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Summary

Cultural Interaction is a complex process, involving different human beings within different formations. It is an interactive process between two or more partners. This chapter is intended to describe how this process works – as a process of knowledge with its possibilities, contradictions and boundaries. The forms of knowledge are described, the forms of interaction or cultural exchange and the distribution of cultural products, the frames and the perspectives of cultural interaction in a world being transformed by new technologies and possibilities. This chapter shows that cultural interaction provides the basis for a rich future. Its opposite is social conflict, in which culture as a construct is used as an excuse for violence and war and as an instrument for creating enemies. It will also be shown here that these oppositions are not the reality of cultural processes. The reality is the so-called “silk road,” the mixed languages and the richness of cultures brought about by the process of cultural exchange.

Introduction

In order to describe cultural interaction, it is first necessary to know what can be described. In this context Gabriel García Márquez begins his “Memoirs” with the remark: “Life is not what we have lived but what we recall and the manner in which we recall it in order to relate it.” This is not only true for a great writer like Márquez as an individual, but also for narrating the history of humankind.

The field of description in cultural processes (and that is the field of life, in which human beings acted or act) is a question of societal memory - horizons and impressions. We cannot recall today the way human beings lived for millions of years on this earth. We can only recall what we believe monuments, images, scripts and other “documents,” artifacts or changes in nature are telling us and whatever part of it all we find worthy of retelling. These decisions concerning what should be retold often differ widely.

Concerning the horizons of human beings in this world, the Austrian writer Theodor Kramer, a refugee after the occupation of Austria by Nazi Germany, wrote in 1949 while still in exile in England:
The border of the world is here at any time, it is far beyond Africa, it is farther than the stars are glowing, but also there, where the mallows bloom, there is the edge of the world.

Even if today we can see the impressiveness of the earth from the air, as Arthus-Bertrand Yann does, it is not so easy to see and read its history, as we learned in 6.23 and in different contributions to this theme in earlier and later chapters. The
contributions in this chapter will deal with theories, colonialism and science (Peter Horn), with the formation of societies (Kathleen Thorpe), with processes of the arts (Ernest W.B. Hess-Lüttich and Dieter Genske), with the influence of new (information and communication) technologies on world processes and with the contradictions inherent in globalization (Maria Wuketits). These contributions analyze the phenomena of the processes and illustrate different aspects of the variety of the world. This chapter will begin with reflections on the knowledge of these processes, the forms they take, what we can see, hear and read about them, about their construction and their distribution. It will also deal with the main frames of these cultural exchanges in a world of chaos, in which men and women try to establish an order that permits knowledge and justice – a culture of peace, but one that was and is always a fragile world with borders. Finally it will be emphasized that the basis of the world’s richness is cultural interaction or interchange.

In this sense knowledge is culture. Without knowledge human beings cannot identify the processes in nature nor a monument, a word, a tone, an image, narrations or frames. They just do not exist for them. These things remain alien objects to people just like the unknown sea or the unclimbed mountain. This circumstance puts these individuals in a difficult situation, as they exist in a reality, in which life threatens them with cold, darkness, thirst, hunger and disease. In any case other human beings are using knowledge, and in this and other ways such people also influence the lives of those human beings, who have no or only limited access to virtuality. This fact demonstrates that knowledge is essential to survival – not only in nature, but also in society. For that reason, the first topic of this chapter will be knowledge, because cultural exchange is an exchange of knowledge in different forms, and cultural interaction is based on that fact.

This does not include the idea that many human beings are not always conscious of the knowledge of humankind – not even those, who deal with knowledge in their profession. We do not understand all the tones, images and scripts of this world – only a small number of them. Only a free and open public and networking make it possible to expand our knowledge, so we can utilize more of it. Thus cooperation is very important in cultural processes and also a basic aspect of human survival. This means that the term or concept culture must include cooperation and cultural interaction. Without cultural interaction even the richest culture is more or less useless. For that reason societies have for thousands of years been not only developing instruments of cooperation, but also instruments to exclude social classes from access to knowledge.

