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Preface

This volume is the result of our global “Transcultural Caravan” essay competition that took place in autumn 2015. The Transcultural Caravan is a project initiated and operated by the Leadership Excellence Institute Zeppelin | LEIZ, encouraging research, a worldwide dialogue and the spread of sustainable ideas which support the development of globally accepted norms of socially responsible behavior. The role of leadership in this process is crucial. We, therefore, asked young researchers and students from all over the world to reflect on values and capabilities which would allow leaders to contribute to the creation of transcultural values.

We received a huge number of essays many of which focus upon current issues. Consequently, the debate about the ongoing refugee crisis which may be regarded as a new type of mass migration industrial nations are not capable to deal with, takes a prominent place. Further key topics are political disputes and economic challenges arising from failed collaboration between nation states, and their transcultural solutions. The third focus is on challenges resulting from the global operations of organizations.

Past leadership approaches have particularly dealt with mono-cultural intra-organizational issues. The age of industrialization was the context within which these approaches arose and within which they have been applicable. Today organizations face multi-cultural settings not only determined by these organizations’ cultures but also by various national cultures. Traditional leadership profiles must be amended to include cultural sensitivity, productive communication and cooperation competence as well as the ability to “feel the societal pulse” – and react to a set of different expectations in a way that respects local cultural norms while still complying with international normative imperatives. Being perceived as a responsible actor that complies not only with national law and regulation but works legitimately in different cultural and socio-economic settings is the new leadership challenge. To avoid moral heroism, a basic set of globally accepted ethical and legal rules for economic activity is needed. The development of global institutions covering this need is still
in its infancy and demands for a global and universal commitment by business, politics, and society worldwide. Global projects facing political, social or economic stress require cooperation between institutions, aiming at the development and formation of shared values and a shared notion of the “right thing to do” in the social, economic and political spheres. A socio-cultural learning process covering these points will further support the formation of a generally applicable standard. Transcultural ideals, as well as the idea of a World Ethos, serve as a common bond in decision-making processes on such crucial issues.

There is a gap in Leadership Theory regarding the transcultural perspective, especially in light of varying perceptions and understandings of leadership styles and concepts when placed in the contexts of different cultures. The questions arising therefrom concern, inter alia, the moral traits, values, and forms of behavior required of transcultural leaders. Other important topics are the differences and commonalities between economic, political and civil-society organizations. Transculturalism represents the idea that there are traits common to all human societies such as empathy and inclusive rationality which are the prerequisites of a learning process facilitating cooperation.

We highly appreciate the various submissions from all over the world dealing with these topics and want to thank all authors for their outstanding contributions. All submissions underwent a rigorous selection process. Additionally, we want to thank all reviewers for their efforts during the selection processes as well as the valuable feedback they provided.

The book is introduced by a conceptual discussion of the relevance of transculturality for organizational management. After this introduction, the essays will provide insights into current transcultural issues in politics, economics and civil society.

We hope that through our project we stimulate the debate about the need for a new type of leadership based on a transcultural approach. This will contribute to face the challenges of our current century and find solutions to them. The debate is in its infancy and so we are looking at a growing field of research with excellent future perspectives.

Josef Wieland
Klaus M. Leisinger
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Part I

Conceptual Introduction
Transculturality and Economic Governance

Josef Wieland

1. Transculturality and economic theory

Transculturality has been an important topic in philosophy, the humanities and social science for quite some time. Driving this phenomenon from the start has been the globalization of economic cooperation, the production of goods and services and their exchange around the globe by people that were socialized in differing societies and cultures. As early as the 1930s, the American sociologist Robert E. Park noted that “In the long run, however, peoples and races who live together, sharing in the same economy, inevitably interbreed, and in this way if in no other, the relations which were merely co-operative and economic become social and cultural” (Park, 1950, p. 354). Park views the related migration “abstractly as a type of collective action” (ibid., p. 350), that gives rise culturally to “the marginal man” who straddles the border, simultaneously living in different, occasionally even strictly opposed, cultures. The man on the border learns how to handle cultural difference, and this process of acculturation begins on the border between two different cultures: where he is “never quite willing to break” with his old culture but “not quite accepted” in his new one (ibid., p. 354). In this being situated “in between”, engaged in the continual attempt to fuse cultural difference, arises transcultural competence that leads to a new, dynamic equilibrium and a refined skill at living a civilizing life.1 “The Marginal Man is concerned finally and fundamentally less (...) with a personality type, than with a social process, the process of acculturation.” (ibid., p. 376) This process

---

1 See Park, 1950, p. 345ff.
of acquiring a culture, if successful, leads to a consensus on the character of societal transactions.

“There can be no culture except where there is some consensus. Consensus is a matter of understanding. It is transmitted through communication, through example and through participation in a common life. It is not merely habit. The term consensus, for the time being, had best remain loosely and tentatively defined” (ibid., p. 17).

In contrast to Park’s “Marginal Man” as a dynamic social process of collective action – whom I quote from extensively here because he will account for a substantial part of this article’s theoretical perspective – philosophical and cultural studies to date have been interested in transculturality more from a perspective of individual or collective identity building. Together with Dominik Fischer (2016, in this volume), I have occupied myself with some aspects of this discussion, especially that of its compatibility with theory building in organizational economics. The deliberations to the following thoughts, however, will only seldom refer explicitly to these studies and also abstain from dealing with the identity building perspective.

Building on Park’s reflections and looking at transculturality through the economist’s lens, I will develop it as a productive resource and an informal institution for cooperative economic value creation. It is my view that, to date, economists have not occupied themselves with the transculturality phenomenon, even though, as indicated, it already plays an important role in global value chains. The ongoing discussion about the influence of culture on the performance of economies and their organizations has treated values, norms, traditions and so forth as informal institutional conditions for action\(^2\) that can have a bearing on how uncertainty is dealt with or the repute in which an organization is held. From an organizational economics standpoint, Benjamin E. Hermalin (2013, p. 433f., p. 458) models culture as a business asset that affects a firm’s operations. From the perspective of a theory of the governance of economic transactions, which, indeed, underlies and informs the argument presented here, transculturality is an individual or collective resource that, as an element and an institutional condition of local and global cooperation, allows the productive handling of cultural diversity and the

curbing of its potential destructiveness. In the era of globalization, I view this as a non-trivial aspect that may also be of interest for philosophical consideration and for the Cultural Studies.

II. Prosocial behavior and moral evolution

The 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and associated 169 “targets” of the United Nations Agenda 2030 can be distilled to a simple overall goal: “Transforming our World.” They are seen as “a Universal Call to Action to Transform our World beyond 2015” (United Nations, 2014, p. 3) addressed to all actors of the national and international societies. According to the UN, achieving the economic, political, and ecological targets and sub-targets depends in the final analysis on the world’s populations, relying on “empathy and enlightened self-interest,” (ibid., p. 5), to be prepared “to fulfil their political and moral responsibilities” (ibid., p. 7). The corresponding moral responsibilities are concentrated in values such as human rights, dignity, equality, justice, and sustainability. It is a challenge issued not least to economic actors, especially corporations, to mobilize their resources, innovative capability, and entrepreneurship in cooperation with politics and civil society.

This article is not about the 17 targets and 169 sub-targets, but instead discusses the underlying assumption that there is in fact a global, universal consciousness of the existence of, and membership in, a collectively shared world (“our world”) whose moral values are similarly accepted as a transcultural cosmopolitan moral culture. But there can be no doubt that this notion, even if desirable and realistic, would be the future result of a process spanning several epochs, not an already existing precondition for this process. Veteran practitioners in the field of intercultural management are even more skeptical: “It is our belief that you never understand other cultures” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012, p. 1). Leaving that aside, we can assert that at present, the starting points for discussion and practical action are, for one thing, people’s belonging to nations and, for another thing, cultural diversity in the conceptualization and signification of values. But the notion of a collective world does not necessarily have to manifest itself in shared moral values: empathy and actors’ enlightened self-interest – which the Agenda 2030 authors presumably regard as anthropological constants ready to be invoked – may also explain
it. It happens that in recent years the discussion about an anthropologically enlightened universality of moral behavior showed that, if an undue anthropomorphism is to be avoided, a conceptual differentiation is called for at the point where the “moral behavior” of animals— for instance, when it comes to the organization and division of food and the care of orphans (calculated reciprocity, cooperative ways of conflict resolution, and communal behavior)—crosses over into that of human beings. Then it becomes a matter of animal/human differences like “moral behavior / moral action,” “prosocial behavior / morality,” “instrumental learning / reasoning ability” or “conditioned benefit calculus / sense of guilt” and this is a discussion that appears far from being concluded. But the idea of an evolutionary development of moral capacity and human morality still allows for the hypothesis that the capacity for empathy and of calculation of self-interest, that includes the interests of others has proven itself evolutionarily in diverse human cultures, since without the formation of this capacity a sustained cooperation between people even in the smallest groups (family, clan, tribe, etc.) would hardly be conceivable. Accordingly, morality and its ethical foundation would constitute a civilizational learning process that has always accompanied humanity’s development and is driven and made possible by the actualized human potential for empathy and inclusive rationality. This, in any event, will form the starting point of the following reflections which link to the Agenda 2030.

Thus it is not globally shared values, but the potential prosocial capacities for empathy and inclusive rationality that in the first instance provide mankind with a common civilizational bond. Global cooperative projects like the SDGs but also cooperation between enterprises lend the actualization of this possibility a target, namely the development of a shared notion of the political, economic, and moral ordering of the world as learning processes. This evolutionary process also encompasses, albeit always in a fragile manner, the development of a repertoire of common

3 See, for example, Frans de Waal 2014: ‘The bonobo and the atheist’ and Jessica Flack & de Waal 2000: ‘Any animal whatever’ and the controversy surrounding this essay.


5 Not necessarily by genetically endowed disposition: This is Paul J. Zak’s argument, 2008, p. 276.
understandings of the situational significance of values – a way of behaving and acting that rests on a specific ethos – which, in other words, cannot always be assumed as given and as stable, but instead have to be continually brought to bear and to be learned with regard to practical transactions. Humanity’s shared moral bond consists of universal capabilities and successful local consensus. It is not a metaphysical universal, but a discursive process of practical learning. Thus comes into being the concept of an instrumental-rational economy and the latter’s metaphysical, political, and ethical embeddedness in Greek thought in what is a discourse spanning centuries which, from the Homeric ethos to the Sophistic techne and Platonic form of knowledge, gave rise to and discarded the various ways of thinking about economic activity and its moral dimension.6

Armed with these two assumptions about the universality of prosocial capabilities (empathy, inclusive rationality) and the evolutionary generation and temporal effectiveness of moral values in specific, local, practical situations, I now turn to the topic of cultural diversity of global action.

III. Cultural difference and transculturality

Learning processes are themselves expressions and implementations of a culture that knows how to handle, either by adaptation or innovation, the diversity of information and communication in the environment of human action and behavior. Below I will not parse cultural diversity as a demarcation of spaces (defined as nations, organizations, etc.) or identities (defined as traditions, ways of life, etc.) or as practices or norms (defined as law, morality, etc.), because doing so would neglect the opposite of each difference. Anyone who talks of national culture ignores subnational variety; whoever deals with intercultural difference obscures commonalities; whoever brings into focus value differences neglects shared performance, cooperation, and communication values.7 Beyond that, it is important to remember that reciprocal exchange, notions of utility, rules of sociability, common courtesy, cultural practices such as music and dance and so

---

6 On this topic of the emergence of the economy as a separate sphere of economic activity from Greek antiquity’s philosophical discourse see: Wieland, 2012, also Wieland, 2010 the literature cited there.

7 For this perspective, see Antweiler, 2011, p. 46ff.; Appiah, 2005, p. 125.
forth are “pancultural universals” (Antweiler, 2011, p. 99) of social learning processes. They are universal not with regard to their local diversity but with regard to their function as structures governing human interactions that permit humans to enter into a learning process in the first place. Kwame A. Appiah (2007, p. 82) termed it the diversity of “deeply ingrained” practices and customs and concluded from this “that in the vocabulary of evaluative languages of all cultures there is sufficient overlap to make starting a conversation possible”. In this situation of a beginning, so Appiah, the aim is not arriving at a consensus but “getting used to each other” (ibid., p. 105) and, in so doing, also to an ineluctable reality and, further, to the possible productivity of cultural difference.

It should already be clear at this point in the argument that the understanding of transculturality presented here ought not be equated with either a radical cosmopolitanism\(^8\) or with an individualistic-instrumental version of intercultural management.\(^9\)

Cosmopolitanism can be construed as a personal ethos, as the basis for a political world order, or as methodological paradigm of transnational research,\(^10\) but in contemporary debate it figures “not as a normative category or concrete achievement but as a state rooted in experience, open-ended, and always precariously subject to reversal” (Tihanov, 2012, p. 99). In contrast, interculturality starts with the assumption that with globalization the idea of “one world” has achieved ascendancy vis à vis the actually existing “many worlds,” (Held, 2013, p. 22), but, in spite of this, the individual has “no access to one world by circumventing the difference between home world and foreign world.” (ibid., p. 26) Intercultural perspectives are determined by the experience-based differentiation between I/We and the Others. This difference of the Other can be comprehended or not, tolerated or rejected, but in either case the continuation of the difference and not the development of similarity is the point of reference for cultural learning in the world of intercultural management. Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (2012) likewise emphasize this “viewpoint” (p. 243f.) and attempt instead to develop a training program aimed at “Reconciling

---

\(^8\) On this, see for example, Welsch, 1994; 1999; 2011.


\(^10\) For this differentiation and a good overview of the discussion, see: Tihanov, 2012, p. 78.
Cultural Dimensions”. It is consistent that they sort their approach under “transcultural leadership” (p. 2) that in turn is based on “transcultural competences” (p. 355).

Both cosmopolitanism (homogenization) and interculturalism (difference) are, in the final analysis, concepts of cultural identity-building for individual actors that feed on a difference of spaces. While the latter refers, for example, to nations or organizations as source and manifestation of difference, cosmopolitanism overcomes this multiplicity and difference of spaces by seemingly only proclaiming one space, namely the One World of all citizens. But since all spaces entail borders, in the cosmopolitan debate the question about this space or these spaces, e.g. about difference is merely shifted into extraterrestrial or interstellar dimensions.

One result of these reflections is the finding that the values of the SDGs and Agenda 2030 that are presumably shared, such as human rights, equality, dignity, justice or sustainability, can be understood in at least two ways: Either quite simply as cosmopolitan “common values” and “globally shared values” of humanity and the world community as such or else as markers for intercultural differences on which transcultural work can and must be brought to bear so that substantial notions of “transforming our world” can be formed in the first place. This relates both to the process of transformation and the contentual determination of that which we want to grasp as “One World”. The latter is the position reflected by the transculturalism represented here. Transculturality excludes neither the cosmopolitan nor the intercultural perspective, nor is it the extension of interculturality into, or its dissolution in, cosmopolitanism. It stands in an orthogonal relation to both, namely, as learning process for the relating of different cultural identities and perspectives. It is not a form of identity or performs the demarcation of a space (or annihilates such a demarcation); rather, the prefix “trans” designates the relation, the creation of a connection, the building of a bridge between “real intercultural interaction patterns” (Antweiler, 2011, p. 125; although he is skeptical of this) in social interactions through ongoing processes of learning.

12 For this interpretation, see Kim, 1999, the UN documents referred to here, such as Küng, 1996, or the Common Framework for the Ethics of the 21st Century by the UNESCO Universal Ethics Project.
Transculturality, in the definition I present here, is both resource and institutional prerequisite for effective, efficient local and global cooperation. As an ongoing learning process, it is an informal governance structure for relating distinct perspectives to which it refers reflexively. Transculturality permits organizing diversity’s potential productivity and is simultaneously an informal governance structure for containing the potential destructivity of diversity. It is this definition that I will explain and develop further in the next section.

IV. The world society and transculturality

The SDGs with their political and moral reference to a world shared by all people (“our world”) imply, as I noted earlier, a conception of a cosmopolitan space, termed the “planet” in the documents, quite simply: the Earth. This reflects the results to date of the process of globalizing political, cultural, and economic interactions that have led to the “growth of a transborder exchange and reorganization of the space” that made the container model of the nation-state appear as “only conditionally viable.” (Mau, 2007, p. 26). Global value chains, communications, media, the sciences, standardized consumer preferences, architecture, cultural events and fashions, just to name a few, together crystallize into a “transcultural sphere” that long ago left the national contexts behind (Brand, 2015). At the same time, let it be said that the overwhelming share of political, cultural, and economic transactions takes place within and between regions and nation-states. The emergence of “atopic societies,”13 the accelerating “dissolution of boundaries between social environments” lead to “compacted social spaces” (Mau, 2007), to institutionalized and relatively stable, structured transnational spaces in which the “distinction between inside and outside” (ibid., p. 42) no longer applies. Hence, the decisive facet of globalization would not be denationalization, but new “communities, communications, forms of exchange and interactions between nation-states” (ibid., p. 38). In the political realm, for example, this would be the European integration project; in the economic realm, it would be the rapid development of the number and importance of transnational corpora-

tions,\textsuperscript{14} which, as distinct from multinationals, organize their manufacturing, sales, research and development and the like in several countries and integrate them strategically on a global scale. They are networked organizations with a common strategy and local operations.

John W. Burton (1972) coined the term “world society” for this, defining it as “a society that comprises people everywhere, who know of one another, and who in most cases trade and communicate with one another” (ibid., p. 32). The world society, according to Burton, rather than being an administratively integrated unit, instead is made up of networks of interacting individuals and organizations, of networks of cooperating actors equipped with resources that can be brought to bear on joint projects for mutual advantage. The world’s globalization, therefore, cannot be grasped as adding-up of nation-states but as transactional relationships made visible. “These global societies are taking shape in addition to, not instead of the national societies to which we belong” (ibid., p. 51). According to Burton, the basic unit of the networked world society consists of “transactions and links that exist” (ibid., p. 35). To comprehend globalization and the development of a world society as the institutionalization and organization of the relating of transactions has far-reaching consequences for cultural issues which I would like to address next.

Culture is an “elastic concept” (Meyer, 2005, p. 23) defined in a myriad ways. One of the first concept proposed by Edward B. Tylor (1889) strikes me as paradigmatic. It holds that culture is “a complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by a man as a member of society” (ibid., p. 1). Here, culture is conceived in terms of identity – and difference theory as individually adopted through socialization and thereby constitutes, confirms, and perpetuates demarcated spaces for action (nation, organization, religions, and so forth). The study of the theory and practice of interculturality is based on this conceptual understanding of culture and that consequently makes its paradigm one of belonging and of difference.\textsuperscript{15} In Western cultures, therefore, understanding and tolerating cultural difference are the object of intercultural management, which, however, implies

\begin{footnotes}
\item[14] According to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, there are 82,000 transnational enterprises (Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, 2010).
\end{footnotes}
the affirmation and perpetuation of difference.\textsuperscript{16} Intercultural management thus is an element in transcultural management but not its systematic reference point, since transcultural management is concerned with creating a common cultural bond by interconnecting various identities and cultural spaces if it is to achieve the ultimate goal of durably institutionalizing successful cooperation and its accompanying learning processes. If global society’s transculturality, therefore, cannot take theories of identity as its starting point but must be conceived of as an element of the process of relationing transactions, it seems reasonable to use governance economics to grasp culture as an informal institution and productive resource that constrains and facilitates transactions.\textsuperscript{17} In this way, institutions represent not just cultural regulators (values, norms, law, and so on) of social interactions and intelligible forms of social organization, but are themselves manifestations of culture. They are congealed theoretical and ideological social discourses, underlying theoretical and ideological assumptions that make desired and unpunished actions possible.\textsuperscript{18} “Culture includes the institutional models of society itself” (Meyer, 2005, p. 29). Integrity is surely a value of Western culture geared toward expecting forms of behavior in social interactions such as honesty, candor, rectitude and the like. However, in this sense, it also expresses a conception of society that assumes social activity between free and self-determining individuals takes place as an exchange process that would be undermined by the absence of integrity. To label this on the one hand ontological and on the other hand meaning-generating aspect of culture, Meyer (ibid., p. 29f.) differentiates between a “narrow” (values, etc.) and “broad concept of culture” (generating meaning through theories and ideologies): “Institutionalizing thus means establishing connections that, on the one hand, organize actions and, on the other hand, anchor them in steadily growing cultural theories and ideologies” (ibid., p. 46). This makes culture as institution an element in a process of rationalization and civilization, a project for which John W. Meyer coined the “world polity” concept (ibid., p. 34) and which he expects to lead to an evolving world culture determined by the West. We put these questions aside and instead attempt once more to distill a definition of transculturality from the discussion to date.

\textsuperscript{16} See also Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012, Ch. 1.
\textsuperscript{18} See Wieland, 1996, p. 75.
In Park’s sense, transculturality is a process of relating different cultural identities. By itself, it is not a form of identity, but an element of, and a prerequisite for, effective governance of local and global transactions. In this sense, transculturality is always also a necessary element in “institution building”. It does not constitute a space but aims instead to make cooperation by culturally diverse individual and collective actors institutionally and organizationally possible. Of course, that does not mean that transcultural transactions do not occur in a space, yet it does mean that not the space and the multiplicity of identities are the reference points for transculturality but that a definable, specific transaction whose completion requires cooperation between culturally diverse resources is instead. This causes a change of perspective: The point is no longer overcoming or neutralizing cultural difference, but about the discursive, cooperative discovery and creation of those cultural commonalities that are necessary for precipitating cooperation between actors participating in a transaction, and for having it succeed. This interactive, social generating of commonalities can rely on behavior rooted in human nature and is stabilized by adaptive governance structures for continued execution of the respective transaction. If this succeeds over time, transculturality leads to institution building in the networks of global society, that is, to a mutual understanding of the sense and legitimacy of a given transaction (Meyer, 2005, p. 29).

In the next section, I will enlarge upon this thought using the example of the transcultural management of corporations.

V. Transcultural management and corporate governance

Elsewhere, I have developed some basic elements of transcultural management as the management of values by a corporation (Wieland, 2010a, 2010c). I describe it there as an “ongoing learning process for individuals and organizations that takes place in day to day business operations” (Wieland, 2010a, p. 213). It is during this learning process that the organization’s transcultural competencies develop along with those of the organization’s members’ with regard to executing the organization’s transactions. For business organizations, the learning process generating the “transcultural skills” resource cannot confine itself to managing multiple national cultures. Transculturality here does not exhaust itself by dealing
with conflicting global values. Beyond that, it must take into account the similarities and differences of individual value systems, of existing professional and corporate cultures. The question is what influence they exert, individually and by their interaction, on the organizational culture and hence on the execution of corporate transactions. The following figure illustrates these interrelationships.

*Figure 1: Transactions in the network of diversity*

This network of cultural diversity made up of individuals and organizations processes both elements of cultural homogeneity and also cultural difference. National cultures, corporate cultures, occupational cultures and individual value cultures are distinguished both by an inclusive and a delimiting character. With regard to the execution of its transactions, every organization is therefore characterized by a specific relation between cultural homogeneity and intercultural difference, which represents a temporary cultural equilibrium that is the outcome of a transcultural learning process. I will clarify these relationships with the following figure.
The straight lines $T_1$, $T_2$ and $T_3$ denote the different strategic orientations of a corporation with respect to its cultural learning process. While in $T_2$ an equally divided mix of homogeneity ($Ch_{1,2,3}$) and difference ($Id_{1,2,3}$) is sought ($Ok_{1,2}$), with strategy $T_1$ a more pronounced homogenization ($Ok_3$) is the aim and with $T_3$ it is a greater emphasis on difference ($Ok_4$). With $Ok_{1,4}$ a temporary and fluctuating equilibrium comes about. The corridor of accepted divergences from this dynamic equilibrium which is not sustainable in practice, is shaded grey. As Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner (2012, p. 37) correctly state, fluctuation is a dimension of culture: "cultures dance". As long as a corporation or indeed any other kind of partnership acts within this corridor of accepted divergences, a change or adaptation of the transcultural management’s strategic orientation is not necessary. These divergences can have various causes. For example, a corporation’s expansion of its business activity into other markets will precipitate less cultural turbulence in the organization than globalizing its supply chain through its own investment and long-term cooperation with partners. Equally, an altered business model (for instance, from car manufacturer to provider of sustainable mobility) will have a different effect on the culture than the M&A process that may accompany it or the establishment of a global joint venture. Precisely in
these specificities lies the reason why transcultural management reflexively relates to the governance of specific transactions. It is a practice arena in which a continual learning process takes place whose equilibrium is always only temporary and never static.

With that, the problems of the governance structure’s adaptivity and of the learning metric assume decisive importance. In Figure 3 below we first assume, in keeping with the St. Gallen management model, that at a given point in time an equilibrium prevails between the strategy, the structure, and the culture of an organization. If next we accept that a corporate strategy can be changed in one year \((t=1)\), the rearrangement of the organizational structures and processes that apply to it may take two years \((t=2)\). However, changing a corporate culture is variously estimated to take between six and fifteen years \((t=6-15)\), so that here we have a situation where strategy, structure, and culture are not congruent, a condition which the transcultural learning process and its organization in a value management system as a fitting governance structure aims to bridge temporally. \((t=2)\).

