). The whole performance is indeed international: teams represent states, their flags fly high and their anthems are played, the supporters are obviously nationals. And yet, globality is there too: many of the players do not come from the domestic but from the foreign teams in which they are playing; they represent all the sections of multicultural societies: they make the subject of huge transactions, which are announced by each speaker, they seek a future contract on the globe; they are on the world exchange: the show belongs to the entire world (up to 2 billion spectators at one match alone), it is super-competitive and rewards both the performance and the good manager, it unifies mankind more than any other event: it even suspends mankind's activities while it lives up a global event.

The ludic effect associates with the peaceful effect. Global events abolish time and space but also create human solidarity.

THE AMERICAN MULTICULTURALISM

This is a new trend which strongly emerges in the American society. We cannot disregard its fervour for the import of ideas from so many new cultures of the world map, a late discovery of world's pluralism of cultures. Montesquieu was denouncing the narrowness of mind of his world, which asked "how can anyone be Persian?", but now mankind must accommodate itself with the unconfoundable identity of hundreds and thousands of cultures.

Multiculturalism is a movement that looks particularly inside the society and takes into account not the world cultures but those co-existing within the same boundaries.

Their justification lies in the fact that it recognizes one ignored dimension of the immigrant melted in the common pot or of the group subjected to discrimination. The decisive moment was, indeed, when the group's emancipation movement refused the name of "blacks" because it considered itself a group of "Afro-Americans". The link with the African countries liberation movement is conspicuous in time (the sixties). Latin-Americans, Chinese and Asians, Poles, Greeks, and Irish have taken, they too, the path of cultural identity.

In the USA, a country of immigration, multiculturalism is a new thing, not in the sense that the practicing of beliefs, languages, customs or solidarity associations of some groups was being disturbed in any way, but because until now citizens' equality before the law did not allow the distinction to acquire relevance and proportions.

The attention for the ethnic, linguistic or religious groups occurred in the heyday of subcultures grouped around some common values by which they distinguished from the "dominant", official and general culture, the culture from

the school textbooks, the youth's and womens' culture, that of the mystical sects, of the drug addicts, homosexuals and of any other deviating group. Culture became the form for defending a position or certain interests distinct from those of the majority and of the Establishment.

The intensity of such trends joins the long series of belief-based movements inside the cultures, starting with religion and ending with ideology even though these were now replaced with the properly speaking "culture". Likewise their predecessors they do not always remain peaceful but may degenerate into fanaticism, exclusivism and even violence.

In the multiculturalist effervescence of our days the term of civilization has a connotation as pejorative as it has with the African populations because they associate it with colonialism. Societies' common projects start fading. One author goes as far as stating that "the American nation has become a multicultural public" and that "the American nation-state was undone in the most radical way in the cultural and educational domain". Of course, it is that author's personal estimation. But before examining the imminent risks, let us outline some of the worth considering achievements.

Multiculturalism represents a change in the long time old American policy of considering itself a "melting pot", a huge pot in which immigrants melt and become Americans. The unique compulsory language, equality before the law and equal chances imparted by citizenship, the oath taken on the Constitution discarded the original culture, this manifesting itself in the private life without being infringed upon but also without being encouraged. The awakening to a self-identity based on culture has changed the situation, while the state policy adopted an attitude of interest and favouring those events that emphasized the specificity of each group. Cultural practices of the group are tied either with the ethnic binding or with the social features endowing it with a differing identity. Such practices are especially the language, the food, the festivals, the marriages and the burials.[29] A new festival named Kwanzaa from the Swahili word which means "the first fruits" is being celebrated by the Afro-Americans for seven days at the end of the year, like a sort of the community's Christmas. The values emphasized are: unity, self-determination, collective work and responsibility, cooperative economy, goal, creativity, and faith.[30]

[29] Mary C. Waters, *Ethnic options*, Choosing identities in America, University of California Press, Los Angeles, 1990.

[30] Anna Day Wilde, *Mainstreaming Kwanzaa*, Public Interest 119, spring 1995. This feast is commented by Walter Truett Anderson, *Santa Claus in the Global Village: Postmodernism Visions of Self and Society*. Communication at the regional seminar of the World Academy of Art and Science, "Cultural Identity and the Demands of Civilization" held at the Black Sea University Foundation in June 1994.

Reviving some traditions, preserving the original language, entertaining some ancestral beliefs, affinities and community solidarity, introducing and preserving some original cultures, in harmony with the respect of the laws and institutions governing the country of adoption may be reckoned as the positive balance-sheet of the era of the heyday of cultures.

