The Challenge of Elusive Borders and Shifting Paradigms in the Context of Globalisation and Glocalisation

Caroline Y. Robertson-von Trotha (Karlsruhe)

Societies and cultures, nations and regions, ethnic and religious group affiliations, social and global civic movements, to mention only a few: Territorial, social, political, cultural, and economic spaces are dynamic and complexly intertwined. Crossing borders, diminishing the effects of borders, but also the creation of new boundaries are ongoing processes in many senses. As many have suggested, generally we are witnesses of a transitional period of hitherto unknown dimensions, of deep change and long-term Grand Challenges. We don't have ready answers to emerging problems, many of which have the potential to threaten or destabilise whole societies. Our appreciation and understanding of cultural diversity in our own cities and societies and the dynamics of networking in a globalised world is fragmentary. Climate change issues and the coronavirus pandemic clearly indicate the dialectics of global interdependencies and the requirements for local action. The gradual process of globalised megatrends poses a major ongoing challenge. The speed and uneven effects of change require monitoring, appreciation, and advocacy for action on many levels. In this essay, I will concentrate on the effects of change on cultures and their identities, and in particular I will address the need to broaden our approaches to intercultural understanding.

Dialogue is a necessary tool and perhaps the backbone of all trans- and intercultural understanding; but as we are presently experiencing, dialogue in itself is not sufficient. Both individual and group interest and openness for dialogue as well as for organised and informal meeting spaces, are important prerequisites. The appreciation of differing societal contexts is central. Under which local circumstances does dialogue take place? Is the right of law and freedom of speech guaranteed? How is space for contradiction perceived? Clearly there are groups who see cultural change and cultural diversity as a threat and consequently wish to control in-group processes of communication.

Rising neo-nationalist and anti-immigration populist sentiment, in particular right-wing populism as observed in the white supremacist "Proud Boys" movement in the US, in the nationalist movements in the Visegrád States,[1] and in the "taking back control" sovereignty campaign that led to Brexit all lend themselves to identity politics and political mobilisation (cf. Robertson-Wensauer 1991). In Germany, the unexpected strength of the Pegida movement (Patriotic Europeans against the Islamisation of the Occident) in Dresden and the formation of Pegida opposition in many cities, in particular in Leipzig, are examples of polarising effects within local space. "Cultural reconstruction", to use Alain Touraine's (2014: 45) term, is a project with highly frictional potential. And that applies to more than just possible modern stereotyped ascriptions, self-ascriptions, and interpretations of Islam. One of the keywords of the Pegida movement – *Lügenpresse* (lying press) – demonstrates that established media institutions find themselves in the midst of a politically charged struggle for credibility against diverse adversaries. Due to the accelerating effects of digitisation and social media, the technical digital revolution has made the challenges and vulnerabilities facing the development of cultural policies of education and exchange more obvious and more complex. Historical borders and divides conditioning the present are often unknown and unseen; their pasts have been forgotten, culturally relativised, and reinterpreted; new and shifting cultural, social, and aesthetic boundaries develop with potentials of inclusion and exclusion; cultural pluralities are selectively compounded within cultural identity politics.

---

[1] The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia form the so-called 'Visegrád Group'.

Social and cultural sciences are confronted with paradoxes and dilemmas they cannot explain. Theoretical concepts and debates on othering,[2] on alterity, and on bordering[3] address important aspects of the dynamic relationships of changing cultures, identities, and their meanings (cf. Ferguson/Mansbach 2012; Cooper/Tinning 2020; Weber et al. 2011). Making borders tangible and meaningful for the development of intercultural training toolkits and for the development and implementation of strategic cultural policy is ongoing (cf. De Beukelaer et al. 2015). We increasingly advocate for more communication between theoretical and applied science and between science and practice. And we recognise the need for international comparative research as well as for interdisciplinarity. In this sense as well, we have to learn to cross borders and to find ways and means of overcoming our language problems – language in a more comprehensive sense of the word, which is often an additional problem, entrenched as we are within our academic disciplines. Most importantly, we need a frank and open debate on the shortcomings of present interactions between theory and practice, including the tendencies of self-immunisation within academia against criticism. This is a debate we regularly return to within the wider contexts of paradigm shifts and the interactions between scientific, societal, and political debates. One important aspect is the use of language in the public science agora. It is, however, clear that cultural difference and intercultural exchange have many levels. For example, the popular toolbox models of the iceberg[4] remind us of the following: When we do see cultural difference, we tend to see a very reduced version of what is, and we cannot really rationally and emotionally grasp what difference means to the other. Cultural difference necessarily constitutes multifaceted demarcation lines – borders with fuzzy edges which change over time: elusive borders.