Figure 3: Strategic management and transcultural learning

---

19 See Bleicher, 1992.
20 See Kieser, 1986.
Should this learning process not achieve a new dynamic equilibrium – and this is not infrequently the result of M&A processes and the establishment of international or global joint ventures – the transformation risks failure due to a lack of transcultural competence. The same holds for a corporation that fails to recognize the crucial importance of transcultural management and does not manage diversity at all or inadequately. To be sure, failure is only one possible outcome; added for the duration of an unsuccessful integration of strategy, organization, and culture is the non-realization of the hoped for productive synergies and the costs incurred due to lack of success in stemming the potential destructive effect of diversity. Inversely, one means for realizing the economic cooperation rent is a systematic diversity management which, from the transcultural perspective, has to proceed specifically from the premise that the shared cultural bond does not automatically reside in a corporation’s proclaimed values (Code of Ethics, Code of Conduct) but rather in the prosocial ability of its leadership and personnel to work out a repertoire of shared understanding of situational meanings and of generally accepted consequences of practicing values. Precisely this is the task of diversity management. It therefore must start with a “thin” interpretation of values that, in the course of the transcultural learning process, can develop into “thicker” or tauter meanings. Thus, for example, the initial, globally applicable version of the value of “diversity” will be understood as merely meaning a “preference for heterogeneity” by the corporation and its members, while, when it comes to implementing this value in the daily operations of the enterprise, we can accept national, regional, e.g., local diversity, hence a “local mindset.” Equal career opportunities for women, inclusion of the disabled, non-discrimination of sexual orientations, religious tolerance, and the like will be possible parallel local implementation strategies for the “diversity” value so long as this multitude of local interpretations is communicated and aired within the corporation. This is why information, communication, discussion, monitoring and reporting are the fundamental building blocks of transcultural learning. What the organization and its members learn in the process is, first, that they have a shared preference for diversity; second, that there are different local priorities in

21 See Li et al., 2001; Park & Ungson, 1997.
22 On differentiating between thin and thick interpretation of moral values, see Walzer, 1996.
implementing this value, and, third, that there exists a transcultural learning process binding for all. As a result, in whatever timeframe, successful “thicker descriptions” or, in technical terms, new cultural equilibriums of cultural homogeneity and intercultural difference are pursued and facilitated. The following chart diagrams this process.

Figure 4: Diversity management – Global principles, local priorities

These reflections lead us to another aspect of systematic transcultural management, namely determining the strategic cultural orientation desired by a corporation’s leadership for performing its transactions. For this purpose, we will differentiate between centralized and decentralized corporate cultures and strong and weak ones. While centralized corporate cultures are intent on having the head office (in a specific country, a city with respect to the various divisions) define and carry out the firm’s culture policy throughout the enterprise and across all cultural spaces decentralized corporate cultures stress (with regard to culture policy) the autonomy of the regions and areas belonging to the firm. Strong corporate cultures aim to homogenize the value culture and its interpretation for all areas of the enterprise. Weak cultures settle for localization.23 Diagrammed, it looks like this:

23 For the difference between strong and weak cultures, see Steinmann & Schreyögg, 1997.
“A1” designates an enterprise whose strategy strives for a centralized, strong corporate culture, while for enterprise “A2” it is exactly the opposite. “Centralized” and “decentralized,” “strong” and “weak” in general are neither positive nor negative in nature; rather, their effect depends on the kind of transaction the enterprise executes. Decentralized and weak cultures are unavoidable in innovative enterprise networks, but they also generate special challenges for managing and monitoring this network. However, an international joint venture run by a firm with an “A1” strategy will find itself in intractable difficulties if the respective partner also favors this particular strategy. In this case, they de facto no longer have a “joint venture” but are merely two organizations in a shell. In “A3,” we are dealing with a cultural strategy that tends to permit local interpretation and action in a rather centrally controlled organization. Finally, “A4” management exerts decentralized control but emphasizes a shared interpretation.

This presentation permits great variety regarding a corporation’s strategic orientations that we will not pursue further. To generalize: Transcultural management is the art of finding the right mix of the four dimensions of corporate culture and determining how to handle the trade-offs between them, which will then determine the direction of the transcultural learning process. In all cases, what matters is achieving the maximal mobilization of an organization’s resources and capabilities with respect
to performing its transactions.\textsuperscript{24} Taken together, Figures 1 through 5 illustrate the major steps in transcultural management.

\textit{VI. Perspectives and challenges}

The globalization of the environments of people’s existence and the transnational transactions of global society have made transcultural management more relevant for corporations. Not only the incessantly increasing demands articulated within the political and social realms on corporate value creation and responsibility, as expressed in the SDGs, drive this dynamic, but so too does the organization and management of transnational economic value creation and cooperation. This perspective has received insufficient attention in theoretical economic research and management theories. While the challenge has barely registered with the former, the latter concentrates on studying the management of intercultural differences. I have attempted in this article to take a first step toward clarifying aspects of this theoretical and practical challenge by critically discussing the concept of transculturality and its consequences for managing a corporate strategy that aims to foster cultural integration. Further studies, especially of the requisite qualities for developing transcultural executives and personnel are called for and are essential. I am convinced, however, what matters in the debates on the transculturality of social transactions are not just intraorganizational parameters. Also on the agenda should be how to achieve a durable, global intersectoral cooperation between politics, business, and society. Conjuring up global commonalities here will not get us any further than systematically emphasizing differences. Transcultural management avoids this polarization and is instead understood as a social learning process that does not aim for the good but for the better, not for a definitive solution but for taking the next, feasible step. This process, which rests on prosocial behavioral predispositions, can succeed in increasing the stock of shared moral interpretations of economic transactions and hence also the volume of feasible, mutually advantageous cooperation projects. Transculturality, seen from the economic-governance angle, is a potentially productive resource but, indeed, also a destructive factor in economic value creation, whose effect

\textsuperscript{24} See Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012, p. 15.
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depends on governance. It is an informal institution that determines the breadth and height of transaction costs in this cooperation corridor. This definition is not intended to compete with philosophical, social- and cultural-sciences discussions of transculturality, but rather to make a contribution to transculturality in the social sciences.

**Literature**


Some Aspects of Transculturality

Dominik Fischer and Josef Wieland

I. Introduction
There are numerous definitions of transculturality particularly in Cultural Studies. The focus of this article are transcultural aspects of managing operations of globalized organizations. In this context, transculturality is a concept paving the way for interaction among people from various cultural backgrounds. Its aim is to facilitate such interactions in order to produce general mutual advantage without the limitations set by national states or other cultural boundaries. Transcultural management is gaining increasing importance due to the globalization of markets, communication, technological progress and division of labor on a global scale, e.g. of what can be seen as the main drivers of transculturality nowadays. It is a way of bridging cultural differences through a social learning process and its aim is to facilitate intercultural cooperation and management.

II. Concepts of culture
There have been countless attempts to define culture. The word itself stems from the Latin word colere that means to till, to tend, to care for or to cultivate. Colere was used with regard to agriculture. The term involved and is employed in a specific social context. More than a hundred definitions of culture can be found in the literature as observed by Gisela Trommsdorff (2000). One of the early definitions by Edward B. Tylor (1889, p. 1) states that culture is a ‘complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired
by a man as a member of society’. In this definition, culture is conceived in terms of identity and space.

Some theoretical concepts of culture limit it to art, education, science and intellectual activities. Sociological concepts are further elaborated in Systems Theory. Systems Theory sees culture as a subsystem of a functionally differentiated modern society. This modern society focuses on an intellectual and aesthetic interpretation of the world. Through predetermined functional capacities, it ensures its continuance (Reckwitz, 2004). Anthropologist Arjun Appadurai (1990) puts culture in another context. According to him, culture provides imagery as well as imagination and meaning in social practice. Cultures are compared to landscapes. People define themselves within them and observe how they relate to each other.

Luhmann sees culture as the memory of social systems and especially the system of society (Luhmann, 1995). Social systems consist of communication. Culture and language cannot be individual systems on their own because they lack an individual operation system. Cultures build and shape social structure through repeated and diversified communication. Communication can be seen as a unity of information, notification and understanding (Luhmann, 1984).

The Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies defines culture as an ‘assemblage’ of meanings and imagining. The aim of culture created by humans is to create community and to communicate (Lewis, 2002).

Of course, this overview is incomplete and merely serves the purpose to illustrate the breadth of possible interpretations of the concept of culture.

III. Concepts of cultural differences

The scholarly debate of cultures as different spheres was originally embedded in the debate on nation states as cultural containers which was developed further and can be found in most modern concepts of culture. Before José Martí’s article about the idea of intercultural ‘mixed’ people in 1891, Johann Gottfried Herder (1871) established the concept of en-

---

1 For further discussion of Martí’s article see section IV.
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tirely separate cultures which was the most influential theory for a long
time. He characterizes cultures by three distinctive elements which are
social homogenization, ethnic consolidation and intercultural delimita-
tion. Social homogenization means that people within a culture are shaped
by it and thereby become cultural objects. A culture unites individual
people who live within it. Second, ethnic consolidation sees culture as the
culture of a nation which represents it. Herder (1966) describes culture
metaphorically as the ‘flower of a folk’. The third characteristic is cultural
delimitation. This means that culture is distinguished from other cultures
and remains separate from them. One mark of culture is therefore the
power to separate (Herder & Kunz, 1871).

Although the terms interculturality and multiculturality are increasingly
 gaining in importance in science and practice, they still lack a universal
definition (Bertels & Waldhubel, 2014). One definition is proposed by
Hamid Reza Yousefi (2010) who describes interculturality as a theory
dealing with historical and present cultures and humans as their facilita-
tors. He sees all cultures on a par with each other. This approach still
regards cultures as isolated spaces that communicate with each other but
have no link or common basis. This communication occurs in that differ-
ences are bridged by acknowledging differences.

Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner (2012, p. 355) see
intercultural management as the ‘capability to communicate successfully
and collaborate effectively with people of other cultures through recogni-
tion of differences and respect for other points of view’. This involves the
capability to act in compliance with rules of more than one cultural sys-
tem and to respond in a sensitive way according to the cultural demands
of a specific situation. The aim is to avoid blunders or embarrassmen-
t and to work and communicate with people from other cultures success-
fully.

Multiculturalism is a concept describing the ethnic diversity and the
juxtaposition of heterogeneous social and cultural patterns within a society.
The pluralistic hybridity of multiculturalism is often contrasted to pro-
ceses of monocentric assimilation under a dominant form of culture (Nün-
ning, 2005, p. 156). A multicultural society is a society in which people
from different cultural origins live together. There are similarities and
differences between individuals and cultures within a multicultural society
(Bertels & Bussmann, 2013). A multicultural society may be a social
space, an organization, a city or a country. Aside from tribes living in
isolation on remote islands, cultures as strictly delimited social spaces can only seldom be found in reality. Cultural exchange across borders is the rule rather than an exception. Consequently, the traditional ‘container’ concept of culture appears open to criticism.

**IV. Concepts of Transculturality: Identity and Relation**

Transculturality is an old phenomenon. It can be found in the cultural influence of ancient Greek culture on other cultures around the Mediterranean Sea or in the interconnection of the cultures of China and Korea with those of India (Kimmich & Schahadat, 2012). At its beginnings, transculturality occurs through cross-border and intra-firm trade which are the fundamentals of getting in touch with other cultures.

Traditional concepts of culture are challenged by transculturalism. While cross-cultural and multicultural theories have their systemic starting point in cultural differences, the transcultural approach is about identifying commonalities. This serves to dismantle the constraints of earlier concept of culture (Antor, 2010). Different concepts of culture also lead to different concepts of transculturality. There are concepts that use identity while others use relational approaches. Transculturality challenges the explanatory power of static models of society, nation and culture. It focuses on mobility and migration as well as associated transformational processes of integration and relations from a societal perspective. Further topics of transculturality are mutual penetration and perception in respect to cultural, national and political limitations (Gippert et al., 2008).

In 1891, José Marti published his article ‘Nuestra America’ in which he examined the idea of an interculturally mixed people which he called ‘métissage’. He thought that the Americas’ people were culturally and ethnically ‘mixed’ and as a consequence individuals are part of the dialectic other (Marti, 2004). Fernando Ortiz (1965) resumed Marti’s idea and defined transculturalism as a synthesis of two phases occurring simultaneously: on the level of culture at large and on the level of the subject. With regard to the former, the past is deculturized and replaced by ‘métissage’. At the same time – with regard to the latter – the subject is shaped by a multitude of different cultures and peoples. Thus, the identity of the subject is not one-dimensional but can only be understood in connection with others. Identity becomes a multiple concept. Indeed, in Ortiz’
view, transculturalism can be seen as the basis of a hemispheric identity (Cuccioletta, 2002).

The identity of a person is increasingly shaped by the combination of various cultural elements drawn from different contexts. Individuals encounter elements of different cultures (Berg, 2011) that appeal to them in a specific situation and thus inform the individual’s personality. While the basic set of values is shaped by one’s native culture, travelling and nomadism confront an individual with elements of other cultures that he can make his own. Globalization and the creation of transcultural spaces are driven not only by economic progress but also by technological progress that facilitates travelling, communication and global media consumption.

By crossing borders, people might experience different cultures. To cope with this, they need to foster a transcultural capacity. For one thing, this means to acknowledge those unfamiliar parts of their own identity that are owed to other cultures; and for another thing to accept foreignness in their environment. Individuals must be able to refer to several cultural systems and to retain a distance to one’s own cultural background (Castells, 2001, in Pütz, 2004). The idea behind transculturality as a dynamic concept rests on the refutation of the idea of a static and pure culture (Welsch, 1999). Cultures can be seen as open systems constantly interacting with each other (Welsch, 2011). Anthropologist Clyde Kluckhohn stated that ‘all people are like all others, like some others, and like no other’ (Slimbach, 2005, p. 208). This quotation can be linked to transculturality. On a universal level people are like each other based on basic values which, assuming different localized meanings can be found in every culture. For example, while those values are rooted in all cultures, different cultures interpret them in different ways. It is this that drives the differentiation of values. On the level of the individual, these localized values are differentiated further, which makes each individual’s set of values unique. According to the concept of transculturality limitations of a culture can be perceived as maneuverable patterns which enable overlapping loyalty. In a transcultural society the focus is set on increasing political, social or economic border crossing activities and thus the meaning of national states shrinks. Indicators of transculturality are streams of communication, goods, art or financial assets (Mau, 2007).

Richard Slimbach (2005) sees the basic pillar of transculturality in the search for common interest as well as universally shared values among
people with different cultural origins. This helps to face issues like personal prejudice against others or violation of human rights. Further, Slimbach states that collective or personal responses to cultural issues are always shaped by one’s cultural awareness which is especially important considering today’s global interconnection. Slimbach says that to become a transculturally open person, the individual needs to demonstrate an open attitude and abilities to enhance ethical and open interaction with persons from other cultural origins.

Transculturalism differs from cosmopolitism. A cosmopolitan is a person who sees himself as a citizen of the world. He might be affiliated to a particular nation (Appiah, 2007) but this is not the systematic reference point of his cultural identity. The idea of cosmopolitism differs from transculturalism. A transcultural person has roots within a specific culture. There is no need to deny one’s own origin. Cooperation with actors from other cultures to mutual advantage occurs on the basis of one’s own cultural and moral conditioning. From a transcultural point of view one would accept that there is one world but also recognize that people live in different cultural contexts. Different individuals integrate elements stemming from other cultures in different ways. It is especially the mode in which the latter process occurs that lends such a highly individual note to biographies, paintings or journalism (Berg & Óigeartaigh, 2010).

According to Wolfgang Berg (2011), rivers and seas are forms of transcultural spaces offering ‘natural links’. When trade occurred in these places and rivers were used as waterways to transfer goods, the areas close to rivers became areas of emerging transculturality. The same is true for trade routes. A near-perfect example of transculturality is a caravan. There are two different types of caravans: trade caravans and pilgrim caravans. In trade caravans, merchants band together to cross challenging territories in order to transport goods and to trade at distant places. People with different backgrounds in respect to race, religion, language and origin need to work together in a caravan towards a common shared goal. What unifies them is the need to cross an area hostile to humans. On this basis, rules are established and followed by every member of the group. This is only possible because they have a shared set of values facilitating a successful journey. The starting and final points of caravans – or better, of their journeys – need to be transcultural places because in these places people from different countries come together. Therefore train stations, harbors and airports, in particular, are transcultural places.
A similar phenomenon can be observed in modern organizations which are particularly affected by globally integrated trade and interaction (Cleveland et al., 2015). Adam Smith (1976) stated that people with very different capabilities can be of use to each other, and consequently advantage can be drawn from a variety of different talents. Transculturality also facilitates diversity which can improve an organization’s effectiveness. Six dimensions were identified that are directly impacted by an organization’s diversity: cost, talent, marketing success, creativity and innovation as well as problem-solving quality (Cox Jr & Blake, 1991).

American sociologist Robert E. Park concerned himself with transculturality, too. He states that ‘in the long run […] peoples and races who live together, sharing in the same economy, inevitably interbreed, and in this way, if in no other, the relations which were merely co-operative and economic become social and cultural’ (1950, p. 354). Park sees migration ‘as a type of collective action’ (ibid., p. 350). The individual is ‘never quite willing to break’ with his own culture and ‘not quite accepted’ in his new culture (ibid., p. 354). In this space ‘in between’ transcultural competences can be developed.

The transculturality approach defined by the Birmingham Center of Contemporary Cultural Studies is oriented towards dynamic processes. Transculturality focuses on issues of contemporary culture especially in terms of relationship, power formation and generating meaning. Transculturalism is, on the one hand, interested in tension, dissonance and instability but, on the other hand, also in the stabilizing effects of social cohesion, organization and communalism. The observation focuses upon how social groups ‘distribute’ and ‘create’ their meanings and how they experience tension and interact. At the core of this lies the transitory nature of culture and the power to transform. Another special interest in the study of transculturalism is the way in which language wars are conducted and shaped. Through these language wars conditions of stability and instability emerge as groups and individuals communicate, congregate and seek to assert semiotic and material interests over others (Lewis, 2002).

We try to summarize the previous discussion in the following table. So far we can differentiate three concepts which are transculturalism, multiculturalism and interculturalism:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcultural</th>
<th>Multicultural</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td>World Society, global cooperation</td>
<td>Society, organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of culture</strong></td>
<td>Options, constraints</td>
<td>Homogenous and enclosed areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Network of diversity</td>
<td>Subcultures, minorities, cities, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual Assumptions</strong></td>
<td>‘The Self in the Other’</td>
<td>‘The Self’ and ‘the Other’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a common understanding</td>
<td>Differences and mutual advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual advantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Creating commonality</td>
<td>Integrating differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspective</strong></td>
<td>Like all others</td>
<td>Like some others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consequences for action</strong></td>
<td>Bridging differences</td>
<td>Understanding cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V. Summary**

Transculturality like inter- and multiculturality is a way for people with various cultural background to work together and thereby foster mutual understanding. Leveraged by globalization, interconnection and nomadism, cultures clash on an individual, organizational as well as societal level. A transcultural approach can help to face challenges on each level. Furthermore, problems no matter whether local or global in origin and scale always have to be perceived from a global angle. Future challenges need to be faced not only by various stakeholders which speak their own technical language but also by culturally and sectorally diversified stakeholder groups.
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Transculturality and the Formation of the Transcultural Sphere

Lennart Brand

Generically, one may describe transculturality as an effect coming about when two cultures engage with each other in such a way that a specific feature of one culture is imprinted on the other, thereby producing a new cultural phenomenon that is attributable to both parent cultures, while the feature of the first culture that was imprinted on the second, too, will henceforth belong to both cultures in that the new element cannot be conceived without it. Both cultural phenomena, the imprinting as well as the imprinted one, together form a transcultural phenomenon. – Examples of such transcultural phenomena abound throughout history. During the Europe-wide spread of the Renaissance movement, for instance, the latter, though being Italian in origin, ceased to be a genuinely Italian phenomenon when taking roots also in France, Germany, England, and Spain – while of course never becoming a genuinely French, German, English, and Spanish phenomenon. Indeed, it eventually was French, German, English, and Spanish as much as it was Italian. Roughly the same is true for Greece and the Hellenic culture, and indeed for England and the English language.

In short, there has always been transculturality as cultures are intrinsically fluid and dynamic entities that adapt whenever they communicate with other cultures. Where such adaption is artificially precluded, a culture – and the corresponding political entity – may weaken (Japan before the Bakumatsu is an obvious example). It is equally obvious that the transcultural developments occurring in the present age differ from those of previous ages not just by degree but in essence. In the past – arguably
up until the 19th century – transcultural phenomena emerged at cultures’ peripheries, slowly progressing towards the centre. The sheer slowness of this process during which the transcultural phenomenon increasingly adapted to the existing culture (the immensely fruitful relationship between late Gothic and Renaissance influences in the German-speaking area springs to mind) meant that it was, as it were, absorbed into the cultural landscape which therefore appeared to remain by and large the same: the Weser Renaissance, to give just one example, is considerably more German than Italian. In the 19th century this changed. The opening of global trade and transportation routes in connection with imperialist geopolitical developments shrank the distances between formerly far-away countries, and mutual cultural influences became far more immediate.

That thanks to air travel and modern tele-communication those distances are now virtually gone and that most aspects of any culture are now accessible anywhere and at any time, is a truism. The question is, rather, what this state of affairs means in the given context. One interpretation is provided by a school of transculturality which holds that due to an increasing hybridization of previously clearly delineated cultural identities the age of separate cultures with their own traditions, beliefs, and values is coming to an end: that the traditional world and its distinctions are to be levelled through globalization and eventually superseded by a one-size-fits-all quasi-global culture of ‘mankind’ – a frankly nightmarish One-World dystopia evoking grim Huxleyan images. This school of thought included an influential Marxist-inspired, post-colonial brand of transcultural thinking that was first spelled out by Fernando Ortiz in the mid-20th century and actually welcomes the assumed dissolution of traditional geographical, cultural, religious, etc. boundaries.¹ Lamberto Tassinari, for instance, describes transculturality as ‘a new form of humanism, based on the idea of relinquishing the strong traditional identities and cultures which in many cases were products of imperialistic empires, interspersed with dogmatic religious values’.²

Though this identity-based brand of transcultural thinking has dominated transcultural discourses for many a decade, transcultural approaches

do not necessarily presume the dissolution of existing – national, cultural, religious, etc. – structures. For one thing, the teleological assumption that national and cultural identities are converging towards a hypothetical single global identity, that, in other words, the traditional world is being swallowed-up by some vague transcultural entity taking its place, is both extremely bold and not sufficiently borne out by empirical evidence. For another thing, to remain valid in principle and applicable in practice, the basic notion of transculturality does not require such assumptions about changing identities. Indeed, contrary to the above, another transcultural school of thought makes do without those assumptions. It takes at its starting point the evident fact that cultural differences exist and, given the specific dynamics of globalization outlined above, assume immediate relevance for potentially any transaction conducted not just in economic but also in political/administrative and civil-societal contexts. This being so, in order to function, those three areas need to be able to cope with different identities by managing the relations between them. In the present volume, such an alternative approach is presented by Josef Wieland who also discusses several recent takes on transculturality.

All I should like to add here is an observation that may seem far-fetched but which nevertheless appears to me worth looking at a little closer. The question I asked myself was what it means that, as I claimed above, the current phase of transculturality is essentially different from previous phases of transculturality. That the difference between, on the one hand, the slow and organic growth of transcultural phenomena within the texture of an existing culture and, on the other hand, the immediate availability of any aspect of any culture anywhere does constitute a quantum leap appears immediately obvious. But again – why is that so beyond the quantitative fact that transcultural phenomena come about at a greater speed, frequency, and density? I.e. is the optimization of the measureable technical accessibility of ‘the other’ all there is, or has the vast transcultural dynamics generated by the process of globalization indeed altered the global cultural texture – albeit not in the way envisaged by Ortiz and the other proponents of the old, identity-based school of transculturality?

I hold that this is indeed the case, that the dynamization of transcultural phenomena as part of the process of globalization in recent decades, though not leading to a fusion of cultural identities as that traditional school of transculturality would have it, has instead begun to crystallize into what I call a ‘transnational’ and ‘transcultural sphere’: an entirely
new cultural entity that exists beyond the world’s traditional cultures, not impeding the latter’s integrity on account of being autonomous and self-contained. In his utopian novel “Heliopolis”, Ernst Jünger says about a new technical elite: ‘They had increased speed to those degrees where it either reverts to annihilation or to calm’. The transcultural sphere is the calm, the “static” product of transcultural hyperdynamization, the “static” fallout, as it were, of transcultural overdrive.

Thus let us begin by making a distinction between, on the one hand, the transnational/transcultural sphere and, on the other hand, the traditional world where national borders, customs, and mindsets as well as religious affiliations and inherited value systems continue to exist. These two spheres coexist on different planes, barely touching one another.

I. The transnational sphere constitutes the locus of transculturality

As an interlude before we continue. – Above I used the terms “transcultural” and “transnational” in a way that may have suggested they constitute two sides of the same coin, i.e. that they are two expressions of the same thing, i.e. that they are essentially the same thing. That, however, is decidedly not the case. On the contrary, I claim transnationality and transculturality are two distinct concepts – two distinct concept which, however, cannot be considered independently from one another.

So what is the transnational sphere? The transnational sphere materializes wherever structures emerge whose specific mode of existence is not related to any specific nation, culture, mindset, religion etc. Such a structure may be a unit of a globally operating organization (or this organization as a whole, though for one or several of its units to be transnational it is not necessary for the whole organization to be thus); or an international airport, hotel, restaurant etc.; or a university, academy, think-tank etc.; or even a religion or an ideology. All of the above – and many more – taken together, constitute the transnational sphere. So why – given that this transnational sphere can be so neatly described – would I assert that transnationality cannot be considered independently from transculturality?

Evidently this transnational sphere in itself is an abstract concept, something that cannot exist materially in the real world. In the real world there is no such thing as a “structure”: all there is people interacting in certain ways to certain ends. A “structure” is but an auxiliary concept, an academic model that helps us understand what is occurring within the chaotic bustle of humanity. But of course without that bustle of humanity there would be nothing that could possibly occur. An airport without people is not an airport but just an arbitrary building; neither is a university without people a university, and so forth. For a university to be a university, it takes people (within or without this building that carries a plate saying “University”) who interact with a view to teaching and research and whatever else may go on in a university. Now, while this may be a trivial thing to say, the implications are less trivial. For what results from people interacting — no matter what people and to what end — is, simply put, culture. Individuals interacting within an institution generate an institutional culture; individuals interacting within a nation, a national culture; and individuals interacting within a transnational sphere, a transnational culture, transforming the abstract transnational sphere into the concrete and very real transcultural sphere. In short: since in the real world the transnational sphere exists only through people interacting, and since any such interaction engenders culture, the existence of the (abstract) transnational sphere necessarily entails the existence of the (concrete) transcultural sphere. The former cannot be without the latter.