The hybris emerges when culture transgresses its limits, confiscating portions of the citizens' society, lessening its interaction with the rest of the population and practicing an anachronical self-segregation.

First, culture becomes the binding of a new category which starts substituting itself to the society: the community. In a classroom in an American university, five students took the floor at the end of a lecture and said :"we believe ..." and on closer analysis it was found that the subject *we* referred to the community to which they belonged, not to "we, the Americans". The confusion between culture (identity) and civilization (political institutions of the entire society) leads to claiming autonomous and separatist leadership. I had a start when I heard some trivial news of an American judge in an Indian population sentencing two young delinquents to the traditional isolation on an uninhabited island, and not according to the laws of the country.

By their exclusivism, communities cultivate intolerance and even violence. Conflicts between them (Koreans and Afro-Americans in California), within them (the sects) or between them and the society (terrorism practised by a sect in Oklahoma) are a sad and upsetting sign. Their expansion is obtained to the detriment of the state's often denigrated institutions meant to keep order and legality. In some instances, communities form armed forces, brigades meant to defend group interests at the cost of violence.

Multiculturalism has, moreover, encouraged the cultural relativism which forbids a value judgement at the address of a culture which may not be condemned for its practices no matter how much inhuman they might be. Since standard criteria for evaluation no longer exist, one cannot any more judge what is right and what is wrong. On what basis can we then judge as unacceptable such practices as sexual or ritual mutilation in some contemporary cultures or the violation of human dignity of the child or of the woman once such practices have been sanctified by tradition, part of the culture that confers them self-identity?[31]

One study[32] shows the dimensions of a large debate. The two perspectives considered by the author are pluralism and particularism. The battle for the university curriculum is described in terms of do we maintain it at the classical or

[31] See: Andrei Cornea, *Turnirul Khazar. Împotriva relativismului contemporan* (Khazar Tournament. Against Contemporary Relativism), Nemira, Bucureşti, 1997.

[32] Ronald Takaki, *Multiculturalism: Battleground or Meeting Ground?,* The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Interminority Affairs in the US: Pluralism at the Crossroads, Nov. 1993; *America as a Multicultural Society*, AAPSS, March 1981.

universal standards or do we modify it in order to include the various cultures of society? Allan Bloom, Diane Ravitch and Arthur Schlesinger adopted the former position; Gerald Graff, Louis Gate and Ronald Takaki adopted the latter.[33]

In the years 1960–1970 the main topic in the USA was "the generation gap".[34] Now its place is being taken by multiculturalism, a theme that is yet to be exhausted. Europeans follow it with skepticism, emphasizing the specificity of some countries in which immigration is a recent accident, not a state policy. Other groups manifest interest for an experience meant to allow several cultures to live within the same society.[35]

THE DIVERSITY OF CULTURES

The respect for the variety of cultures and for their unimpaired right to affirmation, expression and promotion is one of the new acquisitions of our century and a valuable legacy for the coming one. The goal of civilization is the achievement of its global uniqueness while the goal of cultures is to multiply and diversify in liberty. Pursuing simultaneously the two goals summarizes the program of geomodernity.

The progress is due to the big international organizations. UNESCO has devoted an all-encompassing study to this theme.[36] Pluralism, in the sense of tolerance and respect for the plurality of cultures, applies both to the countries and inside them. "The diversity and plurality of cultures are benefits comparable to those of the biodiversity. Pluralism has the advantage that it pays attention to the accumulated thesaurus of the whole experience, wisdom and behavior of mankind.

[33] Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished The Souls of Today's Students*, Simon & Schuster, N.Y. 1987; Diana Ravitch, *Multiculturalism. E pluribus plures*. American Scholar, 59(3), summer 1990; Arthur Schlesinger Jr., *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*, Whittle Communications, Knoxville 1991; Gerald Graff, *Beyond the Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts can Revitalize American Education*, Norton, N.Y., 1992; Henry Louis Gates Jr., *Loose Canons; Notes on Culture Wars*, Oxford Univ. Press, N.Y. 1992; Ronald Takaki, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America*, Little, Brown. NY 1993.

[34] Margaret Mead, *Culture and Commitment. A Study of the Generation Gap*, The American Museum of National History, Garden City NY, 1970. The author, known as an authority in anthropology, divides cultures in postfigurative cultures (children learn from adults), cofigurative (children learn from children, adults from adults), and prefigurative (adults learn from children). The revolt of the young around the world in the 60's is first of all the result of "the emergence of a mondial community. For the first time, human beings around the world, in informing and in answering to one another, formed a community united by shared knowledge and danger."