---

[2] The term *othering* describes the process of distancing oneself from other people or groups by defining them as 'other(s)'.

[3] Processes of *bordering* denote the everyday construction of borders, for example through stereotypes, media representations, or political discourses and institutions (cf. Kolossov/Scott 2013: 3).

I would like to formulate four general hypotheses, which my following reflections will be based on:

1. Civilisation was and is a story of borders. It is not possible to conceive of societies or cultures without them.

2. Borders remain a major structural instrument of geopolitical, cultural, socio-economic, and political interest.[5]

3. The more complex and mobile societies become in the digital age, the more elusive their borders are. Borders often become almost invisible, leading us to underestimate their potential strength, local impetus, and ongoing validity.

4. On account of the unforeseeable effects of globalisation and digitisation, an appreciation of the positive and negative effects of borders becomes a cultural challenge requiring closer scrutiny.

---

[4] Since its development in theories of cultural communication, the ‘iceberg’ metaphor in its many variations can be used as an initial ‘warning sign’: It makes us aware that there are a multitude of blind spots to be taken into account in all inter- and transcultural debates. Cultural diversity can only be fully appreciated by appreciating its multi-layered complexity.

[5] As the example of the COVID-19 pandemic within the European Union illustrates, national state borders can be partially revived by introducing regulatory obligations such as quarantines, which were not foreseen within the open border policy of the Schengen Agreement.

Implications and Consequences of Globalisation

When we talk about globalisation, internationalisation, world culture, world society, and so forth, we often overlook the fact that these terms cannot be used as synonyms – in practice, particularly in the media, they often are. Differentiation is not only of academic interest. It makes the understanding of the changing frameworks within which cultural practice takes place clearer. Effective policy, cultural diversity concepts, and cultural education can only be developed with knowledge of framework conditions. The fuzziness and problematics of the emerging use of synonyms is particularly evident with the vagueness of distinction between the terms *cultural diplomacy (CD)* and *international cultural relations (ICR)* (cf. Trobbiani/Pavón-Guinea 2019).

The present accelerated process of globalisation is commonly seen as starting sometime after the Second World War, and was initially understood as the process of economic internationalisation. An American economist of Jewish-German descent, Theodore Levitt, was probably the first to popularise the term in an essay from 1983 entitled "The Globalization of Markets", which was aimed at business managers. His central insight remains relevant not only for business managers but also for cultural managers and analysts: "Preferences are constantly shaped and reshaped" (Levitt 1983: 102). He, of course, was referring to products and market commodities. But more generally, lifestyles, tastes, fashions, beliefs, personal priorities, values, and behaviour can also be seen from this perspective. Our preferences change and are constantly being reshaped by our social and cultural environments and through intercultural exchange, thus creating a dynamic framework within which cultural practice takes place. Depending on migrational flows over time, local space is more or less culturally diverse; cities celebrate their diversity as part of their changing local identity – or they contain difference in separate city quarters; at the same time, diversity can be regarded both as a potential and as a threat within the broader process of globalisation.

'Liquid Modernity'

Societal change was never a simple linear process, as earlier development theorists sometimes postulated. This applies even more in a globalised world: Decisions are made and actions implemented without being able to foresee all possible consequences. Globalisation is the sum of complex international assimilative and acculturative transfer processes and includes intentional and unintentional change. Within the framework of globalisation, we quite generally find ourselves confronted with a *conditio humana* which Zygmunt Bauman (2007) describes as 'liquid times' (see also Bauman 2000; 2016). In the past, we have often made ad hoc decisions and muddled through. But as Bauman and others have pointed out, there was a general consensus that modernity and the transformation of society through scientific, technological, economic, and cultural change would lead to a better quality of life for most. There was an – albeit diffuse – vision of what modernity should and could accomplish. Opinions on this differ, however.