1. Knowledge

As we have seen in theme Culture, Civilization, and Human Society, human beings have existed on this earth for millions of years. Yet the written form of knowledge is very young – only a few thousand years old. Consequently, it is only possible to reconstruct the knowledge of human beings for a very short time, even though the time of myth is very important, as the modern anthropologists Dieter and Ruth Groh discovered. Even today with all the available means of documentation, it is still only possible to know a small part of what is important. The reason for this is the sheer quantity of knowledge, which ranges from things smaller than an atom to things, which are farther away than we can see – not only with our eyes, but also with all of the technical equipment
available. The most complicated processes still remain those between human beings. These processes also include the field of cultural exchange. This is a very unclear field, because – as in many cases – the constructions of cultural processes are not the same as the cultural processes themselves. Beyond myth, problems with the empirical categories (see: Umberto Eco, Kant und das Schnabeltier) and the “orders,” we also have the interchange of reproduction and innovation, the context of this interchange in the frames of formations (regional, national, transnational), the change of conditions (technologies, mobility, communication) and in this context the increasing importance of virtuality (second or imagined nature) – and the consequences of violence and wars on the development of human beings, on humankind in general. Thus it is important to learn how the constitution of knowledge occurs, before we analyze the interaction of human beings with their surroundings (monuments), their interchanges and the frames of the interchanges.

1.1 Reproduction

Culture is the result of a change from the world as it is to a world of human beings (this excludes all forms of destruction, as we will see – not only of culture, but also of nature). So cultural exchange is not a trade with natural goods, but it begins with every exchange of things that are created or reproduced by human beings.

In the history of humankind the most important precondition and element of this change from a world as it is to a world of human beings is reproduction. Without (narrative) reproduction or reproduction on the basis of monuments, scripts, images and tones, development is not possible, because development is based on knowing how things were used in the past and seeing possibilities for their use in the future. Most important in these processes are, on the one hand, archives, libraries and museums as places of preservation, and, on the other hand, such institutions of reproduction as schools and universities as well as museums as places of meeting and education, handicrafts, theater, industries, films, TV, Internet and the possibility of research aimed at finding in a sea of knowledge the elements needed to produce new knowledge. In this case research is not only innovation, but also the utilization of old knowledge (sometimes in a new form or often as a basis for new forms). In other words, culture is a form of (societal) remembering, which allows us to use the knowledge of other people. In this sense a central element of culture is the cultural interaction of human beings in the past with human beings in the present or between human beings in the present as well as the transmission of culture to the future.

1.2 Innovation

The reproduction of knowledge is far from ideal, because naturally the knowledge of humankind cannot be preserved in its totality and passed on completely to the present or to the future. What and how much of the accumulated world knowledge could and can be transmitted depends on the conditions within the societies (see also Local Cultures and Global Dynamics and 1.6. in this contribution) and on the institutions and means of preservation (see also Diversity and Unity in the Cultural Heritage of Peoples, States and Humanity and Traditions, Innovations and Discontinuations in the Development of Culture by Annette Horn). Normally institutions of preservation (archives, schools,
universities, museums, etc.) exclude knowledge and form their own canons (well-known examples are the trials of Galileo Galilei, the struggle of the Impressionist painters against the entrenched Academy or the restrictions imposed on industrialism). These canons are not only used for the education of individuals, but also of societies, and they reflect the powers within a society (see also Imperialism, Resistance, and Culture).

In any case reproduction of past achievements is involved in an interchange with innovation in various ways. On the one hand, reproduction is necessary for development, on the other hand, the structure of reproduction does not always allow innovation. In many cases traditional thinking refuses to accept new knowledge. Especially in these cases the past - as Wole Soyinka shows - is preserved with its ghosts. The past, the tradition, threatens humankind (for example, in Shakespeare’s Hamlet, Ibsen’s Ghosts or in African plays) and thus is not culture as an aid to the present and future, but a past which exists outside the cultural processes, which wants its rights and cannot be put aside.