Yet neither can the latter be without the former: we are unable to conceive of the transcultural sphere without in some way presuming the existence of a transnational sphere. This is because the transcultural “substance” requires the transnational “form”, or rather, framework. There can be no institutional culture without the institution, no national culture without the nation, no transcultural without the transnational. More specific: though the university is constituted by individuals interacting in a certain way to a certain end, thereby permanently creating and re-creating both academic culture in general and the culture of a particular academic institution, neither would be conceivable without putting that abstract notion, “the university”, first. Equally, though the transnational sphere becomes actual reality through people’s interaction within it which in turn establishes the transcultural sphere, the latter cannot be understood without taking the transnational sphere at least implicitly for granted. Thus the abstract concept is indispensable for us to gain an un-
derstanding of the real-life phenomenon it refers to. This suggests that the abstract concept may actually be "real", too, albeit in a sense different from the tangible reality of the transcultural sphere. (As an aside – that something is abstract does not mean it does not exist: it just does not exist materially in isolation. This is what I referred to when above I stated that transculturality and transnationality are two distinct entities which are inextricably linked and have to be thought together.)

II. A morphological approach to transculturality

To summarize the above: where a number of people – like the ‘inhabitants’ of the abstract transnational sphere – contrive a mode of interaction not by consciously devising it but by merely acting and thereby discovering viable ways to live and work together, and where this mode of interaction settles and becomes a set of habits, subsequently of customs, the seeds of ‘culture’ are sawn. This is exactly what has been happening over the past decades: in some protracted way, it has become feasible for people who found themselves in what may be called the transnational sphere to coexist and collaborate in ways which had previously been the preserve of members of the same national and/or cultural context. This, in turn, brought forth the transcultural sphere.

While there have always been transcultural entities, the formation of a transcultural sphere functionally nigh equivalent to the ‘cultural’ sphere is, as we found, a new and indeed a novel phenomenon that has evolved relatively recently, growing out of the specific logics of the globalized economy and the increasingly globalized texture of politics. (The only historical precedent may be the Roman Catholic Church, whose global organization shows many characteristics of a political-cultural entity in its own right. It, too, exists on a sphere different from that of national borders and cultures, though sharing its space.)

Above I stated the transnational sphere materializes wherever structures emerge whose specific mode of existence is not related to any specific nation, culture, mindset, religion etc. As the transnational sphere is congruent to the transcultural sphere, these structures are congruent to what I referred to as transcultural phenomena. However, while it is true that the transcultural sphere consist of a myriad transcultural phenomena, this definition is still not accurate enough: for a myriad – or any number of – trans-
cultural phenomena would yet not suffice to form the transcultural sphere if they relate to each other in a mere random fashion. A jumble of disconnected transcultural phenomena arbitrarily flung onto a heap do not constitute a transcultural sphere but just a heap of disconnected transcultural phenomena. For the latter to crystallize into the transcultural sphere, an ordering principle is required. In other words, they have to relate to each other in such a manner as to operate as a functionally differentiated system.

My assumption is that such a functionally differentiated system exists on the transcultural level, and it is precisely here that the difference to previous variants of transculturality lies: it is this that renders transculturality in the age of globalization historically unique and fundamentally different from earlier occurrences of transculturality.

To be more specific – looking at the various transcultural phenomena that appeared on the scene in the last fifty or so years, a pattern seems to emerge. Together they constitute a formation which has, inter alia:

- A distinct style of its own as epitomized, for instance, by hotels belonging to global hotel chains, business-class lounges, business restaurants, clubs and the like;

- A distinct language and terminology: a peculiar brand of English centered upon a cluster of words and phrases derived from and describing economic and political patterns and processes (to which may be added terms drawn from sectors of mainly, but not always, low-brow culture such as e.g. Hollywood cinema, football, etc.);

- Its own institutions: first and foremost globalized businesses, to a certain degree supranational political institutions (though that is certainly open to debate), and global NGOs;

- Its own infrastructure, superimposed upon, and only marginally connected to, the infrastructures of its host countries: such as airports, five-star hotels, car-hire services, and some restaurants, all of which bear virtually no relevance to the daily lives of 99 per cent of host populations, including those of Western countries.

Given that the transcultural sphere is functionally equivalent to a traditional culture, and given that what engenders culture is people interacting with one another – who are the people whose interaction transcends the abstract transnational sphere into the concrete transcultural sphere, and
perpetuates the latter? Who are, as it were, the transcultural sphere’s ‘inhabitants’?
Among those ‘inhabitants’ are:

➢ The global nomads entirely holed up inside the transcultural sphere: their lives take place in five-star hotels, business-class lounges, aircrafts, etc.; they are disengaged from and unencumbered by any affiliations with, loyalties to or feelings for any specific nation, culture or tradition other than the transcultural sphere itself; they are permanently on the move – physically or just mentally –, floating across the globe; being, as it were, transcultural in character, these global nomads are virtually without precedent in human history;

➢ The average global businessmen, bureaucrats, scholars, artists, and activists: their lives vacillate between the cultural sphere where their private existence is mostly based and where their natural (though not necessarily their primary) loyalties lie, and the transcultural sphere which is the location of most of their professional existence; since a person evidently cannot be ‘cultural’ and ‘transcultural’ at the same time, their existence is split into two, with the principles ruling either part of their existence being mutually exclusive and irreconcilable; thus their rootedness in the cultural sphere and what it entails can become a serious impediment to that half of their existence lodged in the transcultural sphere – and vice versa;

➢ Those little helpers at the fringes of the transcultural sphere who operate its machinery: waiters, cleaners, receptionists, drivers, etc. – being drawn from the local population, they enter and leave that sphere on a nine-to-five basis; relating to the transcultural sphere in mere functional terms unconnected to their mode of existence, they do not experience the conflict of principles faced by those whose existence is tied up with both the cultural and the transcultural sphere;

➢ Those accumulating at the bottom of the sphere who neither speak its language nor participate in its style: economic migrants, refugees, and the generally displaced.

Two things should be pointed out. First, the transcultural sphere being functionally equivalent to traditional culture, those who are mainly or wholly transcultural in character are not cosmopolitan in the sense of being detached from any specific culture; rather the transcultural sphere
is their culture which is very specific indeed! It is hard to overstress the importance of this: that the perceived dwindling of cultural affiliations in the course of globalization may, where it occurs, indicate not so much a fusion of separate cultures into some woolly ‘global culture’ but rather the emergence of a new separate culture in a spot where nobody expected it.

Second, if the above holds true, the ‘inhabitants’ of the transcultural sphere are mainly drawn from the technocratic-managerial elite (this includes not just bureaucrats and businessmen but also the above-mentioned scholars, NGO leaders, and a specific type of artist). Consequently, transculturality is mainly an elite phenomenon.

III. The transcultural sphere is self-contained

Thus, in contrast to the traditional view of transculturality first articulated by Ortiz, the transcultural sphere as outlined here does not replace the traditional world of national borders, national cultures, religions, etc. with a ‘global culture’ of ‘mankind’ (whatever that may be). Rather it is:

(i) By and large self-contained: even though it feeds on nation states’ resources and occasionally may even dominate them, it is autonomous in that it forms a coherent system – a closed circuit, metaphorically speaking – whose functional differentiation is such that in order to exist it does not compromise the existence of other such systems, i.e. the separate traditional cultures of the world; thus it is:

(ii) Essentially detached from the traditional, ‘cultural’ world – hovering beyond that world like the mythical city in the clouds.

(This being said, it cannot be doubted that elements of the transcultural sphere have for decades crept into cracks and crevices that have begun to open in the surface of that world of nation states, national cultures, and national traditions. This has long been an object of concern to various schools of cultural pessimism. However, it would be too easy to blame this phenomenon on the transcultural sphere as though this sphere were some kind of cancer attacking healthy organisms. If the transnational sphere expands into areas formerly held by the cultural sphere, it is not because transnationalism is aggressively expansive – for, as we saw, it is not – but because the traditions that make up the cultural sphere have become weak, dwindle, and retreat from where they used to reign. And since the empty spaces thus emerging cannot remain empty – nature’s
‘horror vacui’ coming into effect – those forces that, like the transcultural, remain will fill them. To quote Ernst Jünger once more: ‘On altars abandoned demons dwell’.

(iii) The transcultural sphere came into existence precisely because globalization entailed a specific mode of interaction (transcending not just the national but also the inter-national level) among a relatively small, relatively clearly circumscribed group of people within the technocratic-managerial elites. Given the elite-character of the transcultural sphere, the latter may very well dominate the ‘cultural’ sphere but – for sheer lack of critical mass – will not supplant it.

IV. What about ‘diversity’?

Multi- or interculturality stresses the difference between people. In a multi-/intercultural environment people convene who are defined by their nationality, specific culture, and traditions, and who aspire to build bridges across the gaps constituted by those defining features. Interaction between people in such an environment starts by establishing communication where communication is not a given. It has been claimed that it is precisely this multi-/intercultural mode of interaction that generates added value: with people confronting differences and thereby triggering a productive tension within bi- or multipolar scenarios. This assumption that difference generates added value leads to the conclusion that ‘diverse’ groups of people are more effective than homogenous ones, that ‘diversity’ ought to be encouraged to generate a dynamics otherwise unattainable. Whether this is true or mere cliché is insubstantial in the present context (the empirical evidence seems to be inconclusive). Regarding the issue in hand it is important to note that the concepts of ‘multi-/interculturality’ and ‘diversity’ are closely interlinked, referring to the essential differences between players.

Transculturality, by contrast, is precisely not defined as obtaining between people from different national, cultural, etc. backgrounds, but between people whose national and cultural backgrounds are no longer part of the equation. While in a multi-/intercultural environment culture A and culture B come together in some way through the people representing

---

them, a transcultural environment is culturally homogenous in the sense that there is just one culture namely that of the transnational sphere which transcends into the transcultural sphere. The latter constitutes a self-contained culture $C$ in its own right beyond the space containing culture $A$ and culture $B$. This being so, there is no ‘diversity’ in the transcultural sphere. Within it, people do not meet as Germans, Britons, Vietnamese and Senegalese but solely as ‘inhabitants’ of the transcultural sphere: speaking its language and moving within its institutions using its infrastructure. The fact that manager $X$ and manager $Y$, who work on the same Hong Kong-based team in the marketing department of a global corporation whose headquarters are in Los Angeles, were born in the UK and Thailand, resp., is irrelevant. The terms on which they interact being unrelated to categories of national or cultural belonging, the ‘difference’ between them becomes void in the functional context in which this interaction takes place. Nor is this functional context in any way ‘enriched’ by that ‘difference’ – since the latter is not a difference at all but a folkloristic memory on the same level as Hong Kong’s annual ‘Oktoberfest’ at the Happy Valley Racecourse. – The same would hold true, by the way, if both manager $X$ and manager $Y$ were of Thai descent: even then they would not interact as Thais but as inhabitants of the transcultural sphere and speak its language (at least whenever a non-Thai-born third party is present which will likely be the case most of the time). Nor would this instance constitute a lack of ‘diversity’ for, as we saw, the logics underlying the system ‘transcultural sphere’ neither ask nor allow for ‘diversity’; the notions of ‘transculturality’ and ‘diversity’ are logically incompatible; the transcultural sphere is post-‘diverse’.  

(Even at the risk of repeating myself I should point out once more that most inhabitants of the transcultural sphere are also inhabitants of the cultural sphere. When manager $X$ and manager $Y$ join their families in Stoke-on-Trent and Bangkok to celebrate Christmas and Songkran, respectively, they do so not as inhabitants of the transcultural sphere but as a Briton and a Thai. Having said this, their CEO who recently gave up his flat in Los Angeles since he hardly ever used it anyway and who celebrates Christmas in London, Songkran in Bangkok, and a dozen more such events (none of which means anything to him) in a dozen more countries in which he permanently maintains serviced hotel apartments, may remain an inhabitant of the transcultural sphere even when stopping by in his native Gelsenkirchen to spend New Year’s Eve with his parents.)
Part II

Essays
1. Leadership
Overcoming the Horror Vacui:
The Rediscovering of Leadership in the Face of the European Refugee Crisis

Marco Bitschnau and Max Radzanowski

When Angela Merkel, Chancellor of Germany for more than ten years, Forbes-crowned most powerful woman\(^1\) in the world, and main actor in the Euro Crisis, the Greek Debt Crisis and the Climate Crisis, was holding her 2015 Summer Press Conference, her barely hidden tiredness struck the observer’s eye. It was late August and Merkel was talking about the latest crisis she was involved in; about the massive influx of refugees and asylum seekers that was putting increasingly more pressure on governments across Europe, about the necessity of transnational solution approaches, about Islam and the almost epidemic spread of xenophobia and hate throughout the whole of Germany. She knew that she had to take a firm stance sooner or later: “In most, if not all crises, the moment arrives when a single man or woman must make faithful choices about the government’s course of action” (Boin et al., 2005, p. 43). Without any doubt, Merkel’s moment was there as her remarks culminated in a short sentence which has been repeated innumerable times since then, sending out a message of willpower and helplessness at the very same moment: “Wir schaffen das” (We will manage it).

\(^1\) Cf. Howard 2015.
“Wir schaffen das” – this mantra-turned slogan reveals the underlying, subliminal issues that come to light once one looks past the political facade. It furthermore reveals a notion of desperation in face of the continuous flow of immigrants; and it finally reveals a lot about political leadership\(^2\) as one of the major forces in this ongoing debate about how much we are able, willing and obligated to help others within Europe and out. Obviously, her political endurance and stamina has brought Merkel plenty of new followers and made her stand out from her peers. The London-based *Economist* praised the Chancellor in a series of articles, calling her “bold” as well as “brave, decisive and right” while the US-American magazine *Newsweek* concluded that Merkel has not only “provided rare leadership” (Lebor, 2015, p. 12) in difficult times but that also Germany – as a nation – “has rediscovered leadership” (Leonard, cited by Lebor, 2015, p. 14) in an often extremely shaky, insecure and overstrained assemblage of European nations.

*The Battlefields of Migration and Asylum*

The *topos* itself can hardly be considered new or surprising. Throughout the post-war period, migration to Europe has always been an area of dispute, of ideological discord and political cacophony, a ‘battlefield’ that has captured the attention of the public not only but especially in the continent’s most prosperous and influential member states, namely the United Kingdom, France – and Germany. Back in 1992, seventy percent of the German population called immigration Germany’s most pressing problem, despite high unemployment numbers and the mammoth task of managing the aftermath of the country’s reunification process. Another sixty percent stated the opinion that there were already too many foreigners and that immigration needed to be either drastically reduced or even completely stopped (cf. Martin, 1994, p. 189–190) while the country was additionally trapped “in a cycle of high-profile racist attacks” (Göztürk et al., 2007, p. 107). Although these figures have decreased during the last decades, various signs of discomfort have always remained. According to a study published by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, a consistently high per-

\(^2\) “Political leadership measures the extent to which political life in a polity can be attributed to the top ruler or rulers of that polity” (Blondel, 2014, p. 705).
Overcoming the Horror Vacui

A percentage of Germans—especially in the former Eastern part (the so-called Neue Länder)—have arranged themselves with a far-right world view that often borrows from a potpourri of xenophobia, islamophobia, racism, heteronormativity, anti-Semitism, and an apologetic stance on national socialism or the Third Reich (cf. Decker et al., 2012).

In the last two years, refugees and asylum seekers have replaced ‘regular’ foreigners as a main target for right-wing attacks and populistic diatribes. With the (back then) looming refugee crisis the situation even deteriorated further: more recent findings suggest that up to 42% of Germans show tendencies towards right-wing populism, while most of them still consider themselves politically “exactly in the center” (cf. Neu and Pokorny, 2015, p. 13). As the war-torn and impoverished crisis regions in Africa and the Middle East are eventually collapsing, the fight of millions of refugees and their families for a safe harbor becomes the most urgent issue in the political and social sphere of European democracies: Worlds collide in a crucible of cultures, resentments take form as contrasts become evident and these exceptional circumstances put the European solidarity to the test. It seems reasonable to suppose that the current flows of migration (though already extensive and highly controversial) are nothing more than the beginning, that “[t]he barrier that once protected the rich world from the poor has been crumbling for years, undermined by globalization and the information revolution” and that “[n]o amount of barbed wire and steel can stand it up again” (The Nation, 2015, p. 3).

Therefore, the debate on asylum has good chances of turning out as a long-term challenge for our equally wealthy and aging continent. But due to its visibility (the sheer amount of media coverage trumps any other migration narrative quite easily) it is also likely to turn out as a major field of conflict in the relationship between the people and the political class. Established discursive frameworks and terminologies become more and more contested (cf. Holmes & Castañeda, 2016) while the amount of imagery, focusing on mostly young men with a differentiating set of experiences and values, is very prone to fall prey to societal repercussions and heavily fought battles for the identity of a more and more cosmopolitan and trans-border Europe. In other words, the calamitous presence of the ever-exclusionary binary distinction between “Us” and “Them” will

---

3 The most remarkable single result applies to xenophobia; 25.1% of the German (39% of the East German) population would agree with xenophobic statements.
probably reach new heights. Or, as Zygmunt Bauman aptly expresses it, “[there are] always too many of them. ‘Them’ are the fellows of which there should be fewer [...]” (Bauman, 2004, p. 34). Obviously, it is very much possible to interpret this distaste for the Other simply as naked and bare hostility, fueled by prejudices and the wish for homogeneity. But it is also possible to rather recognize a symptom in it – with the real disease and cause of animosity and hatred being something totally different; something related to a certain kind of fear.

The Horror Vacui and its Origins

We call this fear Horror Vacui. This originally Aristotelian term has been applied to a lot of different fields and categories in the past – from natural philosophy to aesthetics – but the ‘fear of the empty’ has rarely been as manifest as in today’s politics. Basically, the reason therefor lies in the current constitution of our political system. In today’s world, our reception of the constant influx of refugees, asylum seekers and ‘traditional’ immigrants is still deeply interwoven with some basic political developments of the past decades: Globalization, the decline of the nation-state, the decrease of importance of territorial borders, and the emergence of interdependent lateral world systems are all observable political ruptures of our era that are constantly reshaping our views of the world and the political dynamics this world is driven by. This multi-edged Sword of Damocles that’s threatening the historically grown roots of our very society by decentralizing the “power and legitimacy we call sovereignty” (Sassen, 1996, p. 65) leads to a pervasive feeling of uncertainty. And this uncertainty is exactly what the political dimension of the Horror Vacui is all about: the fear of the people to wake up from their romanticized dreams of societal and political actionability, the fear to recognize the no longer controllable nexuses of global challenges and the blank spaces this discovery constitutes on the idol-like painting of the modern-day welfare state.

Evidently, the bulk of Europe’s political leaders is aware of this fear and tries to evade the inevitable by taking the easy way out and repelling

---

4 Another, more playful expression for this classic dichotomy of fear and division is offered in Rudyard Kipling’s We and They (1926): All good people agree / And all good people say / All nice people, like Us, are We / And every one else is They.

the responsibilities to provide meaningful help in this crisis. To fight the Horror Vacui of the people, the political actors try to fill the empty space with a set of measures that might or might not spark true, durable change, but at the very least conveys a sense of security which makes society believe that everything is under control. Their superficial acts and expressions of everyday-politics henceforth create a veil that hides the latent fear of knowing that the nation-state is ever more wavering.

This observation is key for analyzing why Merkel received so much praise for her dictum: She simply was the exception. She understood these limitations better than anybody and thus was still courageous enough to speak up for compassionateness and human dignity while most of her colleagues remained silent or outright abandoned their reputed set of humanitarian, European values; rather talking about fences, barriers and border protection instead. And while Merkel addressed the difficulties in a pragmatic yet optimistic and context-based fashion (knowing that modern-day leadership “is largely a function of context”; Genovese, 2015, p. 105), they created an atmosphere of rejection: a situation in which “refugees are victimized twice – first by their persecutors, then by those who conflate them with the very things that forced them to flee” (Sovcik, 2015). This behavior gives rise to a moral and ethical conduct composed of arbitrary principles, ultimately nourishing the extremist thoughts that continue spreading every day. Merkel, just as all the other leaders of her political clout, probably knows that the crisis will not be taken care of with words alone; the problem is so complex and multilayered that no single country – not even an influential one like Germany – can handle it on its own. But she stands as a beacon of hope for those who want to welcome and live with the Other.

Through her simple gesture, the Chancellor has managed not only to assume an alternative position but also to create and uphold the medial image of a real political leader, one that doesn’t back down in dire circumstances and who knows that “[t]he virtues of liberal democracies do not consist in their capacities to close their borders but their capacities to hear the claims of those who, for whatever reasons, knock at our doors” (Benhabib, 2002, p. 171). Obviously, just hearing these claims does not constitute any kind of formal recognition or material benefits at all – but the mere consciousness that a large and self-perpetuating imbalance of life chances on a global scale exists may lead to the acknowledgement of a moral obligation.
Towards an ‘Other’ Society

With Globalization and its surroundings at hand, not only the world will change in a rather merciless fashion but also our social and political environment itself will become more and more frail and susceptible. This is an evolving process that is hardly reversible as cultures, world views, languages, religions, belief systems and sometimes even group identities become blurred and indistinct in multiple aspects; a “hyper-change” as new norm, “creating disequilibrium and disorientation” (Genovese, 2015, p. 101). The halcyon days of a less complicated, less challenged and less self-critical Europe are definitely over and probably won’t ever come back, no matter how much we may be hoping for it or how many populist speeches may be held in marble-lined offices and richly adorned parliamentary halls. The Horror Vacui as a fear is lastly a societal implication of all of these factors. For now, it can still be covered just enough to give the people a feeling of comfort, but it remains questionable for how long this will be possible, as the constant influx of more and more refugees will surely become noticeable in every aspect of life.

More often than not, the narrow window named media that lets the native population peek into the lives of the Other is eager to portray a rather negative image of the situation – instead of focusing on everything that already works well. Even though last year, Angela Merkel has managed to add yet another title to her impressive portfolio as TIME Magazine’s Person of the Year (being the first woman in 29 years to do so) for her handling of this unprecedented immigration crisis, much of the public discourse is overshadowed by the outrage over singular events such as the incidents in Cologne on New Year’s Eve 2015, causing right-wing populists to gain more and more momentum in recent elections (a phenomenon that is observable throughout most of Europe). And yet, despite minor concessions the seemingly never-ending political catena of negotiating, bargaining, haggling and gazumping has been thoroughly cracked by the unforeseeable speed of the refugee wave. An event with

6 In Germany, the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), initially established with the goals of abolishing the common Euro currency and backing down on multinational integration, quickly became a hub for anti-immigration sentiments, rising from just over 5% back in September 2015 to 24.2% in the elections of March 2016 in Saxony-Anhalt. While this is certainly the most extreme example, a common trend can be observed in polls nationwide.
the crude power of a natural force was necessary to ultimately disclose the wretched Status Quo of today’s politics and the waning of illusionary or outdated viewpoints, at least temporarily.

However, not everyone is truly familiar with this new reality yet and today we stand just on the brink of a sweeping paradigm shift in society with a plethora of daily-life challenges (e.g. social mobility7). Nowadays, corporations as well as organizations usually tend to embrace and propose mutual understanding when reaching out to immigrants, minorities or other special factions in their workforce in order to accommodate the newcomers’ needs and avoid any possible traps of social ostracism (cf. Mor Barak, 2014). While this might show noble intentions and open-mindedness, it is often detrimental to the atmosphere, since “[c]ross-cultural collaboration always and everywhere means changes on everybody’s part” (Simons et al., 1993, p. 102). Hence, it’s not only a matter of managing the transcultural world but it’s equally important to have real political leadership that continues shaping our modern society, defying opportunist advances and defending the humanitarian principles. To warmheartedly open the doors means to embrace the Other to its fullest extent; not only in the sense of acknowledging it as equally worthy, but also in empowering it to actively partake in the development of society.

Regardless, the topic undoubtedly remains highly relevant and is sure to spark new forms of social discourse. At the heart of the issue, the loss of sovereignty, control and manoeuvrability of the nation-state has to be handled in a purposeful and reasoned manner in order to prevent the Horror Vacui from spreading further. The transitive process we’re in is not easy to manage, but with adequate impulses like the ones exhibited by Angela Merkel it may be steered without causing too much friction. Only then a truly global society – an ‘other’ society – can emerge and flourish in the minds as well as in the institutions our political system is based upon.

7 According to Müller and Pollak 2004, there is no evidence “for a development towards increasing fluidity between the [...] social categories [in Germany] and a significant tendency towards relative inequality and weak inter-generational mobility”. While other studies (for example by the OECD) are placing Germany more mid-table, they are stating that since 2000 “income inequality and poverty have grown faster in Germany than in any other OECD country”; see OECD, 2008. This development hasn’t changed much in the aftermath of the shaky years in between according to more recent findings (cf. OECD, 2015).
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Global Corporate Governance Regime

Patrick Lühlow

The following sketch discusses the possibility as well as features of self-governance of the globalized market regime. It is assumed that ethical leadership and governance ethics incorporate the potential to tackle problems going along with the present lack of institutions and therefore the lack of capacities to regulate a globalized economy. Hence, governance theory as well as the theory of the firm and leadership theory will be brought together.

1. The Problem

The nation state sees itself challenged by different developments. (1) It is not the defining entity of international politics. In fact: “It does however become part of a more complex constellation of actors, including institutions, transnational corporations, transnational NGOs, foundations, social movements, global policy networks” (Willke, 2007, p. 8) and others. (2) In this arena the developed nations and their welfare-systems see themselves confronted with their »semi-globalization« (ibid., p. 74). (3) The intensified globalization lead to global institutions like “the WTO for global economic system (...) the World Bank and the IMF for the development context” (ibid., p. 42) and others. At the same time (4): “the national economies of the nation states extend beyond their boundaries and merge into an interconnected global economy!” (ibid., p. 55). (5) Being depended on it and its actors, the nation states compete against each other by setting
the most attractive conditions in their respective environments for corporations, which are able to relocate, i.e., they liberalize and thereby reduce their capacities to handle a globalized economy and its implications even further. Since there is no global political system (ibid., p. 64), “self-governance of lateral world systems is dire necessity” (ibid., p. 57).