Growth of Complexity

World society, global governance, the participatory turn, global citizens, and – of course – intercultural dialogue are just some of the constructs which come to mind when we discuss forward-thinking visions of the future. Are these realistic goals? Are they shared on a broad basis or only by few, and what can we contribute as advocates of diversity culture and heritage? Do we have a role as cultural brokers? What is the role of cultural management and where do responsibilities lie with respect to cultural literacy and education? Globalisation today is seen to be much more extensive than what was formerly understood under the narrower definition of economic globalisation. It includes diverse economic, political, cultural, and technological aspects which themselves are usually intertwined. Decisions we make as individuals, as enterprises, as institutions or non-governmental organisations (NGOs), as politicians, activists, artists, or as cultural managers are based on incomplete information. This would appear to be one of the most frustrating paradoxes of the globalised internet society: Due to the enormous accumulation of data and knowledge, coupled with the acceleration of change, we see ourselves confronted with an unknown growth of complexity. Decisions increasingly include elements of risk. An obvious example is the difficulties politicians encounter in policy-making: They make a change of policy in one area, thereby causing unforeseeable and unwanted effects in others. This is by no means new, but it is more complex, and also applies to cultural policy, both at local and international levels.

Increase of Dialectic Effects

Globalisation continues, and despite the legitimate and increasingly necessary criticisms of the effects of change, the shifts of power, the critical and long overdue acknowledgement of the oppression, exploitation, and injustices of colonial pasts, many aspects of globalisation can be seen in a positive light: Global standards in such diverse areas as health and hygiene, safety regulation and education, the growing international awareness of the common responsibilities for ecological sustainability, and the potential formation of a global knowledge society, are just some of the major areas of change. We should perhaps also recognise that the vision of future global governance on the basis of universally accepted human rights can only be accomplished with a minimum consensus on central ideas, values, and norms in globalising processes. The enormity of this challenge in present times is obvious.

At the same time, we can observe many negative developments, which range from anxiety about losing our national and regional cultural heritages and our collective and individual identities; losing our jobs due to the enormous pressure of economic and technological globalisation, migration, and shifts in demographic development; rising inequality in many societies; the offshore evasion of national laws and standards; and most of all the rise of cultural intolerance.[6] Paradoxically, fundamentalist terror is one of the phenomena which take advantage of technological developments and modern communication systems. With the term *globalisation* we describe processes which, particularly at the macro-societal level, lead to a complex matrix of interdependencies. States increasingly lose their governance abilities and competences. Clear concepts of accountability also become more difficult: Local knowledge is often lacking, and the necessary international cooperation, which is needed in order to compensate for the negative effects of globalisation, is not always attainable. Here, we can see the increasing shortcomings and dysfunctionalities of international institutions, multilateral treaties, agreements of cooperation, and cultural diplomacy.

---

[6] A detailed examination of the dialectics of globalisation is undertaken in Robertson-von Trotha 2009.

Globalities

One of the most significant differences between the present conditions of internationalisation and globalisation are the changing bases of power and jurisdiction. In international relations, two or more states come to agreement on common issues of interest and implement regulatory power on the basis of cooperative political agreement to achieve commonly identified goals. In democratic states, this necessarily includes parliamentary ratification at the nation-state level. States are – at least theoretically – in the position to modify and update the terms of agreement together with their international partners. This may be on the basis of new information and developments, making the need to adjust goals or means of reaching them necessary, or due to changed interests and political priorities at the national level.

Globalisation, on the other hand, cannot be negotiated, and withdrawal is not an option. The debate on globalisation, however, often fails to distinguish between *globalism*, which some see as an ideology fuelled by neoliberal thought, and *globalities*, which are the result of globalising processes. Globalities describe the inevitable condition and starting point of our actions.[7] These states or conditions of being are themselves elusive: We don't see them evolving, and we don't understand them – or if we do, we don't always know how we can influence them through our actions. We therefore can't simply ignore the increasing existence of globalities, and at the same time we must be aware of falling into the trap of deterministic thinking. Globalities make large-scale international cooperation more necessary than ever.