New knowledge and innovation have always developed out of new experiences. New knowledge was not simply a new construction based on the thinking of the past. All of the long discussions of the Middle Ages failed to result in much new information. The modern age brought new experiences in seeing and traveling, but in addition it also provided the technology to preserve this new knowledge, enabling not only small groups but all people to gain access to this knowledge.

This is also true for the new knowledge about human beings. As travel with new ships made the world smaller and powerful telescopes brought the stars closer, newly created scientific fields (psyche, cells, gender, social structures, etc.) discovered new knowledge about human beings and pioneered the way to an understanding of human beings and of human society in its complexity.

Innovation in this sense is not the gift of a lone genius, but the result of cooperative research between the new fields of “big science.” Even in the case of “big science” the laws of the past ages are still important, and new ghosts came up. To combat these new ghosts, cultural interaction was very important. At the end of the 20th century the specialists were no longer of central importance in the scientific community. Their place had been taken over by open networks with their publics. The better the network and the cultural interactions, the better were the results of research.

1.3 Formations

We know about traditional regional formations and smaller and bigger empires. However, since the 18th and 19th centuries nations as transregional constructs have become most important (for the importance of “formations” for cultural exchange see also point 6. in this chapter). In the second half of the 20th century transnational organizations gained more influence, but they did not and have not ever yet developed formations, unless one is willing to call India, South Africa and the USA “transnational” formations (see also point 4 in this chapter). It is worth thinking about these states as transnational formations, because they are all “nations” with many different cultures and
a great deal of cultural interaction. The question, however, is: are they transnational
“nations”? At the same time one must keep in mind that there is no such thing as a
“pure” culture. For example, the Afro-Asiatic roots of Greek culture (see Martin
Bernal), the French and Hindi words in the English language or the Latin, Greek and
Arabic words in French or the Polish and French words in German or the German words
in Russian.

It is very clear, that “pure” (national) cultures do not exist, as nationalists and fascists
continue to propagate. We have to ask what the reasons are for these attempts to create
“pure” cultures and what influence do they have on cultural exchange?

When we look back in the past, we see that “culture” as “culture” played only a small
role in the conflicts at the time of mass armies. “Culture” became an instrument of
politics in the sense of serving social interests and the interests of those wielding the
power. To the extent that culture served as an ideology of social interests, it had a place
in the conflicts, struggles and wars.

There is, however, also another aspect: constructed cultures, which are given their
identity by enemies for different reasons such as religion, power conflicts and insanity.
The “Image de l’Autre” (Katérina Stenou) is what should make such a “culture”
“strong.” But, as UNESCO has been demonstrating throughout its existence, this is not
a law of nature, but something existing in the brains of human beings. The question is,
how do these formations understand culture. If one understands it as a process of the
change from the real world as it is to a world for human beings, then it can be seen to
have unifying aspects. In this case cultural exchange is a very important factor for the
richness of a society, as, for example, Eric Hobsbawm discovered. If you want to use
culture for power conflicts (gender, social interests for influence and for making money,
for religious or other groups), then cultural interaction is not allowed, because that
would make clear the unifying aspects of cultures.

The reasons for constructing transregional and then transnational societies were to avoid
such conflicts. This is, for example, a central part of the philosophy of the
Enlightenment but subsequently also of transnational organizations like the European
Union and the United Nations. At all times they have developed open structures,
because they understand that the public is the basis for the change to richness as well as
for cultural interaction. The public of different nations can be organized in very
different ways, but they all share in common the crossing of national borders.

The European Parliament claims that nationalism was a main reason for the world wars
in the 20th century. So the European Union as a peace project has developed
transnational processes. Those who are interested in preserving their old power oppose
these new developments, in which the role of culture is still very unclear. For that
reason there are only a few approaches to mobility and frames for cultural interaction
even in the European Union. Many groups still do not see the global possibilities and
feel strong only within their own borders. It is clear, however, that the way to change
the world can only be one of openness.