Unlike industrialized countries, developing countries do not even have regulative capacities and abilities going along with welfare states. Negative external effects, exemplified by problems of pollution, waste, contamination of land, problems for the market, like fraud and corruption, and legal problems, foremost human rights abuses, like child labor, but also deplorable working conditions, can at least partly be tackled by national regulation in developed countries. But developing countries suffer from the competition over the most attractive regulative settings for corporations, from which often a undercutting competition follows.

Societies all over the world are in a transitional phase where the economy and its actors are already using the advantages of globalization while politics is still bounded by the scope of nation states. Especially developing countries suffer from the implications of the predominant absence of institutions since they miss capacities to oversee firms and secure that they meet their responsibility to act within the laws. Hence, we lack regulation, institutions and governance on a global level.

Tackling the problems which societies, in particular those of developing countries, face requires “Ethical Leadership” on a global level. This is on the one hand the basis for the integration of “Governance Ethics” into business and on the other hand carries the potential of smart global corporate governance structures.

2. The Responsibility of the Firm and its Managers in a Globalized Economy

The lack of global institutions and governance uncovers the relevance of the question as to how firms and its managers bear responsibility for their respective actions in liberal market economies. In the following part perspectives on this question as well as an on the conceptualization of the firm and its purpose will be presented, compared, and discussed. The core thoughts will be developed in contrast to Friedman’s arguments outlined next.
2.1 Firms and their Managers Cannot Be Responsible

Friedman neglects the responsibility of firms since it would contradict their function in the free market process, which is to make the highest profit possible. As a legal body, it does not have something like a corporate responsibility since “only people have responsibilities” (Friedman, 1970, p. 1, as well as Jensen & Meckling, 1976, p. 311). Rather the firm has to be understood as “a legal fiction which serves as a focus for a complex process in which the conflicting objectives of individuals (some of whom may “represent” other organizations) are brought into equilibrium within a framework of contractual relations.” (ibid.). It follows, that it is a mistake to think of organizations “as if they were persons with motivations and intentions.” (ibid.).

From the fact that the firm is nothing less than “a nexus of a set of contracting relationships among individuals” follows that its behavior “is like the behavior of the market; i.e., the outcome of a complex equilibrium process.” (ibid.).

The businessperson, respectively the manager, who as an individual could take responsibility for his private actions, is, in the context of the firm, only “the agent of the individuals, who own the corporation” (Friedman, 1970, p. 1). Owners of the corporations are the shareholders, who share “divisible residual claims on the assets and cash flows of the organization which can generally be sold without permission of the other contracting individuals” (Jensen & Meckling, 1976, p. 311). Thus the corporate executive “has direct responsibility to his employees” (Friedman, 1970, p. 1). He follows their expectations to maximize the firm’s profits. As a matter of course, the corporate actions have to go along with the “basic rules of the society, both those embodied in law and those embodied in ethical custom” (ibid.).

A businessperson, who acts like the firm has a responsibility, causes not only by economic problems in terms of the success of his company but also by problems of social welfare with regard to allocation and its control. Friedman argues that as soon as actions do not serve the interest of the shareholders (employers of the agent), but a social cause, the businessman is in fact raising and spending a kind of tax (ibid., p. 2). Hence,  

---

1 “the personalization of the firm implied by asking questions such as »what should be the objective of the firms«, or »does the firm have a social responsibility« is seriously misleading. The Firm is not individual.” (Jensen & Meckling, 1976, p. 311)
the businessperson would be more of a public employee than a businessperson (ibid.). Being responsible for imposing, spending and controlling the tax (Friedman, 2011, p. 165) safeguards, like the separation of powers or the system of checks and balances, would be of no concern for him (Friedman, 1970, p. 3). This situation would raise questions as how he would know how to spend the money or how much would and should he spent? Would he even get away with spending it, since it contradicts the expectations of the owners (respectively his principals)? (Friedman, 2011, p. 165)

Jensen & Meckling showed that the relationship between principals (shareholders) and agents (managers) is already inherently tense, because of the information asymmetry that follows from the separation of ownership (principal) and control (agent) (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). This could lead to situations where the agent is not always acting on behalf of his principal (ibid.: 308), which for example would be the case if he used the shareholder money for social causes. In order to tackle this problem the agents get shares of the corporation so the interests of the principals reflect the interests of the agents. From these contractual relationships follows that maximization of the utility of the shareholders is the maximization of the utility of the management. Additionally, independent auditors, who “testify the accuracy and correctness” (ibid., p. 306) of the accounting reports, were engaged as well.

The respective authors argue on the basis of a liberal perspective: “the great virtue of private competitive enterprise [lies within the fact that] it forces people to be responsible for their own actions and makes it difficult for them to »exploit« other people for either selfish or unselfish purposes. They can do good but only at their own expense.” (Friedman, 1970, p. 4). Consequently, Friedman summarizes: “there is one and only one social responsibility of business: to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays within the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition without deception or fraud.” (ibid., p. 6).
Global Corporate Governance Regime

2.2 Firms Are Networks Creating Mutual Advantage by Taking Mutual Responsibility

As delineated so far, societies all over the world see themselves confronted with a deficit of institutions that could make sure that firms follow the mentioned “basic rules of the society” (Friedman, 1970, p. 1) they operate in. Nonetheless, firms are convicted in cases of deception, fraud and other criminal actions on a regular basis. Moreover societal expectations regarding “ethical custom” (ibid.) have changed significantly within the last decade. All this leads to the increased necessity to come up with a contemporary understanding of the firm, its purpose, and consequently the implications this has on the comprehension of its responsibility.

Jensen and Meckling’s (1976, p. 311) conceptualization of the firm as a “bundle of contractual relationships” seemingly open up a link to Wieland’s conception of it. Whereas they only include formal contracts, non-formal contracts could be added on the basis of his argument (Wieland, 2014, p. 110) but in fact he dissociates from this approach, stressing the contradicting propositions of agency theory regarding the form of the firm: “Agency theory follows the principles of methodological individualism and must consequently constitute the firm as an autonomous legal form” (ibid., p. 126). However, at the same time the “multitudes of contractual relationships” (Jensen & Meckling, 1976, p. 311) open up the firm’s links to the owners. Hence, the agency theory negates to “see it as an economic entity of its own which can be distinguished from its stakeholders” (Wieland, 2014, p. 126).

Consequently, Wieland proposes to define the firm as “a societal cooperation project with multiple stakeholders to utilize its resources under the conditions of market cooperation. It is a contractual enforcement form of organized cooperation” (Wieland, 2009, p. 282). Through this interconnected process, actors can “pursue their needs and interests for mutual advantage” (ibid., p. 284). In other words, firms are “an economic and societal form of governance of stakeholder-relationships with which the members of the society pursue their economic transactions” (Wieland/Heck, 2013).

From integrating more stakeholders into the firm by defining it as a “nexus of stakeholders” it follows that not only principle-agent problems have to be taken into account by governance solutions. Rather, firms have to come up with communication processes, which consider the dif-
ferent stakeholders constituting their network. Empirically, this can be seen in the various forms of political discourses, e.g.: “stakeholder dialogues, multi-stakeholder, deliberative discourses, stakeholder networks” (Wieland, 2014, p. 121). Processes like these enable “the integration of dispersed knowledge and of new ideas” (ibid., p. 121).

If different stakeholders are integrated in the firm as a cooperation project, its mere sense is no longer just to increase shareholder value but to create shared value. This shared value is a »cooperation rent« for all integrated stakeholders. The »cooperation rent« is proportionally distributed in reference to the yield resources of the respective stakeholders (ibid.). Bringing the different resources together as effectively as possible results in “a higher level of factor remuneration than by exploiting their resources individually on the market” (ibid., p. 110). Thus, this approach can be understood as a value creation theory “characterized by the assumption that the consideration and integration of the interest of actors involved in firm decisions and transactions creates economic value and new docking points for economic transactions, for both the firm and the actors concerned.” (ibid., p. 108).

This stakeholder theory allows to integrate responsibility and values not by referring to a social cause but, according to Freeman (et al., 2006 – as cited in Wieland, 2014²), by “shaping the conditions for the economic success of a network of economic actors” (ibid., p. 108). Freeman (et al., 2006 – as cited in Wieland, 2014) shows that these conditions are based on three pillars (ibid.): The cooperation principle (1)³ states that keeping agreements (formal & informal) is of mutual advantage for both partners. The responsibility theory (2)⁴ argues that responsibility for each other’s actions is taken. While being responsible for the shared success of the network is at the same time a requirement for the access to the network

² Note: the respective paper is unpublished. Therefore it was not possible to cite the original source, nevertheless it is still listed in the references.

³ (1) Cooperation principle: “Value can be created, traded and sustained because stakeholders can jointly satisfy their needs and desires by making voluntary agreements with each other that for the most part are kept.” (Freeman et al., 2006, p. 26)

⁴ (2) Responsibility theory: “Value can be created, traded and sustained because parties to an agreement are willing to accept responsibility for the consequences of their actions.” (ibid., p. 67)
as a stakeholder. The complexity principle (3)\(^5\) stresses the possible multidimensional actions and perceptions of people.

Consequently, values and responsibility are not notions which contradict the economic success of the firm, but rather shape the conditions for it. Resources are still used as effectively as possible – however within the process of a network producing mutual advantages.

3. Leadership Excellence and Global Corporate Governance Regimes

Besides deducing normatively the need for corporate responsibility it could be derived from an understanding of the firm as a “Nexus of Stakeholders” integrating mutual value creation into organizations and especially corporations. Turning to “Ethical Leadership” an individual dimension will be added to the organizational one and the theory of the firm will be connected with leadership theory while keeping governance theory in mind.

To be successful, the approach of ethical leadership has to bring together philosophic and managerial approaches by managers, who are character- and value-driven as well as acting globally. Character has to be understood as “the moral and moral-economic willingness and capacity of individuals and organizations” (Wieland, 2014, p. 241). Defining this requirement for both levels shows the interdependency of firms and individuals – individual character formation through the organization as well as organizational character formation through its leaders. The integration of values is an interactive process. The central value of “ethical leadership” has to be integrity, since – as Paine (1991) pointed out – it includes “honesty, fairness, observance of responsibilities, respect for people and property, the rejection of willful deceit and the capacity for critical self-reflection” (as cited in Wieland, 2014, p. 235). Since ethical leaders have to act globally, integrity should be an universal value as well as the basis for a transcultural understanding in a world where cultural spheres merge into each other more and more as Welsch points out\(^6\) (1999, p. 196).

\(^5\) Complexity principle: “Value can be created, traded, and sustained because human beings are complex psychological creatures capable of acting of from many different values and points of view.” (ibid., p. 67)

\(^6\) “Cultures de facto no longer have the insinuated form of homogeneity and separateness. The have instead assumend a new form, which is to be called transcultural
An ethical and transcultural leader has an understanding for the actual as well as possible (global) effects of his actions in organizations, he is led by his integrity and he leads by his sensitivity for interdependency of the different societal stakeholders constituting his organization. He recognizes that not only his organization but the economy as a whole is a “socially embedded system” (Granovetter, 1992 – as cited in Willke, 2007, p. 21). Having shown that including responsibility by integrating different stakeholders forms the conditions for economic success an ethical leader embraces those chances by seizing them.

For example excellent leaders could implement standards like the “Global Compact” or “ISO 26000”. These are examples of voluntary commitments that enable organizations to become part of networks that offer “convincing arguments and expertise” (Willke, 2007, p. 98) concerning their aims and potential in guiding the organizations in their endeavor to integrate social responsibility. Providing this guidance and expertise makes it possible for ISO to become a definitional stakeholder7 of the network constituting the firm. The same is true for the UN Global Compact, which is a network of UN institutions, international NGOs, but most importantly self-committed firms that want to meet the UN standards8. It can therefore be seen as a “patient and modest approach of coordinating and combining the distributed governance systems” (Willke, 2007, p. 59). Both standards appear to be ways to foster “modes of indirect rule, decentralized regulation or contextual guidance, relying predominantly on the self-organization and self-governance of highly complex and competent lateral world systems, combining these decentralized

insofar that it passes through classical boundaries. Cultural conditions today are largely characterized by mixes and permeations” (Welsch, 1999, p. 196).

7 Standards like ISO 206000 and Global Compact make it possible for Institutions behind those standards to become “definitional stakeholder” of the firm as “Nexus of Stakeholder” since they bring in resources in the “societal cooperation project” the firm constitutes (Wieland, 2014, p. 115). Thereby they contrast classical political institutions like governments or administrative organs, which “act as institutions for the issuing and enforcement of laws” (ibid., p. 110) Those „classical institutions“ are only “instrumental stakeholders” and can’t become stakeholder of the network.

8 They are formulated as ten principles, which refer to human rights, labor, the environment and anti-corruption. They are derived from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work of the ILO, the Rio Declaration of Environment and Development and the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (https://www.unglobalcompact.org).
modes of governance with modest rules of overarching coordination!” (ibid., p. 98). Moreover they exemplify possibilities for a firm to observe changes in their environment and “adapt to them by setting new rules for itself.” (ibid., p. 21).

These standards account for the fact that the relationships and connections between actors, sectors, systems become fuzzy. Approaches, which try to solve problems in this setting, have to take this into account. The “ISO 26000” and “Global Compact” do so by means of “persuasion, deliberation, convincing arguments and expertise” (Willke, 2007, p. 84).

Seeing politics and economy separated, i.e., regulation as mostly external constraint for economic operations, like Friedman argued, proves to be outdated since the complexity of our societal conditions has risen. The UN and the ISO meet this increased complexity by introducing their standards as “structures, processes and rule systems that have the capabilities to provide intelligent decisions for highly complex and concatenated problems” (Willke, 2007, p. 42) Consequently, they enable a form of global corporate governance regimes and exemplify the links of leadership theory, theory of the firm, and global governance structures with each other. This is, if leadership is defined as leadership excellence, the firm is defined as a “nexus of stakeholders” and governance is defined as “smart governance”.

It can be concluded that the nation state sees itself challenged by different developments. Ethical leadership can meet some of the challenges arising from those developments, which is an integral part of Governance Ethics. Both are the basis for a smart global corporate governance regime or reworded self-governance of the economic system.
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The Introduction of the European Monetary Union

How Political Managers and Political Leaders Decide in Transcultural Contexts

Michael Ganslmeier

1. Introduction: “The United Nations of Europe”

Introduced as the new money of “The United Economy of Europe.”
Considered as the new policy of “The United Politics of Europe.”
Celebrated as the next step to “The United Nations of Europe.”

Eleven years later, something is different. Following the world financial crisis in 2008/09, the state debt crisis of several nations of the Eurozone found its peak in 2011. Before the Euro was introduced, many economists already cast doubt on the usefulness of a European monetary union. On the other side, many European politicians emphasized the importance of further integration between the different countries and cultures through one single currency. One might argue that the political arguments won at first and was then proven wrong by the economic arguments in 2011. However, in this paper, the focus is not on ‘who was right’ and ‘who was wrong’. In fact, the focus is on the role of transcultural political leadership in supranational contexts where different political cultures come together.

In order to answer this question, the introduction of the European monetary union seems to perfectly suit as an example since the Euro was both in a supranational context (shifting national competencies to the European Central Bank) and in a transcultural context (integrating national
into a transcultural political monetary system). Before analysing the role of transcultural leadership in such contexts, I will get more in depth into the economic and political perspectives concerning the Euro introduction.

2. The Economic No: 
Mundell’s Optimum Currency Area Theory

After Ireland, Greece and several other Eurozone countries collapsed, the Optimum Currency Area theory (OCA theory), firstly developed by Robert A. Mundell in 1961, seems to be more actual than ever before, especially in the economic and political discussion about the perfect size of the European Monetary Union.

The economic rationales in favour of one single currency concern different aspects. First of all, it is a common argument that one single currency drives transactions costs down in a way that the payment process of international transactions becomes less costly (cf. Hooper & Kohlhagen, 1978). Changing currencies refers to a direct cost because of the required intermediation service as well as an indirect cost because of greater risk exposure due to exchange risks (cf. Hooper and Kohlhagen, 1978). Secondly, it is argued that one currency will increase the price transparency in the different countries of the monetary area (cf. European Commission, 2013). Finally, it is assumed that a single currency country contains less uncertainty/risk exposure due to diversification effects (cf. De Santis & Gerard, 2006). Therefore, the enlargement of the currency area might have a stabilizing effect on the inflation rate.

On the other side, the most dangerous inconvenience can be seen in the heavy impact of a single currency in times of crisis. In other and more metaphoric words, a single currency in a crisis is like oil in a burning factory. It may deepen the interconnections between countries and therefore intensifies the domino effect during a crisis. In this context, it is important to understand the nature of a currency area: a currency union is similar to a fixed exchange rate system: it sets the currency of a region in a specific ratio to another currency. In an integrated currency area, there is only one currency and therefore, the money that is switched for trading is fixed since one Euro in Italy has the same value as one Euro in Austria for instance (cf. McKinnon, 1963). Moreover, the majority of monetary instruments of national central banks and governments cannot be applied any-
more to act in the interest of all countries because helping the struggling countries would mean punishing the growing countries (cf. Frieden, 1998).

Recognizing this unfortunately nature of a currency area, Mundell (1961) stated three fundamental conditions that have to be fulfilled in order to define the optimal size of a monetary union. Due to the difficulty of applying the sufficient and just monetary policy, Mundell (1961) defines that only countries with similar/equal business cycles and similar/equal demand shocks can be in one monetary union because only then monetary policies can be applied to the whole union in times of crisis. The second condition of Mundell (1961) concerns factor mobility and the flexibility in the labour market. One of the major problems of a demand shock is the danger of unemployment. A shock that hits country A negatively and country B positively will lead to unemployment in A and overemployment in B if labour (and capital) cannot move freely. Finally, the third condition concerns the necessity of the openness of the national economic systems (trade integration). For instance, trade barriers influence negatively factor mobility because it is more costly to shift capital and labour between countries.

In particular, the economic literature also took a close look at the Eurozone by looking through Mundell’s lenses and the majority came to the result that many countries (especially Greece) were not part of the optimum Euro currency area as it was established in 1999 (cf. Breuss, 2011). For instance, France indicated high labour market rigidities. Italy’s, Spain’s and Portugal’s economy showed less correlations with the economic performance of the majority of the Eurozone core countries (cf. Thode et al., 1999; Riboud et al., 2002; Rebelo & Alves, 2011; Bayoumi and Eichengreen, 1997). The only countries that would belong to an optimum currency area are Germany, Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands.

Even though there exists a broad range of other economic theories that might come to the different result about the Euro introduction from an economic perspective, Mundell’s framework is still the most prominent and accepted model in economic science concerning the question of monetary unions. Therefore, it is not astonishing that many economists emphasized his model in the discussing before 1999 and after 2011.
3. The Political Yes: Political Theories in the Euro introduction

In the last years and decades, well-known theories of international relations like rational choice, realism, and internationalism got more into focus in the academic and political sphere when talking about the European integration.

When we take a closer look at the Euro as the new European currency, the rationales, stated by the European Commission (2015), underline on the one side the economic dimensions: price stability, lower volatility of the new currency, integration of financial markets and the possibility to a supranational regulation, and economic growth potential. Robert Keohane (1982) sees the rise of international organizations when demand and supply for international regimes are due to reducing transaction costs and limiting asymmetrical uncertainty. In other words, the economic advantages of the Euro were often referred to economic welfare gains inside the European Union. This argumentation follows the logic of the rational-choice theory on the organizational level.

However, also political aspects concerning the European Union in the world play a role as another argument for the Euro and it was seen that it would strengthen the European continent in the global world markets and empowering the presence of the EU in the world economy (cf. European Commission, 2015). In this context, it is crucial to have the situation in the late 90s in mind: after several years of the reunion of Germany and a weak economic growth and a lost of competitiveness against large economies like the US (cf. Röger, 2002), the European countries faced a situation where their position as powerful global player was in danger. The sentiment “we are stronger together” formed an idea that could give Europe both economic momentum in terms of growth and political momentum in terms of power. Another aspect was made by Feldstein’s analysis (1998) as he reviewed the self-interest reasons of the EU member countries. He saw that “countries may join the EMU and participate in the future European political development not because they favor that as such, but because they fear that they will be discriminated against in other European Union activities if they do not join” (Feldstein, 1998). Taking this into account and the structure of the new established European Central Bank in Frankfurt (each country has one seat in the ECB Council), the politicians of the joining countries saw also an increase of political economic power of their country in spite of handing over a large part of
the national monetary policy competencies (Feldstein, 1998). And this is even true for Germany, the largest and most powerful economy in Europe because the country could influence through the ECB the monetary policy of all joining countries. Therefore, from a political realism point of view, the joining of the Eurozone due to power seeking incentives (inside and outside the Eurozone) seems to make sense for all Eurozone member countries.

Finally and maybe the most long run effect of the Euro lies in the integrating momentum again and again emphasized by Euro advocates who saw in the Euro the next great step to the United States of Europe. Helmut Kohl called it a historical chance. Hereby, the integration through a single currency is multifaceted: first, the establishment of a supranational monetary policy developed by all member countries should bring the national political areas closer together following the logic that the political convergence can be pushed forward through the economic convergence. This was especially important after years of multilateral policy of alliances (cf. Nowak, 2014). Second, further and deeper dependencies, especially with economic nature, will make it even more impossible for military violence on the European continent. For instance, the German chancellor Helmut Kohl saw the European Monetary Union as “the best way to prevent a recurrence of a war in Europe” (Feldstein, 1998). Taking the economy as a forerunner for political change already worked out at the very first beginning of European Coal and Steel Community in 1951. And finally, third, the idea that a common currency supports the identification of national citizens with the EU and transforms national pride to European pride and reminds of the common values of all the countries in spite of differing cultures (cf. European Commission, 2015). In this context, one might argue that a political integration may also lead to social integration (cf. Habermas, 1995). Integration for the sake of integration and the creation of a supranational identification is mainly proposed by supporters of stream of internationalism who saw the solutions to the majority of social issues in the bundling of resources through international and intercultural cooperations.

In summary, the political debate about the Euro introduction seems to be a mixture of many different arguments based on different theories. The rationales for the monetary union were discussed heterogeneously in different countries. For instance, the German pro-Euro politicians focused the softer positive consequences of the Euro (identity, peace keeping)
whereas smaller economies like Italy and Spain emphasized the economic (growth and stability) and political benefits (power) the EMU would have for their countries (cf. Miller, 1998). In order to understand the different approaches taken by the leading pro-Euro politicians of the joining member countries, the last section will bring the economic and political rationales together with two different ways of political leadership in the context of the EMU.

4. How Political Managers and Political Leaders Decide in Transcultural Contexts

Even though the term leadership was widely discussed by the academic and practical sphere in the last decades, the term transcultural leadership is a newer phenomenon (cf. Simons et al., 1993). A common leadership definition refers to “the power or ability to lead other people” (Learner’s Dictionary, 2016). The term transcultural – “trans” defined as “bridging between different cultures” – indicates that transcultural leadership refers to the ability to lead groups and individuals with diverse cultural background in order to achieve certain outcomes together.

In the political arena, supranational and international political themes deal with transculturalism most of the time. Therefore, the appropriate political leadership style in a multicultural context seems to be a necessary condition for the successful outcome of such political projects like the EMU. The separation of Burns (1978) and Baas (1985) in transformational and transactional leadership is one of the most used political leadership style theories also nowadays. According to Burns (1978) transforming leadership refers to a “process in which leaders and followers help each other to advance to a higher level of morale and motivation” (Burns, 1978). Additionally, the transforming approach rebuilds perceptions, values and expectations of organizations and individuals and it is based on the “leader’s personality, traits and ability to make a change through example, articulation of an energizing vision and challenging goals” (Kerzner, 2015, p. 180). On the other side, the transactional approach focuses on the operational activities and it tries to create awareness of a beneficial cost benefit analysis (cf. Burns, 1978). In this way, the transactional leader is closer to a management style than a visionary one. Following Burns (1978, p. 3), this kind of leader “approaches followers with an eye to exchanging one thing for another.” In other words, transactional
leadership is closer to management than transforming leadership. Combining these theoretical definitions with transcultural leadership, Derungs-Ruhier (2010) sees that “transcultural leadership is suggested as the new leadership concept, which uses different aspects of transformational leadership and the redefinition of the concept of transculture.”

Regarding this classification, the Euro introduction debate serves as a good example for the analysis of transcultural and political leadership styles since there are strong arguments with both a visionary nature (rather long term) and a cost-benefit-analysis nature (rather short term). Needless to say, the EMU refers to a highly transcultural situation since it was the task of the new established supranational organizations of the EU (e.g. the ECB) to integrate cultural different national politics into one common monetary system. Before 1999, the challenges of these national institutions varied widely from country to country. For instance, Germany’s national bank’s policy focused primarily on the internal price stability and the reunion in 1989/90 – a pretty special task for the German Bundesbank. Smaller economies like Belgium had to be keener about the external value of their currency since its dependence on trade with other countries was crucial for their economic success (cf. Worldbank, 2015). The central banks of southern European countries like Spain served more often as lender of last resort due to their economic crisis they faced the years before the EMU (cf. Etxezarreta et al., 2011). This complex situation makes it obvious that an appropriate political leadership before and after the integration process had to combine the different national competencies by bringing different monetary political cultures together in order to establish a successful EMU.