Monopolised Communication

The dialectic effect of globalised internet communication as an intervening variable has become more obvious.[8] On the one hand, interactive dialogue across cultures, often with common goals, is an observable fact. Open access, sharing, and following are principles of digital culture in democratic countries. Social media research is still a young field, but studies show that the internet has also increased the transportation of closed system dogmas and ideologies (cf. Rieger et al. 2013; 2020). In particular, the dynamics of accelerating, sharing, and mobilising new and old conspiracy myths constitute a new challenge. The incubational and anonymous space which social media offers accommodates freedom of expression, but clearly also gives room for intolerance, polarisation, and radicalisation tendencies. The evolving structures of echo chambers, the unseen influence of algorithms, and the cultures of 'click' and influence act as filters undermining diversity and critical reflection. In the virtual net, we are faced with the competition for followers on the one hand and with what I have described as a new phenomenon of the "intransparency of transparency" (Robertson-von Trotha 2016: 60, own translation) on the other. Institutions and organisations lose track of their digital traces and are thereby facing a new dimension of orientation issues. This means that Niklas Luhmann's thesis of the transparency of intransparency (cf. Luhmann 1987: 23) needs to be supplemented by the observation of the intransparency of transparency.

---

[7] The debate on distinctions between the drivers of processes of globalisation, their effects, and inevitabilities, is ongoing. In earlier works, Ulrich Beck (1983; 1997) and Anthony Giddens (1990; 1995; 1999) contributed significantly to the shift in focus to more interdisciplinary approaches on the one hand, addressing questions of possible means of influence and modification.

[8] The existence of the internet can be regarded as a globality. It also continues to contribute to further globalisation. Digital culture offers exciting potentials and challenges both at the policy level and for cultural management.

Touraine suggests that we are at a threshold leading us beyond the incapacity to act and are entering the first stages of cultural reconstruction:

> "The first actors which appear clearly in the early stage of reconstruction are the most powerful – the communication elites of the mass media who are the producers of language, symbols and images. In the Information Age, those with the means to define society's image of itself have the central power" (Touraine 2014: 46).

In this context we can also analyse the rise of populism, neo-nationalism, and 'othering'. Often leading to extremism, these movements point to a highly disturbing development: the propaganda war of cultures on the internet with the aim of recruiting radical followers – racist, anti-Semitic, and Islamist, to mention only a few. An early example was the recruitment of young men and women for IS and Al-Qaeda, often, as examples from the UK and European countries show, from middle-class families. As Alexandra Borchardt remarked: "The discussion on Islamism and Pegida again clearly shows: The internet allows more freedom than is good for democracy" (Borchardt 2015: n.p., own translation). A recent example is the attack on the US Capitol. In the example of radical Islamists, those charged with the aim of establishing an Islamic State have a construct of belonging formed with religious and cultural borders in mind; in the case of the Capitol attack, we can observe a much more complex combination of motivational factors. Both examples demonstrate that democratic societies require new regulatory borders to safeguard their own freedom. The role of social platforms and the 'tech-giants', and especially their responsibilities with regard to the development of standards in compliance with both the rights of freedom of expression and the adherence to the rule of law, has increasingly come into focus.

'Glocalisation', Cultural Education, and Diversity Management

The most elusive and complex transformation of intentional and unintentional borders can be traced to the ambivalent effects of globalisation. The term *glocalisation* was first used to describe a new phenomenon deriving from the globalisation process: the recognition that the selling of products and commodities is most successful when adapted to local circumstances. And again, as with the term *globalisation*, it was introduced by economists in the 1980s. Roland Robertson was the first sociologist to make use of and adapt the concept in 1992 (cf. Robertson 1992: 173). There is now a large body of literature in academia on the term – and also on its usefulness for cultural policy and advocacy, management, and leadership. The core of Robertson's definition can be given as follows: Glocalisation "means the simultaneity – the co-presence – of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies" (Robertson 1997: n.p.). That is the challenge we see ourselves faced with – as cultural scientists, as cultural educators, and as responsible advocates of cultural diversity. Robertson points out the following:

> "It is essential to note that the themes of glocalization and glocality have brought together ideas from various approaches, including geography, sociology, anthropology, business studies, and comparative literature. At its core, the idea of glocalization involves the contention that all ideas are or can be diffused, but only under certain circumstances" (Robertson 2016: 25).