Thus we can see that it is not only important to preserve knowledge, in order to provide
the possibility of access and innovation, but it is also very important to use knowledge and innovation in ways that are beneficial for human beings. Since the end of the 20th century there have been some approaches that might prove useful for the future of humankind.

1.4 Change of Conditions

The most important factors of cultural exchange within a regional formation or within nations or transnational processes were developed along with the new technologies of transportation (Marshall McLuhan: horses, but even more important: boats and ships, railroads, cars, airplanes), of production and of communication.

Now the possibilities of reproduction have advanced to the point, where in a productive society more and more people have free time for innovation and leisure. (In non-productive societies it is still necessary to work longer. The slogans about working longer during one’s lifetime or within a year are clear signs of problems with innovative structures.)

This change transpired within recent decades and did not take place in all countries in the same way. Many countries still have a great deal of reproduction in their agriculture. Sometimes and under some conditions this is necessary and also a sign of good quality. In any case agriculture is not the kind of enterprise that requires new inventions daily, even if innovations are also good and necessary in this field and over time have brought great changes within the life of societies.

There are also many countries, where industrial production is very important. Nevertheless, industrial production not only created the basis for a new society and major changes for the emancipation of social groups, including women, but it also caused problems in culture. The principles of industrial production, for example, are bad when employed in universities, because, while they are good for reproduction, they stifle innovation.

Today many (political) problems have arisen out of the working forms and exchanges of a virtual society. Social interests and standards are changing. The necessity of working out the aims of activity by oneself is for many people not only a desirable – on the contrary, for them it means the destruction of the social basis.

Such processes are not new. This situation is analogous to the change from agricultural to industrial production. The wealth of Western societies makes the transition easier for them. Such a big change is much harder for poor societies, because the development of industrial production requires a great deal of money. The situation is different in the case of virtual productions. For that reason countries like India are leading producers of software for computers and also of films.

The possibilities within these processes are enormous. The key to success is cultural interaction. Non-hierarchical teamwork and networking are the most important keywords for these processes.
1.5 Importance of Virtuality

For a long time in the history of humankind the most important concern was to create surroundings that made it possible to eat, drink, stay warm and provide help in cases of disease. The world still knows disease and poverty, and at times they are even increasing. In these cases the priority is still to obtain the basics of everyday life. And some basics, like good water, will perhaps become a major problem in the future.

Even in this case there are common perspectives (see 1.4.) of sustainable development. In these new processes (see also Global Information Fluxes and National Cultural Values and Cultural Integration and National Originality of Cultures) the importance of virtuality is growing. More and more it appears that agricultural and industrial reproduction will no longer stand at the forefront. While this process of change is occurring, it is no longer of the highest importance to increase the quantity of reproduction, to follow the old direction of important technological inventions.

Now “new” inventions seem to be appearing. But these “virtual” inventions are also old inventions. For example, the Romans invented the baths. It was cold outside, and their invention made it possible to bathe also in the winter. In this sense houses, too, can be seen as realizations of virtuality. Within this virtuality a new continent is arising – the World Wide Web (WWW), as Hengstschläger/Wiener demonstrate.

The development of this new continent is full of contradictions, as events of recent years have shown. First it was big money, then there were big losses. In any case this continent grew and grew in real importance and not only in the sense of big enterprises. However, the background for this progress was also that the entrepreneurs did not understand the cultural processes and wanted to create “pure” technology, not recognizing that technology is only worthwhile when it provides clear benefits for human beings. Much hardware and software production went the way of very fast replacement, but not in forms that made life easier. Increasingly problems developed with this system of fast replacements, because memory was lost and only the pure technology was left. This situation became very evident at the millennium, when everyone could see that production was being carried on outside societal life: a technical problem led to a technical solution outside the real cultural processes.

These and other concerns are still no arguments against the new technologies, for techno-imaginations are always on the path of change. They have other names, but they remain important for the cultural processes and cultural interactions which represent the new dimensions or potentialities for innovations and leisure time.
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