If we take a closer look to the political decision makers of the joining country and how they persuaded the national parliaments, it seems that the leadership style highly depends on the political and economic situation each country faced at that time. For instance, the German chancellor Helmut Kohl, one of the Euro advocates, emphasized the big idea behind the new currency. Economic reasons were less important since Germany’s economy was in a stable growth period (vgl. Ecfin, 2002). He said that the Euro would be a historical chance and a once-in-a-hundred-years event for the European countries and that the new currency is the decisive basis for a living together in peace, liberty, wealth and social stability (cf. Bundestag, 2013). In his speech at the German Bundestag, Kohl’s leadership style refers to a transforming and transcultural one since it
underlines the danger of the recurrence of national and cultural clashes after centuries of war.

In contrast to Germany, Italy faced a completely different political situation before the introduction of the Euro. The government of prime minister Romano Prodi stood for reforms to ensure economic stability and the fulfillment of the Maastricht criteria; so the public debate about the Euro introduction was less meaningful in the Italian society than in Germany. Speaking in numbers, 78% of the population was in favor with the European monetary union (cf. Miller, 1998). Thus, a transforming leadership style by the heads of government was less required than in Germany because it seemed to be “enough” to indicate the economical usefulness of the Euro for Italy. Therefore, it refers more to a transactional and managerial leadership style.

This short analysis shows that the leadership styles can differ across countries widely. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the national political and economic situation seem to have a significant influence on which political leadership is applied. If this is the case, we face a major problem: transactional politicians as synonym for managerial politicians make their positions dependent on the current situation and the question about the national benefits of the supranational project is omnipresent, also after the establishment of the project. However, in times of crisis such a leadership style makes the whole situation even worse since the cost-benefit analysis of all single countries degrades the transcultural collaboration in a way that the inherent fragility of the supranational project increases due to lacking support even further (e.g. current Euro crisis). Therefore, in a transcultural and converging world, the necessity of the upcoming of transforming political leaders, whose motivation is not based on national self-interests but on policy (here: integration) seeking (cf. Weber, 1968), is a crucial step to master the next supranational projects. Stating it in even harder words: supranational collaboration projects can even fail due to their fragile constitution provoked by transactional or rather managerial leadership.

Transcultural issues and movements are based on the belief of achieving more together in the long run where short term interest maximization of single political entities are rather unstable and more volatile due to the current situation. And therefore, the success of political integration in a fast changing political environment transforming political leadership becomes even more crucial since the political leaders are able to go through
times of crisis unlike political managers do because the first one see the greater picture of the whole project.

– “The manager administers. The leader innovates.” –
– “The manager accepts the status quo. The leader challenges it.” –
– “The manager has his eye on the bottom line; the leader has his eye on the horizon.” –

(Warren Bennis, 1925–2014)
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The Transcultural Leader

A Study Resulting in Five Core Statements

Tim Robert Schleicher

Steering Towards a Joint Future

I begin this paper with Barack Obama’s Middle East speech “On a New Beginning”. Obama’s speech demonstrates the foundation and possible application of transcultural leadership in practice. To me, Obama and his corresponding speech exemplify transcultural leadership because they incorporate several elements I will outline over the course of this paper: Focusing on transcultural commonalities, rather than intercultural differences, in order to enable the capacity to cooperate; developing a global understanding of the world’s interconnectedness and contributing to a shared global moral order that does not amount to the worldwide imposition of a current one; and, most importantly, to bridge societal divisions, to embrace the challenges humanity faces, and to tackle them on the basis of a global sense of responsibility.

On June 4, 2009 the President of the United States of America, Barack Obama stepped up to the podium at Cairo University in Egypt. To that day, war had overshadowed the Middle East and tensions between the US on the one hand, and states of the Middle East on the other hand, had hardened. One reason for this situation was, for instance, George W. Bush’s “War on Terror” including the war against the Iraqi government that started 2003. Six years later, Obama gives his Middle East speech. ¹ Early in his speech, Obama says:

¹ Obama says retrospectively: “My argument was this: Let’s all stop pretending that the cause of the Middle East’s problems is Israel. (…) I was hoping that my speech
I’m grateful for your hospitality, and the hospitality of the people of Egypt. And I’m also proud to carry with me the goodwill of the American people, and a greeting of peace from Muslim communities in my country: Assalaamu alaykum. (Obama, 2009)

Immediately, the audience applauds – and a connection has been fostered. In the following excerpt also from the beginning of his speech, Obama shows major elements of transcultural leadership:

So long as our relationship is defined by our differences, we will empower those who sow hatred rather than peace, those who promote conflict rather than the cooperation that can help all of our people achieve justice and prosperity. And this cycle of suspicion and discord must end. I’ve come here to Cairo to seek a new beginning between the United States and Muslims around the world, one based on mutual interest and mutual respect, and one based upon the truth that America and Islam are not exclusive and need not be in competition. Instead, they overlap, and share common principles – principles of justice and progress; tolerance and the dignity of all human beings. (ibid.)

This leadership style is a result of having gone through formative human experiences. To me, Obama has the capacity to be an outstanding role model at least partly due to his personal experiences of growing up under exceptional circumstances in a more and more interconnected world. Regarding Obama’s life and his identity, Gbotokuma states that

Obama’s global understanding and propensity to building global bridges are the results of life circumstances such as education, community service and, above all, the diversity of his family. (Gbotokuma, 2012, p. 1)

Obama grew up in a variety of diverse ethnic and cultural contexts. For instance, as a child he lived in Indonesia for several years with his mother. When he arrived in Asia, he neither spoke the local language, nor was he familiar with the prevalent cultural norms; however, he still managed to communicate and to relate to local people making him a true polyglot. It could trigger a discussion, could create space for Muslims to address the real problems they are confronting (…). My thought was, I would communicate that the U.S. is not standing in the way of this progress, that we would help, in whatever way possible, to advance the goals of a practical, successful Arab agenda that provided a better life for ordinary people.” (Obama, 2016; cited in Goldberg, 2016)
was also during his childhood when he learnt that a sense of belonging is not necessarily tied to one’s background or ethnicity. Obama grew up in both black and white environments. He writes that

> to slip back and forth between my black and white worlds, understanding that each possessed its own language and customs and structures of meaning, convinced [me] that with a bit of translation on my part the two worlds would eventually cohere. (Obama, 2004, p. 82; cited in Gbotkuma, 2012, p. 2)

I believe this clearly reflects his leitmotif *e pluribus unum* – out of many, one – or the statements he made in his 2004 Democratic Convention Speech.² It seems that Obama has authority because his arguments imply honesty and genuine experience. When he talks about the American Dream, he himself is a prime example of its promises. When he talks about Islam, as in the “On a New Beginning” speech, it is clear that he understands the alienation of Muslims because he even has a Muslim father. Obama can, arguably, quote the Holy Quran without causing anger, without being disrespectful because people believe him due to his transcultural mindset.

In his Middle East speech, Obama also acknowledges global interdependencies and that a global moral order cannot amount to the worldwide imposition of a current one – fundamentals of transcultural leadership:

> Given our interdependence, any world order that elevates one nation or group of people over another will inevitably fail. So whatever we think of the past, we must not be prisoners to it. Our problems must be dealt with through partnership; our progress must be shared. (Obama, 2009)

Leadership is not only about rhetoric but a part of it is. One might argue that, to Obama, the future is a process of the extrapolation of the present in which lie the requirements for action. He believes that the shrinking

² In this speech, Obama says: “Now even as we speak, there are those who are preparing to divide us, the spin masters and negative ad peddlers who embrace the politics of anything goes. Well, I say to them tonight, there’s (…) not a black America and white America and Latino America and Asian America; there’s the United States of America. (…) We are one people, all of us pledging allegiance to the stars and stripes, all of us defending the United States of America.” (Obama, 2004)
world makes us urge for universal human dignity and global mutual caring. Obama says:

There must be a sustained effort to listen to each other; to learn from each other; to respect one another; and to seek common ground. (ibid.)

1. Introduction: Thoughts on the Future of Leadership

Instead of naming this chapter “Introduction: Thoughts on the Future of Leadership” I should have perhaps rather called it “Introduction: Thoughts on the Future and Leadership”. When aiming to think about the future of leadership one might generate additional value by widening the perspective towards focusing on the relations between a sustainable future and responsible leadership. These two topics might exist in a very close, mutually depending liaison. When approaching the future, I consider it a “process of the development of the present” (Wieland, 2014, p. 48), an idea offered by Josef Wieland. Wieland asks whether it might be possible to tackle the future in a non-speculative way and concludes it is not – at least not from an academic perspective (ibid., p. 47). When thinking about the future in Wieland’s way we do not think of the future as a specific time frame but rather as motion. This process of unreeling then poses the challenges and “foreseeable planning tasks” (ibid., p. 48) of society and especially for (business) leaders.

When thinking of the future as a “process of the development of the present” it might seem reasonable to start with a hard look at the present as the basis of an outlook on the future and the future of leadership. On the macro-level it is possible to identify a special deviation in society, or as Rosa puts it: a “desynchronization” (Rosa, 2012, p. 403 [own translation]). This desynchronization becomes obvious for instance in the field of politics. The success or failure of policies depends on how compliant with the corresponding time structures societal requests and concerns can be concentrated, communicated, translated into draft bills, and then be implemented (ibid., p. 393). As, for instance, the failed attempts to regulate European banks demonstrate, the time structures of Western democracies are not congruent with the societal processes anymore (ibid., p. 391). A divergence emerges between the economy’s time and the time of politics.
The fact that the consequences of decisions incline with the rate as the time resources to make them dwindle increases complexity even more (ibid., p. 411). A corresponding example is the field of biomedical research and ethics. To make an educated decision on the use of genetic technology, one needs a factual, well-grounded, and preferably also global dialogue on these issues, and a corresponding decision-making process – which we still do not have.\(^3\)

Simplistically argued: assuming that the actors in the political sphere have a limited effectiveness regarding their capacity of acting – and I did not mention the organizational deficit of the international system so far – one might then say that the burden lies on (business) leaders and thereby on the level of individuals.\(^4\) Yet, we can also identify processes of change on the micro-level. These changes have the ability to strongly influence the decision-making process and, therefore, also the impact of the decisions. Rosa identifies a liquefaction of identities in contemporary societies and argues that the individuals are becoming “drifters and gamers” (ibid., p. 352 [own translation]) who aim at keeping options open as long as possible. Long-lasting, non-contextual goals in life are increasingly rare in today’s world. To cope with the requirements for flexibility, individuals act indifferently regarding content, Rosa (ibid., p. 378). Who the individual is, therefore, depends on where the individual is. In this context, previous patterns of identities are being undermined, explains Rosa (ibid., p. 371). When leadership is needed – when we are urged to define relevancies and priorities and when there are conflicting requests for action, as Rosa puts it (ibid., p. 375) – situate decision-making becomes the defining parameter.

The challenging questions that arise include: How is it possible to foster sustainable, ethical leadership and especially leaders despite these observations? And what does a sustainable, ethical leader look like? Which potential lies in tomorrow’s leaders to generate a future worth living for all beings on this planet?

\(^3\) However, some of the agreements in 2015, for instance the results of the COP21 or the SDGs that were passed by the UN General Assembly, show that cooperation on a global scale is not just possible but also promising – they are a good starting point.

\(^4\) Or as Wieland says: “[T]he burden of morality in a global economy will increasingly lie with the individual actors.” (Wieland, 2014, p. 53)
Since the founding of the Jesuits by Ignatius of Loyola more than 400 years ago, the topic of leadership plays a major role for the fraternity. Jesuits engage in this topic with regards to their own contexts, but also by mentoring others. The Jesuits and for instance monk Michael Bordt SJ (2013a) view leadership as being strongly related to the individual and the corresponding personality of the leader. Their teachings might be summarized as encountering one’s own personality; Bordt (2013b) states that one needs to be able to lead oneself in order to lead others. According to the Jesuits, ethical leadership starts with mindful self-cognition; as a second step, they value a capacity to self-reflection in a potential leader. Their approach is about understanding oneself. This process of encountering oneself then is the basis to gain a foothold in today’s society and only then – when one has grounding – one can help others with directions. Accordingly, to be an ethical leader one needs academic and practical knowledge, but even more importantly, a personality defined by mindfulness and consistence that does not falter – even in extreme situations. The core parts of the Jesuits’ teachings emphasize identifying one’s own personal values and developing integrity; at the core of Jesuits' teachings, then, is the leader’s identity.

Although I consider leadership to be more comprehensive than simply being related to the individual, I still highlight personality and a leader’s character within this research project. By doing so, I leave out many perspectives, including research on organizational behavior, and studies that aim to merge organizational and person-focused research. When looking at today’s world – and the deficit of truly global organizations – it becomes apparent that we (still) need individuals. These individuals have to enable new interactions and have to provide sustainable solutions to the current challenges. In the politics and in business, there is a lack of ethical personalities and upright leadership: Volkswagen’s Martin Winterkorn with his emission scandal and George W. Bush’s offensive war against the Iraqi government illustrate it nicely.\(^5\)

I consider that reflections on leadership still have to mostly tackle the individual – similar to the leadership philosophy of the Jesuits. Of course, general research on leadership and its implementation in practice should

\(^5\) Of course, this is part of a larger problem including the organizational structures, etc. and not just bound to individual failure.
never solely focus on the individual because this could lead to severe danger. It could be threatening because organizational structures are necessary and important to guarantee safeguards for the individual itself, the organization, and the system. Incorporating both perspectives and focusing on their matching, leadership theory then deals with the promising concept of relational leadership. The focus in this paper, however, is particularly on the individual.

* 

In addition, I did not aim to provide an elaborated or final definition of transculturalism or transculturality, respectively. The discourse on this topic is still merely at the beginning. Möhrer et al. (2015) have been working on a definition. There, they come to the conclusion that a fundamental definition of transculturalism must not only view it as a “condition”, but also incorporate the “action(s) that might lead to and/or spring from such a condition” (ibid., p. 27). The scholars argue that transculturalism is a temporary cultural atmosphere for social interaction that results from the competences to effectively deal with moral particularism by contextually implementing ethical universalism; that is to say, the behavioral proficiency to effectively establish a common (working) culture based on shared local experiences that fosters the efficient proceeding of intercultural transactions within a multicultural context. (ibid., p. 28)

To the authors, this means that the leader “must excel in applying and contextualizing ethical universalism” (ibid.). They view multi- and interculturalism as preconditions to transculturalism and, thereby, go beyond Wolfgang Welsch (1999) who, according to the authors of the study, views them as “superfluous and obsolete” (Möhrer et al., 2015, p. 22).

In general, there is a consensus in the established literature which argues that classical distinctions between cultures are outdated in today’s world because cultures are shaped by inter-mixing and interfusion. Welsch says:

 Transculturality wants to show both; that today we are beyond classical understandings of cultural constitutions and that the new forms of culture and living go through these old formations as a matter of course. (Welsch, 1992, p. 5; cited in Hepp, 2006, p. 64 [own translation])
Also common to the understanding of transculturalism is, that it is mostly an “approach which supposes a common culture beyond existing cultural exceptionalities” (Yousefi/Braun, 2011, p. 108 [own translation]). Widely accepted is also that transculturalism allows “overlapping loyalties” (Drechsel et al., 2000, p. 146 [own translation]) due to the fact that borders are thought as “moving patterns” (ibid.). To me, Obama – although not from academia – gives a good description of transculturalism when talking about the overlapping and the common principles that are shared globally as outlined in the beginning of this paper. I view transculturalism in this line and incorporating the active notion. Furthermore, my understanding of transculturalism is reflected in the statements, themselves.

2. Transcultural Leaders

The paper at hand aims to provide a twenty-first century perspective on leadership and leaders; it does not seek to present an analysis of the established literature on leadership. It seeks to find a possible starting point for challenging and enriching future debates on the topic. This paper is divided into a theoretical and an empirical part – as the methods of the research project conducted. The interface between the two methods lies in the use of the theoretically construed “Five Core Statements on Transcultural Leaders” as the discussion material for the qualitative interviews. Reciprocally, the empirical findings of the interviews lead to adjustments of the statements to become the “Five Core Statements on the Transcultural Leader”. For the reason of this paper’s length, the theoretical framework – e.g. on the self or on Shared Value – underlying this paper as well as five more statements that were construed theoretically and discussed in the interviews are not taken into account. The full paper will be published as a Working Paper of the Leadership Excellence Institute Zeppelin | LEIZ in the near future.

In the following part, I present the “Five Core Statements on Transcultural Leaders” which are, as stated, preliminary to the empirical analysis. The notes to the statements present a short overview and not a deep theoretical analysis of the statements’ origins. They were drafted before the empirical study has been conducted. Also before conducting the interviews, the statements were pre-tested by a small but diverse group of five students. The aim of the pre-testing was to tackle major problems through
difficulties in the wording of the statements. The “Five Core Statements on Transcultural Leaders” in this paper, therefore, present the statements after being slightly adjusted in response to the pre-testing.

After presenting the theoretical part, I outline the results of the qualitative study with regards to the five core statements. The qualitative study aimed at testing the statements and at modifying them in response to the feedback. Over the course of the study, eight interviews with experts were conducted. The interviewees are from various backgrounds to make the study as international, intersectoral, intergenerational, and intercultural as possible. The expert group also incorporates different amounts of knowledge and various opinions on transculturalism respectively transculturality and leadership. All interviews have been transcribed to document the empirical analysis. The data analysis itself was conducted with a software for qualitative data analysis, MAXQDA 12. The coding and the results are traceable, too. Prior to the interviews, the statements were e-mailed to the experts. A small guidance was provided in advance, explaining that the interviews were going to be structured into three parts: (1) exploratory discussion of the statements, (2) general discussion on Transcultural Leaders, and (3) further progressing thoughts. Each interview took between 30 minutes and 90 minutes. All interviews were conducted via phone and recorded.

In the final part of the paper, the findings are being discussed and result in the very essence of the mixed-methods research project: “Five Core Statements on the Transcultural Leader”. Overall, I aim to share the results of my research in order to advance the literature on Transcultural Leadership and to generate a debate on it both in academia and practice.

2.1 Five Preliminary Statements

I now introduce the “Five Core Statements on Transcultural Leaders”. As mentioned already, these statements need explanatory theoretical notes to clarify their origins, aims, and the implications that go with them.

[CS1] Transcultural Leaders put their focus on transcultural commonalities instead of on intercultural differences. They, thereby, enable the capacity to cooperate within themselves, others, and between organizations.
Notes [CS1]: The first sentence of the first statement presents the core of transculturalism and also the core element in the context of Transcultural Leadership. Here, it is by no means denied that differences exist and that they can play a role in interactions; the statement, however, is about the focus on commonalities. The focus on differences instead of on commonalities can have major unsustainable implications. Wieland (2014) argues that intercultural leadership impedes a world ethic to emerge through focusing on differences. It does so because this leadership style emanates from outdated conceptualizations of culture: for instance, it views cultures as definable and not inter-mixed nor interrelated entities. Intercultural leadership then aims at preventing clash by mutual consideration. It thereby has the “acceptance of difference [which is being] communicated both as a problem and as the solution to the problem by means of the reproduction of difference” (ibid., p. 55) at its heart. With regards to the challenges the world faces globally, fruitful cooperation is necessary – reproducing difference hinders profound cooperation. According to Wieland, cooperation means the

interaction between owners of resources to their mutual advantage, whose underlying stability depends (…) upon the preponderance of shared interests over conflicting and diverging interests and (…) on the shared moral values of the actors. (ibid., p. 49)

Focusing multidimensionally on commonalities – for instance in a leader’s behaviour and in communication of a vision – enables cooperation because it highlights common, global interests and focuses on shared values.

Today’s global economy is a highly diversified “cooperation economy” (ibid., p. 48). It is diversified due to the variety of economic forms existing. Their success and continuance, then, depends on fruitful interaction through cooperation. Furthermore, the implications of globalization on interaction in societies strongly influence the ethics of the interactions’ environment. A Transcultural Leadership style has these assumptions at its core and does not annihilate differences. The implication of a focus on transcultural commonalities means that successful cooperation will be improved or even at first allowed – within the global economy. Transcultural Leaders, therefore, enable the capacity to cooperate through raising awareness for shared interests and shared values.
Transcultural Leaders are active and open. They are innovative because they value and foster multidimensional diversity. Transcultural Leaders challenge the status quo as originals and lead ethically, meaning that they do not increase their or their organization’s value by increasing another person or system’s fragility.

Notes [CS2]: From an epistemological perspective the word “trans” already includes components as activeness and openness (Möhner et al., 2015, p. 23) — an active notion in general. The word “trans” means “across, over, beyond” (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2015a; cited in Möhrer et al., 2015, p. 23) and might result from the Latin verb *trare*. This is where activeness and openness in the statement are being derived from.

To Adam Grant – the one who shaped the term “originality” – “originality” means “taking the road less travelled, championing a set of novel ideas that go against the grain but ultimately make things better” (Grant, 2015, p. 3). The world in the twenty-first century is marked by uncertainty about the future, Grant analyses – so is fear (ibid., p. 216). Grant argues that originals are good in “embracing” (ibid., p. 217) their fear and thereby “shift the go system into higher gear” (ibid.) – which does not mean that they have to be solely optimists. Transcultural Leaders have this spirit of “originality”. Furthermore, originals create symbols that enable orientation (ibid., p. 223) and introduce “single-dissenters” (ibid., p. 225) that challenge conformity. In addition, originals are able to create a “sense of urgency” (ibid., p. 231). Transcultural Leaders with this spirit of originality, therefore, are able to change the status quo. This challenging the status quo, however, does not go as far as losing the control over anger (ibid., p. 241). Originals “speak truth to power” (ibid.) through focusing for instance on the victims and not the perpetrators. According to Grant, this activates “empathetic anger – the desire to right wrongs done unto another” (ibid., p. 242). He sums up:

Originals embrace the uphill battle, striving to make the world what it could be. By struggling to improve life and liberty, they may temporarily give up some pleasure, putting their own happiness on the back burner. In the long run, they have the chance to create a better world. And that – to borrow a turn of phrase from Brian Little – brings a different kind of satisfaction. Becoming original is not the easiest path in the pursuit of happiness, but it leaves us poised for the happiness of pursuit. (ibid., p. 243)
The last part of the statement is related to the Golden Rule. Transcultural Leaders adjust their organization’s utility function in a way that it is aligned with the maximization of the societal utility function. This means that they lead ethically in a way that they for instance internalize negative external effects and do not increase another person or system’s fragility.

Transcultural Leaders have discovered their personality, they met themselves in the context of their existence in a globalized world. They are self-leaders, know their bases, their values, and developed a global understanding of the world’s interconnectedness as well as interdependencies. Transcultural Leaders have a foothold in today’s world and can, thereby, give orientation and provide guidance to others – lead.

Notes: As mentioned previously, the self and the personality of the individual are major elements of Transcultural Leadership. The individual’s identity as a process is one basis of ethical leadership because it is connected to self-leadership. And through being able to lead herself or himself, the leader can lead others. This means that she or he has to know herself or himself in the context of the challenges we face. The concept of self-leadership is not only tackled by the Jesuits, as outlined earlier, but, for instance, also by Andrew Byrant and Ana Kazan. They “define self-leadership as the practice of intentionally influencing our thinking, feeling, and behaviors to achieve our objectives.” (Bryant/Kazan, 2013, p. 13) The authors focus on “self-awareness”, “self-responsibility”, and “self-development”.

Wieland predicts that “the burden of morality in a global economy will increasingly lie with the individual actors” (Wieland, 2014, p. 53). If this is true, it has major implications and puts a tremendous burden on current and future leaders. A major role will the values themselves play because they are able to create identity, too – as Wieland puts it: “Values order the difference ‘I/others’ and ‘we/others’, meaning that they always define individual and collective identity” (ibid., p. 163). This then results in the fact that Transcultural Leaders can shape collective identities (ibid., p. 208) – a major competence to foster a sustainable world as a further step.

The Golden Rule means the principle that one should treat others as one would prefer to be treated oneself.
Transcultural Leaders have a strong sense of fairness, value humanity and integrity as the core of their actions, and put special attention to something that cannot be priced: dignity. They are able to do so because they went through formative human experiences. Now they create these experiences as intended events in their respective environments. An awareness for minorities is inherent in their actions.

Notes [CS4]: The LTCP team also tackles among other fairness and provides a definition. According to the LTCP’s value framework, fairness incorporates “that all are treated equally” (Internal documents of the LEIZ; cited in Möhrer et al., 2015, p. 10), being inclusive in behaviour, and “careful to avoid stereotypes and all forms of discrimination” (ibid.). The concept of human dignity as a basic principle guiding action and fundament of shared values is written down well in the Manifesto Global Economic Ethic (Küng et al., 2010) or for instance outlined by Michael Sandel (2013). Wieland (2014, p. 50) explains the concept of human experiences which plays a major role to enable these values. He states that values and standards are brought up in an evolutionary process and explains that an “underlying universalism of values is not of course the product of discourses or other rational procedures, but of human practice itself” (ibid., p. 163). In addition, Wieland points out:

The global acceptance of values derives less from intellectual justifications and more from the fact that globally valid values have always been developed in all of the human societies known to us, because without them cooperation in the interest of mutual benefit and the progress of civilization are impossible. (ibid.)

Minorities in all senses can easily be assimilated to the majority – may it be the suppression ideas, contexts of the so called “ethnic cleansing” or in spirituality or values of excluded groups. Minority protection is especially important in democracies, where decisions are made by majority vote, rather than consensus. The progress of a given society can be measured by how it deals with excluded, unpriviliged groups and their respective members. It is included in the statement because it will be increasingly relevant in the twenty-first century, I consider. In addition, this incorporates leadership tasks that need to focus on empowerment of these groups, as outlined earlier.
Transcultural Leaders embrace the challenges humanity faces and tackle them on the basis of a sense of global responsibility as a new evolution of nomads. They see the future as a process of the development of the present in which lie the requirements for action. By doing so, Transcultural Leaders contribute considerably to commonly shaping a sustainable world and a global moral order.