I could continue demonstrating the preliminary character of definitions, concepts, and the use of language. With regard to the current cancel culture debate and ongoing differences on the balance between political correctness and freedom of speech, again we see ourselves confronted with elusive borders: for example, the sometimes positively and sometimes negatively connotated terms integration, multicultural society, cosmopolitanism, modernity and tradition, and so on – all of which are viewed more critically today, both in science and in popular usage, and according to differing contexts.

From an academic point of view, the following example could be illustrative: Looking back at ten years of the *Global Civil Society Yearbook*, Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius, and Mary Kaldor recalled their original operational definition of global civil society as belonging to "the sphere of ideas, values, institutions, organisations, networks, and individuals located *between* the family, the state, and the market and operating *beyond* the confines of national societies, polities, and economies" (Anheier et al. 2001: 17; 2012: 2, emphasis in original).

They, however, point out that this definition would also theoretically fit the most uncivil act of 2011: the bombing of government buildings and the shooting of 69 persons, many of them teenagers, by Anders Behring Breivik in Norway (cf. Anheier et al. 2012: 14). On the one hand, this highlights the complex relationship between theory and practice; on the other hand, it confirms the importance of and need for an open, (self-)critical academic examination regarding this issue. In that respect, the Anna Lindh Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures, founded in 2005, deserves a special mention. Comprising all EU states, the Middle East, and North Africa – in total 42 countries – the foundation is a network of approximately 4,500 civil society organisations, including a wide range of small but also large civil society organisations from the arts, education, and science. The foundation's programme is dedicated to the promotion of intercultural dialogue in the Mediterranean region. The so-called '4D' strategy of a past phase of action (development, democracy, diversity, and dialogue) remains highly relevant both in the context of globalisation and glocalisation. The strengthening of the '4Ds' is a normative universal project with the aim of supporting global civil society.

Influenced both by Zygmunt Bauman and Roland Robertson, I have suggested the German term *Zwischengesellschaft* – 'in-between society' – to describe the condition societies presently find themselves in. Bauman himself regards 'liquid society' as an interregnum. What will the condition of future societies be? Will it be more global and borderless? Will our student generation contribute to and experience a world society? Can we agree on universally accepted rules, which should not be confused with cultural assimilation? What are the roles and challenges for cultural education and management? What competencies does the cultural activist, educator, policy-maker, or manager require in order to be an effective broker across international borders? And how do we mediate within local spaces of multiculturalism and within cross-cultural environments? In this respect, we can also raise a very central question: Is culture constrained by the role of the ‘soft diplomat’? And what does this imply for intercultural education and communication?

The cultural broker first has to know that there is a tremendous amount of relevant situational and local knowledge which he or she doesn’t know and very often can’t know. I would like to state this as a quasi-law of intercultural relations. Due to globalisation, migration, and the persistent and urgent need to integrate refugees, we see ourselves confronted with very varied and rapidly changing cultural situations and constellations within local space.[9] These can be harmonious and lead to the recognition of cultural diversity as a positive societal asset. In this case, we can postulate the conscious or unconscious recognition and acceptance of the condition of cultural diversity.[10] Or cultural difference can be highly frictional and can be seen as a major threat to local traditions and identities – both of so-called ‘host’ communities and of incoming migrant groups. We therefore require a holistic approach of awareness. How do we recognise the beginnings of radicalisation? These beginnings can end in intolerant fundamentalisms, from political Islamism to Neo-Nazism.

The Dynamic of Cultures

As we can clearly observe: Cultures and their interpretations are dynamic. European history testifies to that fact and also raises questions. In an interview under the title “The ‘End of History’ 20 Years Later”, Francis Fukuyama (2013) addresses one of the major ongoing issues in the world culture debate when he asks: Can questions of democracy, individualism, and human rights be regarded as universal, or, as Samuel Huntington (1996) in his renowned essay on the “Clash of Civilizations” postulated, are they deep reflections of a culture rooted in Western Christendom (cf. Fukuyama 2013: 32)? This is the debate which continues to fuel discussion on universalism and cultural relativism. Over time, how do cultures change, whether as a gradual process or as a bundle of processes, and make cultural and ideological borders less important? Significantly, if we look at a history of ideas and philosophy, in many cases we can identify the loss of knowledge with regard to the origins of ideas – ideas that have had a profound impact on societal change worldwide. As Fukuyama has, for example, importantly argued, values which have their roots in Western Christendom have grown beyond their origins (cf. ibid.: 31). In the practice of everyday life, origins often simply don't matter. However, it is essential to appreciate the following: When they are attributed and associated with cultural, ethnic, and in particular with national identities, they can be mobilised, and are then very effective in drawing and strengthening borders. The clan, the group, the sect, the milieu, the football club, the city-quarter, and of course, as we are presently observing in Europe and in many other parts of the world, the renewed identification with national, regional, and separatist movements are gaining in momentum.