[35] Michel Wieworka (ed.), *La société fragmentée? Le multiculturalisme en débat*. La Découverte, Paris, 1996.

[36] *Our Creative Diversity*. Report of the World Commision on Culture and Development, President Javier Perez de Cuellar, UNESCO, 1995.

Any culture may benefit from the comparison with other cultures, because this unveils its own idiosyncrasies and particularities. This does not imply any cultural relativism: it is wholly consistent with the affirmation of the validity of some absolute standards." Diversity is a source of development of human society on all planes. The great quality of the study resides in the fact that it begins with the need for global ethics. Human rights and responsibilities, democracy and civil society, protection of the minorities, peaceful solution of conflicts and negotiations, international equity are the five pillars proposed for this ethics. In some points it is differing from other proposals that we took notice of but the important thing is that the discussion is being carried on and has a clear idea. It is correct to ask cultures to generate common values. Pluralism is seen again in a universalist light. "Acknowledging the differences is before anything else a condition of the dialogue and hence of the construction of a much larger union of diverse people. Despite the difficulties, we are confronted with an inescapable obligation: ways must be found to reconcile the new plurality with the common citizenship. The goal may not necessarily be that of a multicultural society, but that of a state constituted multiculturally, a state that acknowledges plurality without loosing its integrity."

"No culture is an island." Cultures influence one another and are in a state of constant flow pushed by exterior and interior forces.[37] On such reasonable premises is constructed an analysis of the civic issues: minorities, aboriginal peoples, women, children and youths, environment, development viewed in the light of the possible and necessary contribution of the cultures, as well as the risks and obstacles, *e.g.*, xenophobia and racism, fanaticism, inequity and social gaps.

The report suggests a global summit in the next five years, which should be devoted to the issue of culture and development. The summit should sustain the idea that development is built around the people and not people around development, and should devise those development strategies which enrich the cultural heritage and do not destroy it.

However, the main weakness of the study is that it neglects systematically the economic factors of development: science, technology, finances, trade, knowledge, in a word the factors of civilization and modernization, the latter being completely omitted. On the threshold of the 21st century when the meeting would be planned, a new summit is necessary. Its subject should not perpetuate the hostility against and lack of interaction of cultures with civilization, but yield a productive resonance.

In the nongovernmental field there are numerous initiatives, too. A project for the world culture was launched for the 1988–1998 decade.[38] One may attribute its

---

[37] The cultural transfers are discussed. Thomas Sowell, *Evoluția civilizațiilor* (The Evolution of Civilizations), American Enterprise, 1991. Thomas Sowell is the author of *Race and Culture*, Basic Books, NY, 1994, in which he emphasizes the influence over the culture brought by migrations and conquests.

[38] D. Paul Schafer, *The Challenge of Cultural Development*, World Culture Project 1994; The New World Order, Markham, Canada, 1983; *The Cultural Personality*, Markham, Canada 1991.

unsatisfactory efficiency to the premiss of the project by which no distinction is made between culture and civilization. Culture, in the singular, was supposed to include all the human activities (eight kinds of cultures: social, artistic, technological, political, religious, educational, scientific, and economic) based on the fact that back in 1871 Sir Edward Taylor had said that culture = civilization, *i.e.* a complex whole comprising also the knowledge, together with all of man's capabilities and customs as a member of the society.

In the field of human sciences and history a contribution larger than many of the international debates and projects together in understanding culture is brought under our eyes. The relevance of comparative studies, of the influences and relations occurring in all the spheres of culture, of the mentalities and ideas, of the great trends of thought and of their reception and reflection in the laboratory of each culture is outlined.[39]

The same interference takes place between science and culture. Their interaction is considerable even nowadays and is heralded as a sign of the future.[40] It is much facilitated when the interlocutors recognize their distinct characters and do not pursue "mergers" as in the Vancouver declaration or the UNESCO meeting in Tokyo.[41] Their resonance begins when they acknowledge their differences, when they do not confiscate their areas and methods, as in Denis de Rougemont's happy formula "a couple of inseparable antinomies".

[39] In this field the Romanian school distinguished itself by the works of acad. Virgil Cândea, Răzvan Theodorescu, Alexandru Duțu a.o., and by hosting regional cultural organisms like the International Association for South-East European Studies, founded in 1963.

[40] Pierre Bernard, *L'avenir de la culture.* Diogène, UNESCO, Gallimard 66, 1969.

[41] Science and culture for the 21st Century: Agenda for survival. Symposium UNESCO, Vancouver, Sept. 1989. See also Mahdi Elmandjra. *Fusion of Science and Culture; Key to the XXIst Century*. Paper to the Symposium.