Notes (CS5): A global responsibility here is related to the maximization of a global utility function that also includes environmental factors, and is based on the idea of nomadism. For nomads there are two ways of interaction with the world around them – they can either leave things destroyed when travelling further – because they are leaving –, or they can act sustainably with, for instance, the environment around them and – when they return one day – will have the opportunity to use it again. Transcultural Leaders might also be nomads. Wieland (ibid., p. 53) points out that those actors in the economy whose potential arena nowadays is no less than the globe are beginning to resemble more and more modern nomads who find their herds in the widest variety of pasture grounds. Some time ago Bruce Chatwin pointed out that for the lengthiest part of their phylogensis human beings were nomadic and not sedentary and that even today they still have “the nomadic alternative” at their disposal. (Wieland, 2014, p. 53)

These nomads, according to Wieland, must be able to handle today’s diversity. They must find ways how the world can grow together despite today’s heterogeneity (ibid., p. 54) and have to succeed “in cultivating ambivalence and hybridity as a life form through self-observation and objectification of his own possibilities.” (ibid.) At the core of this is a “level of thinking and reflection (…) which enables individuals to position themselves inside and outside a difference at one and the same time and to form an identity at this place.” (ibid.)

Regarding the emergence of a global moral order, Wieland states that a globally created and accepted moral order (…) will probably not amount to a generalization of an already existing and, to a certain extent, already tested moral order (for example that of Western civilization) but must as a first step ascertain its specific functional and situational challenges, which have to be defined as clearly as possible, and for which answers can only then be developed as a second step. (ibid., p. 53)
3. Qualitative Study and Discussion

In the following chapter, I outline the findings of the empirical study that was conducted with the theoretically construed “Five Core Statements on Transcultural Leaders” at its basis. The study aimed at testing the statements and modifying them in response to the feedback provided by the interviewees. As outlined previously, eight expert interviews were conducted for the course of this study. Information on the experts is provided. The structure in which the findings are presented follows the logic of analysing each statement separately in relation to the corresponding feedback. This process is possible due to a coding procedure that has been conducted with a software for qualitative data analysis, MAXQDA 12. In the process of coding, I matched quotes of the interviewees with the corresponding statements. To each statement, then, I could aggregate all relevant feedback from all interviews. This feedback was summarized and is presented after each statement is named again. Subsequently to this, a discussion section is added that examines the feedback to the statement in the context of the theoretical notes and the original intention of the statement. After the statements are addressed, another short general discussion is enabled that incorporates feedback that did not match a specific statement. Following this, the “Five Core Statements on the Transcultural Leader” are being presented.

3.1 The Experts

As mentioned already, the experts come from various backgrounds to make the study as international, intersectoral, intergenerational, and intercultural as possible. The experts incorporated different amounts of knowledge and various opinions on transculturalism and leadership.\(^7\)

Marisa Drew is among the top ten most influential investment bankers worldwide and among the most influential women in finance.\(^8\) She is currently Managing Director in the Investment Banking Division of Credit Suisse and Co-Head of the Global Markets Solutions Group. Drew

---

\(^7\) All experts agreed that their names, biographies, and input of the interviews can be stated without anonymizing it.

\(^8\) According to The Telegraph, available via http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/markets/11161933/The-11-most-important-women-in-finance.html (07/15/16).
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is active in the field of diversity and philanthropy – especially in the context of women. The U.S. citizen holds a MBA from Wharton Business School. Being active in investment banking for 25 years, she is now based in London.

Lorenz Narku Laing (Narku Laing) is a member of the board of Humanity in Action Germany e.V. Currently, he is studying “Politics, Administration & International Relations” in his Master’s at Zeppelin University. Laing founded several initiatives, for instance Schwarze Jugend Deutschland. Laing has a Jamaican father and a Ghanian mother and holds the German and British citizenship.

Sebastian Spio-Garbrah (Sebastian Garbrah) was voted one of the world’s top analysts and is seen as one of the leading frontier market analysts globally. He is currently Global Managing Director and Chief Frontier Markets Analyst for DaMina Advisors. Garbrah is an advisory board member of several charities, among them a Jewish charity that is engaged in Africa. The Ghanaian holds a juris doctor (J.D) in law from Rutgers University and is based in Toronto.

Jason D. Patent (Jason Patent) is currently Director of the Center for Intercultural Leadership at the International House Berkeley. Previously, he has been active in several sectors, among them the non-profit sector. The U.S. American holds a Ph.D. in linguistics from UC Berkeley and has worked for several years in China.

Murali Nair-Rajendran (Murali Nair) was awarded, for instance, AT Kearney Falling Labs Scholar. He is currently Project Manager at Bertelsmann Foundation for the program “Germany and Asia”. Before that, he has been working at the Leadership Excellence Institute Zeppelin | LEIZ as a Research Fellow. He holds a MBA from the Indian Institute of Technology, Delhi. Now living in Gütersloh, Nair is originally from India.

Liad Ortar is today Manager of the Corporate Responsibility Institute of the College of Law and Business in Israel – where he is from, too. He holds an MA in Geography from Tel Aviv University and is currently pursuing his Ph.D. He is now based in Ramat Gan and also Sustainability Lecturer at the Ben Gurion University of the Negev.

Pindie Stephen is Senior Migrant Training Specialist and Integration Focal Point at the International Organization for Migration. She holds an MA in teaching from Georgetown University. Living in Thailand for over three years, the U.S. citizen is now based in Geneva.
3.2 The Study

[CS1] Transcultural Leaders put their focus on transcultural commonalities instead of on intercultural differences. They, thereby, enable the capacity to cooperate within themselves, others, and between organizations.

Findings [CS1]: With regards to this statement, Jason Patent sees a “false dichotomy”. According to him, one needs to “hold and respect and honour differences as a means towards arriving at commonalities”. Patent reads this statement as not displaying commonalities and differences as equally important, of what, however, he is convinced. In his view, difference is generally treated as something dangerous although it presents “tremendous opportunity”. Therefore, differences should be embraced and an awareness for related biases should be risen. According to Patent, intercultural leadership is coming to turns again and again with the fact that there are so many ways of viewing the world and so many different ways of behaving in the world – all of them equally valid.

Patent, relating to the so-called “intercultural continuum”, identifies similarities between transculturalism and the stage of “minimization”. He analyses that “we are all the same” ideology hinders true and honest interaction to take place. Engaging in differences is important to relate deeply, he argues, and that interculturalism does not represent a we-versus-them ideology.

Also Pindie Stephen argues that a “solid understanding of the differences to find that common ground” is important. She mentions that she is working with an intercultural approach and intercultural coaching. Taking this into account, she argues that it’s a bit easy to assume that even leaders have the capacity to even focus on commonalities without first, at least understanding the underlying differences.

However, Stephen also acknowledges that at the core of interaction should be the focus on commonalities – although at the centre of identifying these, an intercultural awareness is necessary.

Angelica Marte’s feedback shows similarities with Patent’s and Stephen’s arguments. She explains that one has to not only know and focus
on commonalities but has to be aware of the differences, as well. According to Marte, the

value to transcultural leadership is actually that you can get the treasure or lift the potential of diversity and put it into more value added business in a way that you focus on transcultural commonalities. By also agreeing on or allowing local differences!

For Marte, “focusing on the differences in the first place” is the answer to the challenges we face in global businesses. She argues that “culture is one thing that differentiates people from each other”. To her, the “transcultural thing” is a process, “something you have to work on, something where you have to go into a dialogue”. The Transcultural Leader, then, Marte explains, has “to integrate differences, to find inclusive strategies, to find better decisions to come to the goals where we want to go.” In addition, Marte relates the argument to her research saying that there are so many “commonalities which need to be fostered.”

To Marisa Drew, the first statement aims at putting the focus on differences. On that she agrees, too. She argues that it is a good statement because one has to be aware of differences. Otherwise, “you will have a failing team”. Saying that, she is in continuity with Patent, Stephen, and Marte.

Sebastian Garbrah, however, says that “the Transcultural Leader acknowledges differences but focuses on the commonalities within the differences”. Garbrah argues:

Compare two people: One who lives at a lake and one who lives in the desert. It is very stupid to say they are the same. They are not. But they have similar hopes and aspirations. Their music may be different but both have it. The greatest cultural leaders are those who are able to provide synthesis and integration.

For Narku Laing, “intercultural differences – in a conceptualization how differences come about – always makes you know that the creation of ‘yourself’ and ‘the other’ is the main difference we talk and discuss about.” Laing argues that focusing on commonalities does not continue this way of framing. According to Laing, the first sentence of the first statement, however, incorporates the idea of intercultural differences as where to put the focus. In continuity, he understands the second sentence of the first
statement as “cooperating between themselves and others”. To Laing, cooperation has the notion to only cooperate with people you are like-minded.

To Murali Nair, “the first statement, of course, is basically a summary of what transculturalism means”. For him it is “a good starting point”. This strong support by Nair stands in contrast to Liad Ortar, who says that the first statement is not clear to understand.

*Discussion [CS1]: When analysing the feedback on the first statement, it becomes clear that there is a major gap in understanding of the statement between the different interviewees. There is, for instance, Ortar, to whom it is not clear at all in which direction the statement goes. Nair, meanwhile, believes that he can understand it very well. Especially Nair understands how the statement is intended. All the other experts are somehow in a grey zone. All others think that they understand the statement in the way it is intended but most of them did not – may it be due to a misleading phrasing, a different perception, or something else.

According to the intention of the statement, it by no means says that differences should be neglected or do not exist. The core lays on where to put the focus, namely on transcultural commonalities. An annihilation of differences is not supposed to be represented in the statement. By saying that the focus should lay on commonalities, the statement itself acknowledges that differences do exist. A lot of the feedback on this statement can, therefore, be satisfied when rephrasing the statement to make it clearer.

However, there exists the question of what aspect of this topic should be addressed first: commonalities or differences. It depends very much on the situation and the circumstances, meaning that whether people are on a table yet or not, for instance. Pindie Stephen acknowledges that when people need to be brought jointly on a table, the focus on commonalities from the early beginning can be more beneficial. The focus on differences when aiming to form a team and people are not on a table yet can be detrimental. In a dialogue with the Director of the World Economic Forum, Philipp Rösler, he explained to me that when aiming to build coalitions and to cooperate, for instance in politics, people have to start with commonalities in negotiations – otherwise cooperation would not be possible. When people are a team, however, it can be detrimental to the team’s success to focus on commonalities because this can possibly re-
sult in conformity. Here, one needs to encourage difference, or rather: diversity. In fact, differences and diversity are used interchangeably sometimes, but are not actually synonymous. In contrast to difference, diversity emanates from the transcultural idea that there is a common basis. Diversity and transculturalism, therefore, are not at all contrasting but dependent on one another.

Another aspect that became obvious in the feedback to this statement is the idea of culture, itself. For instance, seeing culture as something that distinguishes people and as distinct entities. This perspective is being fostered by intercultural thinking and the use of the so-called “container models”. With regards to Hofstede’s model and other similar approaches, Patent remarks that they clearly lack complexity due to not being “designed to deal with intermixing”. However, Patent argues, these approaches are still helpful and represent a good starting point and general guidance. As outlined earlier, container models are not helpful – although they can provide guidance: they reproduce difference and, thereby, hinder successful cooperation. I will come back to this in the general discussion.

When Laing mentions how he understands the second sentence, he says that it is dealing with “cooperating between themselves and others”. This is not what the statement is intended, but rather aims at showing that the focus on commonalities enables the capacity to cooperate. This capacity is enabled in the individual, by the individual in other individuals, and, thereby, also between other individuals. Laing also remarks that cooperation has the notion to only cooperate with people you are like-minded. This is not the intention of the statement – otherwise one would not have to focus on commonalities.

As Marte discusses the commonalities between leaders on a global scale, these commonalities do not represent transcultural values but rather a generalization of values like Western professionalism. The leaders have something in common, yes, but it is not something transcultural. However, how she defines transcultural leadership is an approach very much coherent with this paper: finding inclusive strategies and integrating differences.

Additional reflections that came up during the interviews with regards to this statement were a general distinction and awareness for wording related to “sameness” and “oneness”. To Patent, it is important to distinguish between the words “oneness” and “sameness” – oneness does not mean we are all the same but rather, “we are all humans and we share a
common faith. But beyond that is nothing.” This distinction is very help-
ful and reflects also the results of this paper in general.

However, Garbrah dislikes the word “oneness”, because, “it tends to
mean that we are all one – not different”. For him, there is no difference
between the words “sameness” and “oneness”. To Garbrah, “harmony”
would be a better expression than oneness. In the context of Transcultural
Leaders, with regards to this paper, “oneness” is viewed as the most fit-
ting, however, and seen as the idea behind focusing on transcultural com-
monalities.

Transcultural Leaders are active and open. They are innovative
because they value and foster multidimensional diversity. Transcultural
Leaders challenge the status quo as originals and lead ethically, mean-
ing that they do not increase their or their organization’s value by in-
creasing another person or system’s fragility.

Findings: To Liad Ortar, this statement is “too individualistic. I
think there is some kind of zero sum game and you cannot have it all.” In
addition, he identifies “a conflict of interest or something like that” in the
second sentence.

Regarding diversity, Pindie Stephen mentions “classes” as a dimen-
sion. Furthermore, she thinks that the aspect of not increasing another
one’s or system’s fragility in the second sentence “is a good point”. She
lines out that it could be “vulnerability, could be at the expense of some-
one else’s loss” as how she understands fragility.

For Sebastian Garbrah, the Transcultural Leader is innovative because
he “leverages modern technology. And uses it as a tool for learning and
as a tool to connect with other people” – one part of making use and un-
folding diversity. To Garbrah, the Transcultural Leader is “a perpetual
student”.

According to Angelica Marte, you “have to have a diversity com-
pentence to have a transcultural leadership capacity”. She believes there is a
problem in the world of global business because, to her, global elite with
the same value exists: “profit” – which is taught at “today’s business
schools”. This reduces diversity, she says, and leads to the lack of “an
ethnic navigation system”. In business schools, people are being “brain-
ashed” to become “one-dimensional, singular-driven guys.” To her, di-
versity is of high importance to ethical leadership.
For Jason Patent – being confronted with thoughts similar to Marte’s points in the interview – “differences can exist on many levels.” To him, “even in this global elite (…) are well-demonstrated differences” because they cannot be vanished entirely in business schools: “national tendencies definitely exist and cause difficulties for working together”.

Marisa Drew is “a firm believer in having diverse teams results in a better outcome.” A diverse team, however, needs good leadership to make it flourish – the idea behind valuing and fostering multidimensional diversity, she argues: “So I think it comes down to who is leading the team being aware that by creating a diverse team you are going to have these gaps in understanding.” She explains that in investment banking, merit is not the only criteria for success and being employed, but also having “people from different cultures and backgrounds”. She identifies a “natural bias in respect to investment banking (…) that people tend to hire in their own likeness because it makes them feel comfortable”. According to her, Transcultural Leaders have to counter this. Being asked in detail on topics of diversity in the interview, she remarks that there are many “levels” of diversity, such as “diversity at background” or “diversity at ethnicity”.

To Murali Nair, the sixth statement is “good”. The fragility aspect mentioned is also a very important one, to which he “agrees completely.” Especially, he likes that it is not only tied to persons but also relating to systems as the “financial” or “environmental system”. According to Nair, not to increase another’s fragility means that leaders will not destabilize the system.

To the adjective open in the first sentence, Narku Laing agrees and argues that “openness is always necessary because I think it is mandatory for Transcultural Leaders.” Laing argues that

they have to describe openness because they are transcending within the frameworks and systems they are attached to. So mostly they do not belong in that system and they want to transcend very quickly and they have to be open.

Openness, to Laing, is also important to the development of transcultural leadership capacity: “what defines how good of a transcultural leader you are is how quickly you develop your polylinguality and your intersectorality”. To Laing, active is not of as high importance as openness is. By being active in a non-reflected way, Laing sees the danger of breaking “a
common status of institutional procedures”. According to Laing, Transcultural Leaders challenge the status quo because they are coming from minority backgrounds or they are coming from outside the system, where they always have an understanding that there is a different way to do what you are doing now.

* 

Discussion [CS2]: A major part of dispute with regards to this statement clearly is the ethical rule about not increasing another person or system’s fragility. For Laing, this clearly cannot be validated because “breaking the status quo means taking away privileges.” In turn, “taking away privileges always means you enhance another system’s fragility.” Stephen agrees with Laing, in a way, when she says that “when you come up against those with diverging value systems you must question whether their beliefs represent shared humanitarian values.” To her, “sometimes you have to shake things up – especially when they are not ultimately fair.” However, she admits that she agreed with the sentence before being presented Laing’s perspective in the interview. Also to Marte, “you have to pay a price” for diversity, which means that of course others have to lose; “white people will be fewer then”. She says that “if you want to have a heterogenic group, you have to make it heterogenic.” The privileged group is from now on not necessarily seen as a relevant stakeholder in this context.

Diversity in this statement clearly is multidimensional. This means that it is not only centred around culture but can also include class, thinking, and many more fields. The task of the Transcultural Leader is to efficiently and effectively lead diverse teams.

[CS3] Transcultural Leaders have discovered their personality, they met themselves in the context of their existence in a globalized world. They are self-leaders, know their bases, their values, and developed a global understanding of the world’s interconnectedness as well as interdependencies. Transcultural Leaders have a foothold in today’s world and can, thereby, give orientation and provide guidance to others – lead.

Findings [CS3]: Liad Ortar reacts to the statement asking: “What did you take when you wrote that?”
Sebastian Garbrah can agree well with this statement. He argues: “I would also say the Transcultural Leaders know themselves – I like that you say it, too. Knowing yourself, knowing your weakness. Then it flows from there.” To him, this is something new in a way that

our parents do not know themselves. They are schizophrenic. They want to save the world but then they live in a community where there is racism. Or they lived a life of two sides. In the twenty-first century you want to live a singular life. A business to be good – ethically and regarding the profit. Earlier, you could work for Shell and then take the money and give it to charity. The paradigm has shifted.

To Angelica Marte, the “decision-making skills” of Transcultural Leaders are “enhanced by having multiple frames of references”. For her, “in an intercultural world, everybody needs to have a transcultural mind-set”, meaning that “you can look at it from various points” without a “reference” to a specific culture. Marte explains that a Transcultural Leader, in her opinion, “does inclusive management” to manage differences. In addition, Marte argues that a Transcultural Leader can only flourish in global or transcultural organizations, otherwise it is not possible.

Marisa Drew thinks the importance of self-leadership and self-awareness is “very high” for Transcultural Leaders because “if you do not push yourself to see the differences that these diverse teams bring, your own natural biases will creep in.” She argues that

you have to be self-aware on your background and your experiences brought to the table that leads you to communicate in a certain way with your people, that leads you to make decisions about people, and that leads you to value certain aspects that you bring to the table more than others.

Murali Nair considers this statement to mean that Transcultural Leaders “understood about themselves”. To him, this is contradicting with statement 5 because there the personality and transcultural leadership capacity is portrayed as a “journey”. He argues for rephrasing it, underlining the importance of understanding “some basic fundamental truth” – but that the idea of a process still remains; it could be phrased to “more aware of their personality”, for instance. According to Nair, the self-leadership aspect is something relevant to all leaders and not just Transcultural Leaders. Nair also identifies a logic behind it:
They are more aware of themselves and they know it is a work in progress, so they are leading themselves and also are helping others. Yes, so that’s a process right, they continue learning and they help others learn.

According to Narku Laing, one can provide guidance to others if one has an “understanding of difference” that makes leaders “able to work with the complexity of the world”. In the context of Transcultural Leaders’ personalities, Laing mentions “loneliness”. Talking of himself and his background – “his specific mix of Jamaican, Ghanaian, British and German – Germany-born, raised here” – he argues that not many people have similar experiences. This makes him lonely sometimes. In this context, self-leadership becomes important:

I would understand self-leadership as the reaction to the fact that the competencies and backgrounds you are striving to seek or create for yourself can nowhere be found. If you want to be an interdisciplinary, cross-cultural, transcultural leader, there is no university where you can go to. It is often the quest for self-definition and for constructing this profile.

This loneliness has its origin in “self-constructing what you are doing, so you always move in (…) expert groups.” In addition, the loneliness comes from the fact that Transcultural Leaders are in “spaces where you are actually not supposed to be”. Transcultural Leaders, such as Laing, always face the risk of being excluded from the environments they are in because they are in-between. Transcultural Leaders, however, like this risk, he explains. They “like the constant status of reorientation”, the “status of always being into sections, always being breaking outside of path, always being able to be there or there”. Furthermore, Laing argues that Transcultural Leaders have an awareness of “how it is to be without power” that results from potentially coming from, for instance, minority positions.

Discussion [CS3]: The feedback underlines the relevance of this statement – to leadership in general and to transcultural leadership. “Having multiple frames of reference”, knowing the own values and background are an essential aspect for Transcultural Leaders.

Transcultural Leaders do not, necessarily, work in a global organization, as Marte has put it. In addition, Transcultural Leaders are not neces-
sarily part of a global elite, but can also work in a small size company in a rural area.

Murali Nair pointed out that this statement could be conflicting with statement 5, in regard the learning aspect. This statement here is not intended to mean that someone does not have to learn anymore or develop, anymore. It is at the core of knowing oneself that one might probably never know oneself completely.

Narku Laing gets the notion of Transcultural Leaders and his concept of “loneliness” describes it well. They embrace their loneliness and thereby can empower others.

[CS4] Transcultural Leaders have a strong sense of fairness, value humanity and integrity as the core of their actions, and put special attention to something that cannot be priced: dignity. They are able to do so because they went through formative human experiences. Now they create these experiences as intended events in their respective environments. An awareness for minorities is inherent in their actions.

Findings [CS4]: In the context of this statement, Pindie Stephen identifies a process of growth that can come from being in a Diaspora, for instance. She mentions the example of the Syrian Diaspora that is currently occurring. Stephen says that some Syrians might become “bridge makers” due to the opportunity “to experience a shift in cultural values and a shift in work ethics”. When returning back to Syria, they might be able to positively shape the country.

As a value that could be named in the context of this statement, Sebastian Garbrah mentions “honesty” and gives the example of Donald Trump who appeals to people because of his honesty. He argues,

why Donald Trump has done so well is because he is honest. He is a bullshiter [sic!]. He is honest about it – as opposed to other politicians who pretend. (…) Leaders who are respected: Putin, Trump, Merkel. Because they are honest. They do not have two lives. They do not say one thing publicly and believe another thing privately.

In addition, Garbrah names shared values, or “impulses”, “even” among different religions as Islam and Christianity: “senseful identity, senseful good, preservation of the family, preservation of human experience.”

With regards to experiences, Angelica Marte mentions her observations:
So they were raised here and had a mother who was Chinese or whatever. Or diplomats: I have some friends and by 20 they lived in many different countries in the world and they, therefore, have no feeling of home. They do not have a specific cultural relation anymore.

In terms of enabling experiences, she agrees that interaction with, for instance, refugees would be beneficial, but adds that: “I would rather make it the other way around: You go to Syria.” In addition, she agrees with the statement proclaiming that it is the task of the leader to enable these experiences and that the “stupid intercultural workshops” should be abolished. She says that “the big corporations figure out that when we want to develop global leaders we have to change our total approach of leadership development.” When these experiences take place and Transcultural Leaders develop, she mentions, it is important that these processes be accompanied through “development programs”. These experiences, themselves, are very useful, because they enable “you to look down to situations. It enables you to be a more meta person. You can go on a meta level and look at things.”

Jason Patent does not agree with the word “fairness”, because for him this has very different meanings in different cultural contexts and mentions that it is dangerous to use language like this – as outlined earlier.

Marisa Drew thinks that the values mentioned are “admirable principles”, and everyone would agree on them when asked, but she still thinks that it is not as easy as shown and that there can be many conflicts, for instance due to communication issues – here “things can go wrong”.

Murali Nair argues that “when you help others or empower others you raise their potential. You also raise their sense of fairness and dignity.” For Nair, the experiences Transcultural Leaders have make them become what they are. However, Nair criticizes that there is just an awareness for minorities mentioned; to him, “the weakest link in a society is of course the minority. But the weakest link in the world is the environment.” Climate change is one of the biggest challenges the world faces and therefore it should not be ignored, he argues.

With respect to sensitivity to minorities, Narku Laing says that due to changing the sector very often, Transcultural Leaders know “the feeling of being excluded.” In addition, Laing mentions that the “the sense of naturalization shouldn’t be forgotten”, meaning that leaders should not reaffirm the status quo. Not just because one is black, he says, means that
the one will change the situation when in power – many say: “‘I had to do it, so you have to do it’”.

*  

**Discussion [CS4]**: The value of honesty, as Garbrah puts it, is a very important one and is also connected to the potentially transcultural value “transparency”. The aspect of religions he mentions is also relevant. This is something Transcultural Leaders can work with and focus on – shaping also a bond between different religions.

What Pindie Stephen and Angelica Marte mention in terms of experiencing expatriation or living in Diaspora is very important. That one has to have been to another country, however, has been criticised in the discussion already. That intercultural workshops are described as “stupid” by Marte is in a way positive – since they reproduce difference. That there is a move toward development programs, including transcultural coaching, seems very positive, as well.

This statement is not intended as proclaiming that everybody has the same understanding of fairness. Rather, it says that there is strong *sense* of fairness – meaning that the idea of fairness is inherent in all cultures but that there can be differences of how it is interpreted and what is seen as fair. Being explained this in the interview, Patent says that he does “absolutely see what you mean and I think on that level I can understand what you seeking to get at here.” To understand exactly the different notions, however, is, so Patent, “the kind of work that needs to be done”.

When Nair outlines that the environment is a major weak link in our global system and that special attention has to be paid to it, he mentions a very important point. Although it was intended to be include it in the general tenth statement – in general, not much focus has been put on it so far in the statements.

**[CS5]** Transcultural Leaders embrace the challenges humanity faces and tackle them on the basis of a sense of global responsibility as a new evolution of nomads. They see the future as a process of the development of the present in which lie the requirements for action. By doing so, Transcultural Leaders contribute considerably to commonly shaping a sustainable world and a global moral order.
Findings [CS5]: Liad Ortar does not think of Transcultural Leaders as “a new evolution of nomads. Maybe it is rather a new form of nomads, a new realization of modern nomads.”