---

[9] For the challenges and chances of diasporic networks, see Robertson-von Trotha 2019.

[10] For an early appreciation of the importance of sharing diversity and comparative research on national approaches to intercultural dialogue, see European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts) 2008.

Partly due to the rightly criticised Eurocentric attitudes, the post-colonial debate in cultural science, and the centralisation of EU legislation with the accompanying loss of national and regional sovereignty, many people are no longer clear about what Europe stands for. Oskar Negt's (2012) plea *Gesellschaftsentwurf Europa. Plädoyer für ein gerechtes Gemeinwesen* reminds us: Europe stands for the social state, for humanisation of the workplace, for the security of pensions – without which our democracies would not be stable (see also Bekemans 2013). Growing inequality, and particularly the high unemployment rates of young people in many European countries, have the potential to upset that balance and can have serious effects on living together in diversity within our cities. In 2015 the demonstrations for freedom of the press after the attack on the satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo in Paris showed in particular – perhaps indeed as never before – that European solidarity across cultures, including migrant populations, is possible. At the same time the images of demonstrations against the freedom of satirical expression remain, reminding us that solidarities, especially cross-cultural solidarities themselves, remain fragile constructs.

If we agree that, despite contrary developments of renationalisation and the simultaneous development of cosmopolitanism and cultural sectarianism, the world is becoming more intertwined and cultures are indeed meeting more often – also in the local arena – then there can be little doubt that intercultural understanding and behaviour have gained in importance. Ulrich Beck once very aptly remarked: "The cosmopolitisation of life situations and lifeworlds does not necessarily lead to a cosmopolitan consciousness and way of thinking" (Beck 2012: 283, own translation[11]). Therefore it is necessary to negotiate on the fine line between appreciation and respect for regional cultures with simultaneous consideration of cultural values of international validity – a task which cannot be undertaken only by individuals but will increasingly become an important mission for international institutions, educational facilities, and, most importantly, for actively engaged civil society organisations with their international networks and local knowledge.

Conclusion

I would like to conclude by returning to the present momentous challenges we are facing due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The fragilities, interconnectivities, and interdependencies of our global society are only beginning to be assessed in this context. It is already obvious that, even while experiencing engagement and action in the spirit of empathy and solidarity, we are also observing serious expressions of othering, of racist blame, and of neo-nationalist-oriented mobilisation in many countries. I am by no means a cultural pessimist. I think I am very much an optimist. As scientists, however, we have a responsibility to distinguish between our roles as scientists and our rights as citizens, who in democratic societies and within the framework of a democratic constitution can of course believe and support whatever they want within the frameworks of democratic order. In this respect, we ourselves as scientist citizens sometimes cross elusive borders: We may be tempted to interpret situations in the way that we would like them to be, rather than how they actually are; we may not sufficiently confront our own selective perceptions and choice of evidence. Pointing to contradictions and ugly realities, is not always our forte, although it is our responsibility. With my hypotheses at the beginning, I articulated my thoughts about the characteristics of borders and the necessity to overcome these borders. Certainly, borders remain; they are elusive and they are complex; and in developing as-yet unknown states of the global, we may see ourselves confronted with the necessity to create new borders and demarcation lines: red lines, for example, against the manipulation of research data with the aim of mobilising conspiracy myths and stories.

---

[11] In the German original, the two keywords used are *Lebenslagen* and *Lebenswelten*.

Due to globalisation, the questions of participation and worldwide exchange highlight the need for consensus on the basis of human values and behaviour. Minimum standards on the basis of human rights are of paramount importance and have gained in urgency. Today's cultural educators, policy-makers, and diversity managers require an ongoing glocalised sensitivity to negotiate the balance between the sympathy for and promotion of colourful communities living together in diversity – and the limits of such communities, as set by cultural universals which importantly include freedom of expression. We ourselves have to become more active – as scientists, as cultural brokers, as responsible citizens, and as policy-makers. Even if the realisation presently appears utopic, the need for networked cultural organisations, educators, and NGOs to work together towards the further development of post-nation-state foreign cultural policies and their implementation has increased in urgency.

References

Anheier, Helmut/Glasius, Marlies/Kaldor, Mary (2001): Introducing Global Civil Society. In: ibid. (eds.): Global Civil Society 2001. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–22.

Anheier, Helmut/Kaldor, Mary/Glasius, Marlies (2012): The Global Civil Society Yearbook: Lessons and Insights 2001–2011. In: Kaldor, Mary/Moore, Henrietta L./Selchow, Sabine (eds.): Global Civil Society 2012. Ten Years of Critical Reflection. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 2–26.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2000): Liquid Modernity. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2007): Liquid Times. Living in an Age of Uncertainty. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2016): Liquid Modernity Revisited. In: Robertson-von Trotha, Caroline Y. (ed.): Die Zwischengesellschaft. Aufbrüche zwischen Tradition und Moderne? (Kulturwissenschaft interdisziplinär 10). Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 11–22.

Beck, Ulrich (1983): Jenseits von Klasse und Stand? Soziale Ungleichheit, gesellschaftliche Individualisierungsprozesse und die Entstehung neuer sozialer Formationen und Identitäten. In: Kreckel, Reinhard (ed.): Soziale Ungleichheiten (Soziale Welt, Sonderband 2). Göttingen: Schwartz, pp. 35–74.

Beck, Ulrich (1997): Was ist Globalisierung? Irrtümer des Globalismus – Antworten auf Globalisierung, 3rd ed. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Beck, Ulrich (2012): Globale Ungleichheit und Menschenrechte: Eine kosmopolitische Perspektive. In: Beck, Gerald/Kropp, Cordula (eds.): Gesellschaft innovativ. Wer sind die Akteure? Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, pp. 273–295.

Bekemans, Léonce (2013): Globalisation vs Europeanisation. A Human-Centric Interaction. Brussels: Peter Lang.

Borchardt, Alexandra (2015): Zehn Thesen für ein demokratisches Internet. Weniger Freiheit, mehr Geheimnis. In: Süddeutsche Zeitung, 15.01.2015; https://www.sueddeutsche.de/digital/zehn-thesen-fuer-ein-demokratisches-internet-weniger-freiheit-mehr-geheimnis-1.2303638 [01.02.2021].

Cooper, Anthony/Tinning, Søren (eds.) (2020): Debating and Defining Borders: Philosophical and Theoretical Perspectives. London/New York: Routledge.

De Beukelaer, Christiaan/Pyykkönen, Miikka/Singh, J. P. (eds.) (2015): Globalization, Culture, and Development. The UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts) (2008): Sharing Diversity. National Approaches to Intercultural Dialogue in Europe. Executive Summary of a Study Prepared for the European Commission by the European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts); https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/d2ac59ce-55cf-43be-9468-8946a826e457 [01.02.2021].

Ferguson, Yale H./Mansbach, Richard W. (2012): Globalization: The Return of Borders to a Borderless World? Abingdon: Routledge.

Fukuyama, Francis (2013): The “End of History” 20 Years Later. Interview. In: New Perspectives Quarterly (NPQ). Vol. 30, No. 4, pp. 31–39.

Giddens, Anthony (1990): The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Giddens, Anthony (1995): Politics, Sociology and Social Theory: Encounters with Classical and Contemporary Social Thought. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Giddens, Anthony (1999): Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping our Lives. London: Profile Books.

Huntington, Samuel (1996): The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Kolossov, Vladimir/Scott, James (2013): Selected Conceptual Issues in Border Studies. Questions conceptuelles dans les recherches sur les frontières. In: Belgeo. Revue Belge de Géographie. Vol. 1, pp. 1–17; http://journals.openedition.org/belgeo/10532 [01.02.2021].

Levitt, Theodore (1983): The Globalization of Markets. In: Harvard Business Review. Vol. 61, No. 3, pp. 92–102.