One major challenge that is connected to statement nine and statement ten is, according to Murali Nair, “intergenerational fairness”. For him, this is connected to “environmental sustainability”, however. Nair again raises awareness to the fact that a “global moral order” might sound like something “coming from the top” and should, therefore, be reconsidered. Nair suggests the word “understanding” instead, because order sounds very “hegemonial” and not “inclusive”.

Narku Laing agrees with this statement and especially the last sentence of the statement. He believes Transcultural Leaders can shape a sustainable world due to their “different cultural ties”. Through these ties, they change how the world clinches together – they shape a “sense of solidarity”, the “base of identification”, and the “base of empathy”. To him, Transcultural Leaders also enrich “the process of dialogue” through moving “in between different groups” and translating. As an example he names Barack Obama who has “a background which relates to other parts of the world” and which, therefore, also changes “global world politics”. Transcultural Leaders, Laing points out, “do the mix-up now”.

Discussion [CS5]: The entire feedback on this statement is very valuable and matches strongly the intention of this statement. That the global moral order is not intended or misunderstood as being hegemonial is important – a global moral order, as pointed out in the theoretical part, cannot amount to the worldwide imposition of a current one.

In the business world, a global corporation might work “in countries – and not on the moon”, as Angelica Marte puts it. A truly transcultural corporation, however, works on the globe and blurs borders with the help of Transcultural Leaders.

Further Discussion on General Findings: With regards to language and understanding, all provided feedback that has additionally been articulated in the interviews is relevant and beneficial to the adjustment of the statements. The statements themselves are designed not only for academia but also for practitioners. Although Ortar argues the statements are not at all
understandable for a regular (business) manager, it is still assumed that they at least partly are. One might argue that, for instance, practitioners as Pindie Stephen and Marisa Drew understood it well. However, some clarifications have to be implemented. That Stephen argues the statements just standing alone might not be self-explanatory is a relevant point for their presentation in the future.

As it has been widely supported in the interviews, the conceptualizations of cultures as distinct entities are outdated and an approach not beneficial in the twenty-first century. Thereby, the approach underlying the statements has been confirmed. Pindie Stephen and Sebastian Garbrah have outlined well that their experiences in life lead them to this conclusion.

The criticism that was mentioned in further feedback in the interviews with regards to a rather elitist approach to Transcultural Leaders is something that has to be partly admitted. Of course, this assumption is valid when addressing transcultural experiences and expatriation. However, as for instance Narku Laing has outlined, Transcultural Leaders can come from unprivileged environments – although they might, then, still have earned their way up. In general, it cannot be confirmed that Transcultural Leaders have to work in top-level positions in global corporations, as Marte argued.

On the question to which sector of life the statements refer to, one might argue that it depends on the reader. The statements are not intended to have the claim to be relevant in all sectors of life – although they can be. If it is up to the reader, it underlines the personal relation one might have to this topic. A business leader who reads it might see it differently than someone else. In addition, the statements can be only referring to the working life but can go much further, as well.

In general, the role of women was a major aspect in the interviews, too – that has not been outlined much in the discussion because it was so far not tangibly reflected in the statements. Especially in the interviews with Angelica Marte and Marisa Drew, this topic was dominant. Since this has not been included in the statements yet, a special attention will be drawn to it in the modification of the final statements: the “she”.

To underline the aspect of loneliness and the originality of the individuals behind it, also findings in the qualitative study, the final statements are being adjusted to singular. Of course, a sense of community among Transcultural Leaders is relevant and still reflected. In the follow-
The Transcultural Leader puts her focus on transcultural commonalities. She is aware of differences but enables and promotes the capacity to cooperate within herself, within others, and between organizations through celebrating oneness.

The Transcultural Leader is open and active. She is innovative because she values and fosters multidimensional diversity and leverages modern technology. The Transcultural Leader challenges the status quo as an original and leads ethically, meaning that she does not increase her or her organization’s value by increasing another relevant person or system’s fragility.

The Transcultural Leader is aware of her personality, she met herself in the context of her existence in a globalized world, and embraces her loneliness. She is a self-leader, knows her bases, her values, and developed a global understanding of the world’s interconnectedness as well as interdependencies. The Transcultural Leader has a foothold in today’s world and can, thereby, give orientation and provide guidance to others – lead.

The Transcultural Leader has a strong sense of fairness, values humanity, honesty, and integrity as the core of her actions, and puts special attention to something that cannot be priced: dignity. She is able to do so because she went through formative human experiences. Now she creates these experiences as intended events in her respective environments. An awareness for minorities and the environment is inherent in her actions.

The Transcultural Leader embraces the challenges humanity faces and tackles them on the basis of a sense of global responsibility as a new evolution of nomads. She sees the future as a process of the development of the present in which lie the requirements for action. By doing so, the Transcultural Leader contributes considerably to commonly shaping a sustainable world and a bottom-up global moral order.
Leadership is needed when no management task is apparent. In the twenty-first century, this will be increasingly the case – which causes an even stronger urge for sustainable, ethical leadership. The approach outlined in this paper aims at being a contribution to a leadership style that tries to integrate this demand. What has been conceptualized is a starting point for further debate and lays several fundamentals that might be beneficial to this debate.

Also, the research design itself has had a slightly transcultural character. The mixed-methods approach allowed a hybrid research project merging theory and empiricism, whereas especially the qualitative part was in-depth. The debate, therefore, should not be one solely in academia but could integrate other spheres, as well.

Of course, the limitations of the research project presented are tremendous – as has been outlined throughout the paper. However, the paper at hand provides a twenty-first century perspective on sustainable, ethical leadership and the corresponding Transcultural Leader that outlines how a Transcultural Leader could look like. This can be stimulating for others to join the debate and to commonly advance this topic.
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Abstract

In this essay we take a look at the interrelated phenomena of international business migrants and rural migrant workers in Shanghai, China. Through separate case studies of each group’s role in the construction process in this rapidly developing world city, we observe them in parallel and shed light on the spatial implications of both groups’ migrant status. In doing so, we determine that both groups live in “cocoon worlds”, albeit in different ways. We recognize that both groups live in a state of permanent temporariness in Shanghai, and, drawing on work by Lefebvre (1974) and others, we assert their temporary “right to the city” and thus call them “Urban Nomads”. Our uncovering of the stark inequalities and harshly inadequate living and working conditions affecting rural migrant workers in the construction industry in Shanghai leads to our development of a concept of “Fair Building”, a socially conscious architecture
that calls for accountability in ensuring that rural migrant workers’ needs are taken into account so that their living and working circumstances can improve. Finally, we present our contribution, “Yídòng kètáng”, which represents our small part in intervening in the unsustainable and unjust reality of construction work in Shanghai.

The development of megacities is a global phenomenon that is particularly visible in contemporary China. In no other country is the process of urbanization occurring at such a large scale and with such speed. Chinese cities are “shooting skyward and exploding outward” and this generates its own dilemmas (Hsing, 2010). Not only economic and political changes but also structural changes in society make the ongoing urban transformation of China possible. Therefore, cities are not just a reflection of the relation between production and consumption, between supply and demand, but are an ambivalent producer, product, and a production and consumption process at the same time. Thus, the current spatial transformation of Chinese cities is happening at a rapid pace and often without consideration for the inhabitants. China’s new cityscape is defined by speed, scale, spectacle, sprawl, and segregation (Campanella, 2008). In many ways urban phenomena are too complex, too big, and too fast to be fully understood or to be made explainable by breaking them down into comprehensible elements. Fascinated by this rapid urbanization, we came to Beijing and Shanghai to study and work for several months in 2008, 2010 and again from 2013–2015. During our working experience in the field of architecture we repeatedly witnessed things that appeared puzzling within the construction process and the question “weishenme?”— why?— constantly aroused our curiosity.

This is an examination of a very specific group of people: individuals who are involved in various construction processes over time. The ongoing building boom in China has caused them to following their work without settling permanently due to the temporary nature of building projects. Among the people involved in the construction process in China, two groups must be emphasized—because they include such a large number of people that it is important to investigate their role in the construction process. But there are several additional reasons to pay close attention to these groups—torn away from their homes, they have many things in common while remaining completely different. And while their existence
is recognized by the media, scholarly research has not paid them sufficient attention.

The field of Urban China is approached from various different angles and begins with a discussion of our understanding of city development and urban planning. Besides the familiar debate on the quality of buildings erected at such enormous speed in Chinese cities, it is often forgotten that construction is more than the materialized end result. In the language of critical urban studies, space is neither just a materialized end result nor a pure concept, but rather is a social process of production. The theoretical framework of the production of space is mainly based on Lefebvre’s theories when describing the relationships between the production of the built environment and societal processes. Here we are stressing out the necessity of the interaction between different realms, which can be achieved by using a post-disciplinary approach. Further the focus is on construction phases as described in the disciplines of project management and project development by highlighting the relationships and dependencies that are part of the construction process. Again, we observe that construction is more than just the materialized end result. From the beginning of a project until the building is actually used and reused, many different groups with various professional and even cultural backgrounds are involved. In this context we refer to the minimum standards of human rights according to the UN and the International Labour Organization (ILO) and use this as a benchmark for all actors involved. Here we refer to the assumption that migrant workers play a special role in construction processes in China in general and in Shanghai in particular.

Mobile rural migrant workers strongly affect China’s development and especially rural-to-urban migration is rapidly reshaping the spatial, economic, demographic, and social landscapes of the Chinese city and countryside. Migration in China, with all its possibilities and obstacles, is inevitably connected to the national household registration system – the hukou (户口) system. When it was introduced it effectively put a stop to rural to urban migration as it subjects all Chinese residents to strict control through registration at their place of residence. Since then the hukou system divides Chinese society into urban citizens and rural citizens. However, rural migrant workers who are not registered with their hukou at their temporary residence are not entitled to the same social security benefits as local urban workers are. Today masses of rural migrant workers are flocking into Chinese cities even though the government of China
maintains restrictions on internal movement and access to state-sponsored benefits. These observations are complemented by our analysis of another group of migrants, for whom the key driver of migration is also employment: high skilled international business migrants. Even though the circumstances surrounding these two migration flows are completely different, they do share various characteristics. We have observed both types of migrants in parallel instead of comparatively and have focused on the individual characteristics of each group rather than viewing them in relation to one another. Our perspective is that the benefits of development should be reflected in the improvement of the quality of life of all people.

Figure 1: Societies Influenced by Migration

The term URBAN NOMADS is a different concept of mobility and details our goal of helping to shift the perception of the migrant workers from passive, victimized migrants to active participants in urban life. Similar to traditional nomads, the two groups are usually lead a temporary existence over a long period of time and instead of losing their identity by virtue of this migrancy they should be empowered to strengthen their potential within the urban realm. Internal migrant workers and inter-
national working migrants who are temporarily involved in construction processes in China are participants in city life. While they actively shape the city through the projects they are working on, they are also individuals living in the city. The naming of the observed groups as urban nomads thus clarifies their special role as permanently temporary individuals as opposed to a mere analysis of the involved migrant workers.

The two groups of international business and rural migrant workers as an integrative interpretation of urban transformations over time are investigated in Shanghai, the ‘head of the concrete dragon’. The research field Shanghai is a global city with over 23 million inhabitants (census 2010), of whom around 9 million are a floating population without proper registration, a city that is constantly negotiating what it means to be modern and what it means to be Chinese. The transformation of urban space is manifested not only in a flood of new construction, but also in the changing urban culture and lifestyles of residents.

When looking closely at the objects of our research construction sites in and around Shanghai some special features become apparent. Construction sites are situated in the setting of existing urban development, dominating the changing urban landscape and at the same time contributing to the rapid transformation of these spaces. Like the transitory people we are observing, the place itself is impermanent and undergoing constant change. Thus the interviews conducted during our research are a snapshot of the construction process at a particular point in time within the process of urban transformation. Our investigation is conducted in two parallel parts: the first observes international working migrants and the second looks at internal migrant construction workers. Both are temporarily involved in construction processes in Shanghai and are at the same time participants in the city. While they are active in shaping the city through the projects they are working on, they are also individuals living in the city.

In our first case study we describe what this means in detail for global urban nomads, where we, as international business migrants, were also part of the observed group. We highlight the dynamics of urban change in Shanghai under foreign influence, which includes service packages provided by support companies and various networks of belonging in the form of clubs, associations, and internet communities especially for expats. Further observations relate to the spatial conditions of international business migrants in Shanghai. The international community has now
exerted a strong influence upon the real estate market and two categories of residential dwelling have emerged: the high-rise apartment complexes better known as “compounds” and the low-rise villa compounds including private gardens that are situated further away from the dense city core. One finding is that both dwelling forms are “gated communities” and creating enclosed, cocoon-like spaces within the city fabric. When we shift our attention to the challenges of working, it becomes clear that working in China is a challenge in many ways, but it also offers nearly infinite opportunities for Western professional planners. While there is an immense demand for urban planners and designers, foreign architectural firms are usually only involved in the conceptual planning and need a local partner organization (LDI) for any actual construction activity.

In a second case study with a slightly different research approach, we focus on the circumstances of rural migrant construction workers. We have analysed the working conditions of rural urban nomads, including the structure of working relationships on site, demographic characteristics of workers such as level of education and age, and difficulties they encounter relating to job security, working hours, wage levels, and insurance. Based on several construction site visits in and around Shanghai we have further observed the spatial configurations of migrant workers and present a detailed breakdown of housing conditions, which are usually less than desirable with prefabricated dormitories situated directly on the construction site. Our analysis finds that the typical patterns of family life are quite scattered and that individual freedom is extremely limited as a result of working and living on site. In many parts of the world such sub-standard temporary housing exists mainly in response to natural or man-made disasters, but in this case it is due to the economics of the construction business. We thus compare the living conditions observed to international examples and question the role of architecture and design in temporary dwellings. The final section provides context for our observations by describing the social, political and legal situation that influences the lives of rural migrant workers in the city.

In this context research in the future should include possibilities of how to avoid low-quality dwellings on site and how to develop further strategies for affordable housing in Chinese cities. Migrant construction workers of course find themselves positioned between their own precarious living conditions and the buildings they are erecting. Dealing with the topics of labour migration, multiculturalism, and the diversity of local
Urban Nomads: Permanently Temporary

and transnational identities remains a challenging issue in Shanghai over the next few years. Hence it remains necessary to further encourage intercultural exchange in planning as well as long-term project implementation. Increasing awareness of cultural and social issues among architects, urban planners, and designers could lead to cities being shaped not only by economic and political decisions but by a greater focus on the inhabitants’ needs. We strongly advocate and support such an approach and call for an urbanism that responds to the needs of ‘permanently temporary urban participants’.

We address several central arguments for a socially just and sustainable form of urbanization by offering possible strategies for future construction. We propose scenarios wherein urban planners, designers, and architects could include fair building processes in their concepts and builders, contractors, and construction managers could support the fair realization of projects. These arguments ultimately form the framework for our concluding section – the project “Yídòng kètáng”, a mobile vocational school for migrant construction workers. This educational program works toward a solution by addressing all participants in construction to support a building process that goes beyond the traditional audience and contributes to a socially conscious architecture. We propose to do this by setting up a part-time education centre in a vocational school that focuses on building trades and handcrafting skills. The training program aims to provide adequate education for internal migrant workers and encourages improved cultural understanding of international migrant workers. As there are so many different participants in the construction process, it is now more important than ever that those involved have the skills necessary to understand and communicate with one another in a transcultural dialogue. To us, architecture is more than form, material and design. We understand architecture as a social, economic and political process and see the architect more in the role of a generalist than a specialist, and, in the particular case of China, as a cultural mediator too. To open a cultural dialogue it is important not to oppose either the eastern or the western positions, but to establish and investigate parallels so that conclusions for progress can be drawn.
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Migration, Uncertainty and Transculturalism

Marco Möhrer

Introduction

According to the annual displacement report of the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR, 2014), almost 60 million people worldwide were forcibly displaced in 2014 due to human right violations, war or persecution (UNHCR, 2014). Major source countries of these refugees are primarily the Syrian Arab Republic, Afghanistan and Somalia, which are home to 53 percent of all forcibly displaced people worldwide (UNHCR, 2014). The remarkable extend of the raising refugee migration1 can currently be observed especially in the European Union (EU), where almost 400,000 refugees, mainly from Arabic and Balkan countries2, applied for asylum during the first two quarters of 2015 (Eurostat, 2015a). In the same period of time, 38 percent of all asylum applications in the EU accounted for Germany (Eurostat, 2015a), making the central European country the

---

1 For this paper, migration is defined as “the geographical relocation of a person’s main place of residence; this applies accordingly for international migration when the relocation takes place beyond state borders” (BAMF, 2011, p. 12). Own translation. In this paper, the term migration applies simultaneously for national and international relocation movements.

2 With regard to the EU, the Syrian Arab Republic and Afghanistan are identified as the major source countries of refugees, counting for more than one third of all asylum applicants. In the second quarter of 2015, 21 percent of all applicants were Syrian, 13 percent Afghan, followed by Albanian (8 percent), Iraqi (6 percent) and Kosovan (5 percent). Cf. Eurostat (2015a).
most desired final destination for the majority of refugees. The latest projections expect up to 800,000 asylum applications for the year 2015 only for Germany (BAMF, 2015) which even exceeds the 600,000 applications that reached the EU in total in 2014 (Eurostat, 2015b).

These figures are substantial and illustrate how urgently an adequate reaction of European decision makers is required. However, European society seems to find itself in an ambivalent state of mind. On the one hand, the European immigration and refugee policy of recent years has been shaped by isolative patterns of behavior (Rinne & Zimmermann, 2015) that nowadays finds its climax in the construction of fences along the borders of Hungary, Bulgaria and Greece (Kalnoky, 2015). On the other hand, when analyzing the amount of refugees taken over per inhabitant, countries like Sweden, Austria and Germany demonstrate a more liberal proceeding regarding the question of how to handle the thousands of people trying to attain asylum in the EU (Eurostat, 2015a). Europe is clearly searching for orientation during times in which uncertainty about future developments is a constant companion for many Europeans. This uncertainty finds its expression in an emotional and cognitive continuum, which on the one extreme is determined by the fear of a decline of the European shared identity due to increased cultural diversity (Klingemann & Weldon, 2013), and on the other extreme by the hopeful pros-

---

3 For this tendency and daily news reports about the refugee situation in transit countries like Hungary, Austria, Greece or Macedonia cf. also Köhn (2015); Jaeger (2015) and FOCUS Online (2015).

4 Hungary has, relatively considered, the highest amount of refugees (3,317 refugees per inhabitant). However, it is argued that this number is the result of an initial overextension of the Hungarian government concerning the question of how to deal with the large numbers of refugees applying for asylum. The isolation policy shown in the sequel by building up fences and enhancing border controls puts Hungary rather in the light of being a “defender” instead of being an “enabler”.

5 For the concept of transcultural values representing a global common bond of shared principle and moral norms among all societies cf. Wieland (2014) and Küng, Leisinger, and Wieland (2010).

6 As Klingemann and Weldon (2013) point out, the mainstream argument in this regard is that cultural diversity can be a threat to a shared (political) identity. They found that this is in fact true on the short term, but “there is good reason to believe this will fade in the long term” (Klingemann and Weldon, 2013, p. 474). In contrast to this negatively connoted causal relationship between diversity and cultural identity, Josef Wieland develops a cultural conception that considers diversity as an essential
pect of an immense degree of solidarity\(^7\) coming from people who put priority to the moral side of the argument.\(^8\) It is this uncertainty in particular that results from unpredictable, complex and insoluble events\(^9\), that is to say ambiguous situations faced by individuals (Krohne, 1993), which is also characteristic for the current migration event in Europe.

The paper at hand argues that the migration movements towards Europe are not a problem per se, but a chance for cultural development. Based on Wieland’s theory of transculturalism as a continuous learning process (Wieland, 2010, 2014), it follows the overarching thesis that migration can be the starting point on the way towards a transcultural society facing less uncertainty due to shared local experiences. In order to get there, however, the paper claims that an enhanced understanding of transculturalism\(^10\) is necessary that goes beyond the current conceptual set-up that can be found in literature. Starting from Welsch’s concept of transculturalism (Welsch, 1992, 1999, 2011), the subsequent paragraph therefore unfolds an enlightened theoretical framework of transculturalism that readjusts and broadens the current understanding on two dimensions, namely on (i) the dimension of cultural diversity and on (ii) the dimension of a situative cultural learning that allows for a reconstruction of transculturalism as a continuous dynamic discovery procedure\(^11\).
Enlightened Transculturalism

The general idea behind transculturalism as a dynamic cultural concept is that cultures are not pure and static by nature (Welsch, 1992, 1999, 2011), but must rather be understood as open systems that continuously communicate and interact with one another. From a historical point of view, this approach is not completely new (Welsch, 2011). The metaphor of caravans representing “a medium of cooperation, of economic and intellectual exchange, and human experience” (Wieland, 2015), processing transcultural interactions, therefore, seems to be appropriate. However, since the nineteenth century when Herder introduced his concept of homogeneous (national) cultures that are considered to be closed and ethnocentric, clearly separated from each other and excluding any foreign elements (Herder, 1966, 1967), the view of “cultures as islands or spheres” (Welsch, 1999, p. 196) remained for a long time the dominant understanding. Referring back to this traditional perspective on cultures, Welsch concludes that even the today’s commonly known concepts of interculturality and multiculturality that supposedly try to overcome Herder’s traditional view of cultural homogeneity (Welsch, 1999), still hang on to his conception of cultures “as autonomous islands” (Welsch, 1999, p. 195). He argues that cultures are, and always were, by nature permeative and mixed systems and that a novel conceptual framework, that is to say the concept of transculturalism, is more suitable to reflect the current cultural realities, especially against the backdrop of today’s globalized society (Welsch, 1999, 2011).

In that configuration, the concept of transculturalism was first introduced by Welsch in 1992 (Welsch, 1992). In his analysis, Welsch correctly recognized the implications that the traditional understanding of cultures brings about, namely that cultures can “do nothing other than collide with one another” (Welsch, 1999, p. 196). However, the therapy that he suggests for his negative diagnosis of the traditional concept of cultures, including inter- and multiculturalism, namely the rejection of

---

12 For Welsch, the term “interculturality” means the encounter of two or more different cultures.
13 For Welsch, the term “multiculturality” means the location where these diverse cultures meet one another, namely within one society.
these concepts for the sake of transculturalism, can surely be contested. With regard to the further development of Welsch’s understanding of transculturalism considering (i) the dimension of cultural diversity, it is argued here in the words of Adam Smith that even though cultures seem to converge and mix up at the social level (Cleveland, Rojas-Méndez, Laroche, & Papadopoulos, 2015), “the most dissimilar geniuses are of use for one another” (Smith, 1789/1994, p. 18), and that it is in our own interest to make use of the “advantage from the variety of talents with which nature has distinguished its fellows” (Smith, 1789/1994, p. 18). This argument also applies for the cultural diversity in our globalized society, as much research shows that cultural diversity is not only conducive for creativity, but also for innovation and productivity (Almeida & Kogut, 1999; Alvarez, Forrest, Sanz, & Tena, 2011; Hewlett, Marshall, & Sherbin, 2013; Ozgen, Nijkamp, & Poot, 2011). Against the backdrop of the increasing socialist and fascist propaganda in the 1930s, Friedrich A. von Hayek goes even further by stating that the social process “which consists of the interaction of individuals, possessing different information and different views” (Hayek, 1939, p. 36), is the source for dissent and the basis for intellectual progress that “to us represents the greatness of humanity” (Hayek, 1939, p. 38). It seems that for Hayek it is in fact the diverseness in society, including cultural aspects likewise, that fosters dissenting opinions among different people and that builds the basis for competition, increased societal knowledge and innovation (Hayek, 1939, 1968). With regard to a theory of global ethics, Wieland argues in the same vein when he states that “the factor of diversity as an element of transcultural management has a substantial influence on the willingness and ability to cooperate of individual and collective actors, which for their part are in turn the decisive resources which have to be economized in the global cooperative economy” (Wieland, 2014, p. 182).

The aforementioned discussion has remarkable conceptual consequences for the theoretical evolution of transculturalism. In this context and against the approach of Welsch (Welsch, 1992, 1999, 2011), transculturalism has to be re-constructed as a framework that is not separated from the concepts of inter- and multiculturalism, but rather has to be understood as an integrated cultural set-up that takes both approaches into account (Wieland, 2014). In such a comprehensive cultural understanding, interculturalism then might take place on the individual level and represents the knowledge of diversity in our globalized society, that is to say the aware-
ness of cross-cultural differences and individual sets of values that drive the personal motivation of people. Further, these different individual value sets, when pooled together in an organizational context, could be considered as being multicultural in the sense that they reflect the attitude of people and groups towards diversity at an organizational level. Transculturalism as a third and completing element of such an overarching cultural conception might then be located at the institutional level building upon inter- and multiculturalism. At this level, the differing sets of cultural values among two or more individuals (interculturalism) interacting in a structured, organizational context (multiculturalism), are institutionalized in a common and specific (working) culture, defining a particular values-based framework of social interaction that is the result of shared local (situative) experiences (transculturalism). Figure 1 tries to illustrate this relationship.

Based on this theoretical understanding, transculturalism is developed in an integrative fashion and can be defined as follows:

Transculturalism reflects a temporary cultural atmosphere\textsuperscript{15} for social interaction resulting from the transcultural competences of individuals, that is the behavioral proficiency to effectively establish a common (working) culture based on shared local experiences which fosters the efficient proceeding of intercultural transactions within a multicultural context.