Luhmann, Niklas (1987): Soziologische Aufklärung 4. Beiträge zur funktionalen Differenzierung der Gesellschaft. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Negt, Oskar (2012): Gesellschaftsentwurf Europa. Plädoyer für ein gerechtes Gemeinwesen. Göttingen: Steidl.

Rieger, Diana/Frischlich, Lena/Bente, Gary (2013): Propaganda 2.0. Psychological Effects of Right-Wing and Islamic Extremist Internet Videos (Polizei + Forschung 44). Cologne: Luchterhand.

Rieger, Diana/Frischlich, Lena/Rack, Stefanie/Bente, Gary (2020): Digitaler Wandel, Radikalisierungsprozesse und Extremismusprävention im Internet. In: Ben Slama, Brahim/Kemmesies, Uwe (eds.): Handbuch Extremismusprävention. Gesamtgesellschaftlich. Phänomenübergreifend (Polizei + Forschung 54). Wiesbaden: Bundeskriminalamt, pp. 351–388.

Robertson, Roland (1992): Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. London: SAGE.

Robertson, Roland (1997): Comments on the "Global Triad" and "Glocalization". In: Inoue, Nobutaka (ed.): Globalization and Indigenous Culture. Tokyo: Institute for Japanese Culture and Classics; http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/ijcc/wp/global/15robertson.html [01.02.2021].

Robertson, Roland (2016): Glocality: Transcending the Modernity-Tradition Binary. In: Robertson-von Trotha, Caroline Y. (ed.): Die Zwischengesellschaft. Aufbrüche zwischen Tradition und Moderne? (Kulturwissenschaft interdisziplinär 10). Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 23–30.

Robertson-von Trotha, Caroline Y. (2009): Dialektik der Globalisierung. Kulturelle Nivellierung bei gleichzeitiger Verstärkung kultureller Differenz. Karlsruhe: Universitätsverlag.

Robertson-von Trotha, Caroline Y. (2016): Die Zwischengesellschaft. Ein Orientierungsentwurf. In: ibid. (ed.): Die Zwischengesellschaft. Aufbrüche zwischen Tradition und Moderne? (Kulturwissenschaft interdisziplinär 10). Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 53–68.

Robertson-von Trotha, Caroline Y. (ed.) (2019): Diaspora – Netzwerke globaler Gemeinschaften (WIKA-Report 3). Karlsruhe: KIT Scientific Publishing; https://doi.org/10.5445/KSP/1000084128 [01.02.2021].

Robertson-Wensauer, Caroline Y. (1991): Ethnische Identität und politische Mobilisation. Das Beispiel Schottland. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Touraine, Alain (2014): Neo-Modern Ecology. In: New Perspectives Quarterly (NPQ). Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 43–47.

Trobbiani, Riccardo/Pavón-Guinea, Andrea (2019): Culture in EU External Relations. Strategic Reflections and Future Scenarios. EL-CSID Policy Brief 2019/16; https://cris.unu.edu/culture-eu-external-relations-strategic-reflections-and-future-scenarios [01.02.2021].

Weber, Barbara/Herb, Karlfriedrich/Marsal, Eva/Dobashi, Takara/Schweitzer, Petra (eds.) (2011): Cultural Politics and Identity. The Public Space of Recognition (Political Philosophy and Anthropological Studies 2). Vienna/Münster: LIT.

About the Author

Prof. Dr. Caroline Y. Robertson-von Trotha is Founding Director of ZAK | Centre for Cultural and General Studies at the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (KIT) in Germany and Professor of Sociology and Cultural Studies. Her research interests include cultural change and globalisation, internationalisation and integration, foreign cultural and educational policy, and the theory and practice of public science. She is coordinator of the German network of the Anna Lindh Foundation (ALF), chairwoman of the Academic Council on Culture and Foreign Policy (WIKA) at ifa (Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen), and member of its advisory board. She is also a member of the advisory council of the Institute for Cultural Policy of the Association of Cultural Policy (Bonn) and spokeswoman of the scientific committee (Kleiner Konvent) of the Schader Foundation (Darmstadt). From 2009 until 2020, she was member of the Culture Committee of the German UNESCO Commission, thereof vice-chair from 2009 until 2011. Caroline Y. Robertson-von Trotha is the editor of numerous academic books and publication series. She is initiator and scientific convenor of a large variety of innovative teaching formats and public science events.
Contact: caroline.robertson[at]kit.edu