Besides the previous conceptual readjustments of Welsch’s theory of transculturalism on (i) the dimension of cultural diversity, the paper further argues in line with Wieland’s dynamic understanding of transculturalism as a continuous learning process (Wieland, 2010, 2014) that there has to be a conceptual enhancement on (ii) the dimension of a situative cultural learning. This dimension is already reflected in the definition of transculturalism understood as a “temporary cultural atmosphere for social interaction” that is “based on shared local experiences”. The term local is crucial in this regard as it refers to the situative character of cultural interaction. The institutionalization of differing individual sets of cultural values, interacting in an organizational context, in a particular behavior-guiding framework, that is to say a common (working) culture, cannot be
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Figure 1: Enlightened Transculturalism

Transculturalism
Institutional level
- Common and specific (working) culture
- Particular values-based framework
- Result of shared local experiences
  ➔ Temporary cultural atmosphere for social interaction

Interculturalism
Individual level
- Cross-cultural differences
- Individual set of values
- Personal motivation
  ➔ Knowledge of diversity

Multiculturalism
Organisational level
- Pool of different individual value-sets
- Structured in an organisational context
  ➔ Attitude of people and groups towards diversity

Source: Own figure

static by nature. Such institutional arrangements rather exist only temporarily for specific single situations involving selected individuals as they are continuously distracted by social events leading to changes in society. According to Karl Popper, only these social events and their situational analysis allow us to “explain and understand what happens in society” (Popper, 1985, p. 358). Taking this perspective, we are enabled to see the current migration movements in and towards Europe in a different light: they are, from a situational-analytical point of view, just another social event that all of a sudden has popped up and that, like every other event,

16 The idea of assigning inter-, multi- and transculturalism to the individual, organizational and institutional level came up during a discussion with Josef Wieland.
is supposed to reconstruct our current social reality in a certain way. As the previous statements have shown, the enlarged cultural diversity that comes along with this particular social event is, according to the argumentation of this paper, not something “foreign” to the concept of transculturalism, but a necessary prerequisite for its realization. By taking the chance of making new shared situative (local) experiences while engaging in intercultural transactions within a multicultural context, novel common (working) cultures as temporarily existing values-based frameworks for social interaction in our (European) society will emerge. These new institutions can be considered to be further steps in a continuous cultural and societal learning process. Transculturalism, in this regard, then becomes a dynamic ever changing concept, influenced and changed by socio-cultural events, that has to be understood not as the final destination of cultural development, but to say it with Hayek, “as a procedure of discovering [cultural] facts which, if the procedure did not exist, would remain unknown or at least would not be used” (Hayek, 1968, p. 9).

Conclusion

Understanding transculturalism as a discovery procedure (Hayek, 1968) is insofar appropriate in this regard as the term “discovery” already implies that there is something unknown, something uncertain that can potentially be exposed. It is that uncertainty among European civil society which also plays a crucial role regarding the social event of refugee migration. This particular event imposes a new social reality and therefore presents new challenges for our civil society whose consequences we are not able to foresee. Even though it is not possible to eliminate uncertainty completely, it can at least be hedged in a certain way (Wahl, 2011). As the above outlined enlightened conception shows, transculturalism is qua definitionem determined by effectively sharing local experiences and can thus be seen as a method of hedging societal uncertainty. In this regard, transculturalism then means creating a fruitful “cultural atmosphere” that enables the compatible communication between different systems (Luhmann 1987), or in our context different cultures, for effective and efficient cooperation. In fact, the migration movements of today lead to more

17 For this argument also cf. Wieland (2010, 2014).
cultural diversity in our society and they finally represent nothing else than another management task for European society requiring ex ante investments. And as every other investment, this engagement also holds (societal) risks whose outcomes are not equally positive for every single person. However, for the sake of cultural and societal development, “the only common objective we can pursue in choosing this technique for the ordering of social reality is the abstract structure or order that will be created as a consequence” (Hayek, 1968, p. 15).
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What will be the cultural impact of Japanese companies reaching out for global talent?

Aidin Ahmadi

Japanese companies marching into a new era

This paper is raising questions regarding the potential cultural impact of companies that have started to implement recruitment practices on a global scale, with special regards to the implications for Japanese society. Important keywords in this regard are certainly among many others: Globalization, Knowledge Society, Business Organizations and Intercultural Communication, with each of them being very important to be able to approach the most relevant questions.

‘Globalization’ as a concept, as well as the term itself, has already become essential for especially social and culture sciences, when conducting research and analyses of change and new paradigms, with special regards to the various concepts of culture and their implications for our economic environment. For example, one could argue that ever since the end of World War II (WWII) the process of westernization and digitalization on a global scale is very likely to have supported the drastic spread of knowledge and, thus, new forms of cultural clashes within global categories (Meyer et al., 2010). These cultural clashes need to be taken notice of, especially if we are to conduct research or business in a global context.

This essay intends to draw attention to Japan’s labour market from an intercultural perspective, and by seizing the very current matter of Japan’s strive for a economical change discuss the potential cultural impact of Japanese companies reaching out for employees on a new and global scale.
It is inherent that Globalization has had an impact on business organizations and the manner in which they conduct human resource (HR) management and business processes internally, as well as externally. Due to the rapid increase of sales and revenue on a larger, namely a global scale, it is obvious that business relationships with various different national cultures necessarily will continue to issue unknown and great challenges to business organizations. In addition to that, apart from national cultures there are also far more distinct forms (or layers) of cultures to be considered, e.g. ‘Professional Cultures’, ‘Organizational Cultures’ or ‘Local Cultures’ (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005).

On the one hand business organizations strive to develop and encourage a safe cultural playground based on the combination of certain theoretical themes and viewing culture as an entity, a belief system, strategy, or even mental programming (Maull et al., 2001). On the other hand, they try to capitalize on Global HR efficiency by strongly encouraging employees and expecting graduates to be able to cope with the cultural challenges within their very own and unique business context. This has led to an increasing number of researchers and consultants who try to support business organizations and their employees in this regard from their various professional point of views by e.g. raising the right questions, conducting empirical studies and trainings, developing guidelines or even competency-based tests.

Apparently, it is especially the term of Intercultural Competency, which continues to gain importance throughout these developments. One of the most relevant theoretical concepts is certainly the Hofstede model of the six dimensions of national cultures (Hofstede, 2011):

1. Power Distance;
2. Uncertainty Avoidance;
3. Individualism/Collectivism;
4. Masculinity/Femininity;
5. Long/ Short-Term Orientation;
These dimensions are significantly useful for conducting research and relevant for hopefully getting closer to understand one another’s national culture to the fullest.

However, the problem is that in the case of business organizations, their individual and complex cultures may differ a lot from the national cultures they are operating in. Therefore, the model might not be sufficient enough to provide us with the mentioned safe cultural playground for global business. Although it is difficult to refer to certainty when analysing culture and communication, certainty is still one of the six dimensions which Hofstede (2011) has based his assumptions and scientific research on.

It is to be noted however, that theories may just be theories and quickly meet their limitations when being applied to a particular situation: no situation can be understood as being alike, but rather an intercultural scenario of actions and codes among two parties (Hall, 1980). From what we can learn from intercultural communication and our own experiences in this regard, it is imperative to seek this kind of playground e.g. by knowing about each other’s opinions, interests and history in order to even get close to what we would assume mutual understanding.

In the case of Japan, a country that lived in almost complete isolation from the rest of the world for more than 200 years during the Edo-Era (17–19th Century), employees and students have just recently started to more and more develop an interest for foreign cultures and the global economy. Thus, preparing themselves for the intercultural challenges ahead of them: even today’s Japan with a total population of more than 127 Mio citizens only shows a foreigner’s rate of 2 \%.\footnote{Source: Japan Statistical Yearbook 2015, Statistics Bureau, Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications, Japan.}

The cultural heritages from the former Edo-Era are still very present in Japan, especially in terms of Japanese business culture (Sugimoto, 2003). Therefore and due to economically being forced to enter a new era of business culture, Japan and its working society, as well as their everyday life, may be very likely to face a new and enormous cultural impact caused by – not only, but to begin with – organizations participating in the global hunt for new talent.
Why may business organizations have a cultural impact at all?

‘Culture’ and ‘business’ both seem like two intertwined concepts and at the same time not to be comparable at all. As for this relationship, literature and managers tend to suggest rather an incorporated and particular manner or business related how-to based on the combination of various factors and intercultural influences, than a new and distinctive form of a culture. For example, authors like Schein (2010) have suggested that culture is best thought of as a set of psychological predispositions or ‘basic assumptions’ that members of an organization possess, and which leads them to think and act in certain ways. Schein (1985) rather understands a business organization’s culture as:

“Pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learns as it solves its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to those problems.”

These shared basic assumptions are not only psychological, but also highly linked to one’s national culture and education, which leads to unsurprisingly very different Encoding/decoding processes (Hall, 1980) within business organizations. This is one of the reasons why American organizations have very different management, leadership and communication styles compared to the German or Japanese, and vice versa.

It might be true that the national culture and the individual himself do have a very important impact on a business organization’s culture, however, it also true that it is the nature and necessity of a business to put quantitative success and economic goals before personal interest, even cultural customs. This is especially the case if a business aims to grow in a fast paced and competitive, not to speak global, market.

The external effects of actions like these can be analysed internally, as well as externally. Japanese business organizations, like any other business organization, may indeed have a cultural impact with their goal-driven actions, e.g. the recruiting of foreign expatriates as new labour force.

Internally, they appear to be more and more dealing with the various cultures, trying to fully integrate foreigners into the daily local business routines and shaping their individuality by adoption and learning in order to effectively capitalize on human capital. This way, Japanese employees
are more and more starting to connect with people who were supposed to be 外 [so-to: outside]. As a matter of fact, this change has been pushed forward already for several years, especially ever since Globalization took its effects through digital commerce and enforced intercultural business relations, such as an increasing number of mergers and acquisitions with firms from other countries (Bebenroth, 2007). Businesses more and more rolled-out their business models and sent out their employees worldwide.

Externally, Japanese business organizations inherently determine local employment paradigms, e.g. by adjusting their expected qualifications or identifying new job opportunities which most certainly may not be accessible for local natives. Hence, there may also be a strong impact on a political dimension as well, disrupting the local education system and in particular its academic and pedagogic foci, whilst also affecting local demographics by inviting different cultural groups (which may also cause less cohesion due to out-groups even among Japanese, e.g. Interested in Europeans/Not-Interested in Europeans).

What are the circumstances of Japan’s new course?

Japan is a country with the third biggest GDP in the world. However, today Japan is also a country that is required to go through a lot of changes – not only, but also due to the implications of its rapid demographic change (Sugimoto, 2003). Yet, Japan is also a country that wants to maintain its unique traditions and sustain economic vitality by any means. They are very confident to walk down this difficult path, especially as evidence for success can be found in the history of Japan.

It was during the 東京-Era when Japan completely isolated itself from the rest of the world and pursued strict policies like 鎖国 [Sa-ko-ku: locked country], under which foreigners were prohibited to enter and Japanese to leave the country on death penalty. Policies like this most certainly not only led to an isolated Japanese society, but also to their very unique developments onwards (Albert, 1961).

---

At the same time, Japan maintained limited-scale trade and diplomatic relations with selected partners, e.g. the Netherlands. Because of these exclusive foreign relationships, Japan was able to develop thriving cities and pompous castles, whilst increasing the commodification of agriculture and domestic trade, foster literacy and a healthy education system whilst laying the foundation for modernization.

In addition to that, the notion of 会社 [Kaisha: Japanese Corporation] is also one of the legacies from this time. It is a management concept entirely based on the strong foundation of Japanese values and therefore very close to Japan’s national culture. Even today, the Kaisha is still a highly valued concept, which essentially determines working life in Japan: it is common knowledge that it was their individual and national culture oriented management approach that supported Japan’s enormous economic growth up until 1990, when the crash of the economic bubble took its full effects (Wördemann, 2014). Ever since that time, Japan has been struggling to cope with the new situation and maintain its economic standing by depending on old means.

However, today’s challenges in Globalization and the rapid demographic changes may already have proven that the traditional notion of Kaisha is not necessarily an ideal one, but rather one that needs to adapt to the information era (Bebenroth, Kanai, 2011). Whilst the concept of Kaisha requires a mixture of private and professional life for the sake of the community, this may not be the case for western business organizations. They are explicitly about a data-driven, namely profitable, professional life and excluding any personal matters for the sake of the individual. For example, Japanese employees are expected to work immeasurably hard by putting the sake of their company before their own needs in order to meet the goal of stability and 和 [wa: harmony, important notion in Japanese Culture]. Foreign employees (westerners) are trained to be individually effective and efficient in terms of goals and metrics, thus growing their company’s success as an entity of individuals.

Therefore, foreign employees as they are entering a Kaisha might not only provoke cultural clashes, but also require the local system to understand, change and adapt. If Japanese business organizations – like any other business – really are to meet their new economic needs, they are required to fully capitalize on human capital and deal with those cultural clashes in an efficient manner, e.g. understanding their own cultural bias
and reflecting on intercultural communication processes from multiple points of view.

In addition to this, contemporary management literature tells us that the successful recruitment of employees only starts with the search and shall by any means sought to be understood as a long lasting and intense relationship between organization and participant (Bebenroth, Kanai, 2011). This relationship not only asks for attention and respect, but also mutual understanding – especially when recruiting from a global employee market. The Kaisha has to change, however not for but rather along with the structural and cultural challenges ahead of them. The search for a truthful and meaningful mutual understanding may just be the foundation for this.

How can Japanese deal with the challenges?

It has become a matter of course that any mutual understanding in business terms is usually related to relevant data and metrics. Throughout communication processes one can surely misunderstand the other’s cultural codes and implications (Hall, 1980), but there can always be common ground on the basis of facts and figures, e.g. test results measuring language proficiency. In fact, there are various approaches trying to provide one universal solution for intercultural challenges, however this only alludes to the question whether there can really be one and to what extent cultures are really able to listen and understand each other. Kurt Lewin (1947b) contributed greatly with his development of a key model about measuring change processes with special regards to organizational theory and behavioural sciences.

In the following, this model will be applied as theoretical framework in order to develop a proposal as to how Japanese can possibly prepare themselves for the upcoming challenges in the employment market and yet maintain their own cultural agenda. According to Lewin, a successful change involves at least the following three steps (Burnes, 2004):

1. Unfreezing (Understand);
2. Moving (Change);
3. Refreezing (Adapt).
The first step of Unfreezing is most likely also the most difficult one, as it requires the equilibrium to be destabilized in a psychological dynamic process before old behaviour can be discarded and new behaviour learned (Schein, 1985). Further, it is inherent that there can be no universal approach to this, which could be applied to any kind of situation, whereas it is to be taken notice of the fact that any approach in this regard would have to create sufficient psychological safety for successful Unfreezing. For example, one will have to feel safe from loss and humiliation before he can accept new behaviour, or no change is to take place at all.

The second step of Moving seizes the motivation to learn, which is created throughout the first step, and directs it towards a particular outcome. Due to the complexity of planned change and learning processes, one is highly dependent on reinforcements when evaluating available options on a trial and error basis. Otherwise, the change might just turn out to be fugacious.

The third step of Refreezing seeks to stabilize a new equilibrium and ensure new behaviour from its likely regress. New behaviour has to be compatible not only with one’s personality but also his environment in order to avoid the risk of a potential disconfirmation dilemma, and ultimately regress (Burnes, 2004). Therefore, unless group norms and routines adapt as well, any changes to individual behaviour will most likely not be able to sustain. In organizational terms this means that Refreezing requires changes to organizational culture, norms, policies and practices, just as well.

If we apply Lewin’s model (1947b) to this paper’s question of a cultural impact, it is obvious that the fact of Japanese business organizations participating in a global recruitment market comes along with changes to organizational culture as well as new requirements for current and especially future employees in Japan. Suddenly, Japanese not only need to compete with foreigners, they also have to deal with cross-national assignments and intercultural challenges, e.g. when working in an international team. With more and more Japanese businesses going global these kinds of challenges are increasing rapidly.

This appears to be one impossible task that needs to be taken care of. One out of many possible solutions as to how to deal with this task could be to address the problem as the following: “Think Local, Act Global” (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005) and Foster Expertise.

"Think Local, Act Global" (Hofstede, Hofstede, 2005) and Foster Expertise.
Today’s globalized world is highly depended on its most important resource, which is knowledge. However and as mentioned before, it seems to be extremely difficult to find common ground in this regard, if not measurable by numbers. Japanese are suddenly becoming part of a global employee market, in which they are required to stand out from an impossible number of people and where – today more than ever before – employment decisions are based upon Big Data. One the one hand, this can have various negative external effects, e.g. if we are to consider Japan’s aging society that needs to be taken care of by their children who are too busy meeting impossible numeric goals at work, just to stay in their employment. On the other hand, this can also have very positive effects, e.g. if Japanese know how to prepare themselves, make the right choices and seize the chances that they are given.

Therefore, Japanese shall go through an individual and very intimate change process, whilst developing intercultural competencies on their way and ensuring the measurability of their personal developments all along.

The first step is for Japanese to seize situations where they feel secure and accepted, yet are able to confront and learn about foreign cultures. Above all, this requires organizations to create and encourage such opportunities. It is to be noted that the first step has to be a completely personal process, which is fundamentally dependent on the patience and willingness of the individual to learn. Once one manages to discover his individual interest or excitement about a foreign culture, this motivation will be the key on the way not only to understand but also to be able to cope with any intercultural challenge ahead. Apparently, Japanese business organizations have already started to support their employees in this regard, e.g. by sending them to international universities within Japan and have them study English and spend time with foreigners for a few months, before calling them back to work.

The second step is to embrace foreign culture individually and reflect on each other’s cultural identity not only through one, but multiple ways. During this step, cultural clashes are inevitable and required, as Japanese will not only start to understand foreigners’ cultural bias, but also more importantly their very own. Based on their individual experiences and personal evaluation, Japanese will begin directing their learning processes towards a particular outcome, which they assume to fit their professional and/or personal needs best. Therefore, Intercultural Competencies are to
be built from multiple points of view within an individual field of expertise and personal interest. Apart from trial and error, further examples in this regard may include friendships or even romances with foreigners, traveling abroad, the participation in cultural projects, or the involvement with foreign languages and literature.

The third step is to recognize and foster transcultural knowledge and share it within one’s peer group(s). Positive experiences and competencies are to be used to contribute to a group-reflected change in a relevant environment, which can be of personal and/or professional nature, e.g. adjusting the function of feedback or appraisals to the individual needs of a department or assignment.

Possible Scenarios for a cultural impact in Japan

“Think Local, Act Global, Foster Expertise” as described in the latter is a solution approach model for change processes in the Japanese labour market. However, it is also a model that is ought to be understood as a suggestion trying to outline one potential approach as to how to deal with the cultural impact of Japanese business organizations participating in a global labour market. It is more than essential to see the fact that this model may only examine one out of many approaches within many possible scenarios. As a matter of fact, certainty is a notion very rarely to be applicable when discussing culture, whereas it is essential to draw attention to certain facts and developments in order to be able to provide relevant variables as a valid framework for future scenarios. As for this paper’s research question, examples include especially empirical values, such as employment/unemployment rate, birth rate, migration rate or diversification rate.

In the following, previous thoughts and ideas upon Japanese business organizations will be seized to summarize and conclude with four possible scenarios that may outline the cultural impact for Japanese employees, based on the two selected variables of Uncertainty Avoidance and Foreigner Employability.

Scenario I (see Table 1) more or less represents today’s situation in Japan, which is being stuck in the middle and forced to take actions. In this scenario, e.g. low birth rates may imply how Japanese employees, men and women, have to work for a longer time in their life under harsher
conditions, such as low wages. At the same time, younger generations are too scared to even consider a career path in Japan under these conditions and therefore, if possible, try to reach out for employment either within the near APAC area so that they are able to fully support their families sufficiently, or within the USA where they expect to receive even higher wages. In fact, these trends and assumptions appear to be already proven by the most current research conducted by the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (2015).

Table 1: Scenario Overview
Uncertainty Avoidance; Foreigner Employability

Scenario II resembles a situation where Japanese have started to face the situation with the confidence in a change from in-between a nationalist Japan. Hence, they take risks instead of avoiding the conflict, and in order to maintain their traditions and national identity see the necessity to break with certain traditions whereas determining a new cultural line through trial and error. For example, Japanese could start providing individual
and constructive feedback with their supervisors, however not in public to avoid the risk of the supervisor “loosing his face” (Sugimoto, 2003) – therefore, a new cultural line.

Scenario III describes the impact of a large number of foreigners who come from very individualistic and masculine countries and immigrate to Japan. The Clash of Cultures and their opposing behaviour towards Japanese harmony eventually leads foreigners to outcompete even Japanese locals to an extent, that Japanese are forced to overcome their own cultural identity and undertake a change process, which may however turn out to be not very sustainable or sincere (Burnes, 2004). For example, in the worst case this could even lead to young Japanese wanting to leave their home country or a high degree of差別 [sa-be-tsu: term for discrimination against foreigners in Japan].

Scenario IV portrays a situation where a large number of foreigners have immigrated to Japan, however able to successfully adapt and fully integrate into the local culture e.g. via intercultural skills. Foreigners pay high attention to alter their behaviour in a Japanese manner, maintaining the harmony. At the same time, this will also most likely turn out to seclude them from the local Japanese and eventually leave them in a group of foreigners who are continuously trying to fully adapt to Japanese culture, yet facing the reality of seclusion. For example, even when foreigners were to address others in perfect Japanese they will still most likely be answered in English.

Based on the two variables of Uncertainty Avoidance and Foreigner Employability it is evident that one may conclude various scenarios, as shown by the latter four ones. As a matter of fact, the diversification rate in Japan is already rapidly increasing (Tanikawa, 2014):

“Japan's appetite to engage more non-Japanese has been soaring, reflecting a growing desire to go global and to add diversity to the workforce. Of more than 800 midsize to large companies [...] 48 percent of them say they plan to recruit non-Japanese college graduates.”

Therefore, Japanese will have to find a way inbetween Scenario III and Scenario IV, if they earnestly want to to maintain their unique traditions and sustain economic vitality whilst undergoing a change process. Scenario IV is closest to the desired Boom-Scenario (I), whereas Scenario III with its inevitable extent of a Clash of Cultures is required to be able to accept the challenge and undergo the upcoming changes in Japan. For
example, if one day Japanese truly desire to work efficiently together with foreigners within an business organization, both sides will have to gain intercultural skills, knowledge and expertise within their common field of interest, as well as an in-depth understanding of each other’s history and personal background. Is important for both sides to start appreciating the individual as a mixture of numerous cultures and interests, rather than focusing on one figurative collective and homogenous cultural identity. Fostered expertise equally measurable by data and numbers along with intercultural skills may be just one out of many potential but important stepping-stones on this way.
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3. Governance
‘Homeless’ Global Nomads and What They Bring Us

Kirill Krainov

Abstract

This article shows the new mainstream of life in the modern society, what is called nomadism. Nomadism is considered as a natural migration process, but not in a psychological context. Human behavior is the critical point of the article. There are seven reasons why modern people to migrate, breaking their stability, comfort and daily routine. However, this process has consequences and they are the real problems that must be solved. Solutions therefore are proposed in the article. The solutions are not radical. They are fitted in civilized society. The one global barrier is that the modern society is not probably ready to accept the objective reality and use the solution like presented there.

Keywords: multiculturalism, world, problem, nomadism, people, mainstream, modern society, integration, democracy

Nowadays, nomadism is an actual problem. But it is not considered as a social deviation. According to J. Attali’s point of view, nomadism is considered as a different form of migration. Despite the fact that we take another definition (not from social psychology) of this phenomenon, nonetheless it leads to definite consequences for our society.

We often see how news construct xenophobic realities making us think that it is an objective reality we live in, and involve into an artificial mainstream (The New York Times, 2016). Before we start to critically
look at consequences of nomadism, it must be said that we will not talk about xenophobia or public opinion regarding migrants in different countries. It is much more interesting to analyze nomadism out of social psychology frames, but in context of personality. The consequences of nomadism are analyzed in the article from different points of view, out of political patterns or formations, that press and TV provide every day, generalizing the events from singular situations to cast-like categories and making people hate each other. So, why not look at the world in another way instead of closing eyes? That point is the one of endless wish to infinite perfection, like survival of the fittest, or civilization lifecycle, like the graphical dynamic of currency.

When we hear the word “nomads” we usually see in the mind’s eye Huns with Attila in the lead, Mongols under the famous Genghis Khan’s leadership, wandering the lands, settling down in the most favorable places to recover strength and then proceeding further squatting and colonizing new lands. It is known from history lessons at school, educational TV programs, encyclopedias and the internet. Looking back in the past we can recollect the Ice Age which caused the Great Migration of peoples. The Great Migration of peoples is considered to be the great peoples shift, conditioned by certain aims and events. However, the definitions of “nomadism” from psychological point of view do not come to mind.

Nowadays, probably, we are not in danger of living in the Ice Age. Nevertheless, from everlasting, people keep leaving their houses, seeking for better living and working conditions, comfort and many other factors the evolution entailed. There is no need for people to use spears and bows. Earlier unknown parts of the planet have been successfully discovered. But still we know a lot of travelers, migrants, discovering the broad expanses of the developing and developed countries. Why does the world get new nomads? It is impossible to answer this question in two words. Jaques Attali, reviewing the phenomenon of nomadism in his “Brief History Of The Future”, does not take on the traditional approach accepted in social psychology. His definition regards people’s migration connected with some circumstances. Also J. Attali appeals “either to interact with the global nomadic society or to be excluded from it” (Attali, 2009 [own interpretation]). I’d like to dwell upon this approach and study it from all sides.
1. Economic Integration

According to the database of the United Nations, there are 82,000 transnational corporations that have 810,000 foreign branches. The number of employees is constantly changing, depending on events that take place in the corporations. Driven by the desire of being wealthy, experienced and promoted, thousands of people leave their home cities and strike into the very heart of the new IT industry.

At the end of the 20th century plenty scientists didn’t see any prospects in Russia (Russian Scientists Emigration: “Circulation” Or “Leak” Of Brains, 2013), accordingly migrated to those countries where their profession would be highly esteemed, to the USA, for example. People who aim at self-actualization, perhaps, would better choose a developed country with great number of opportunities rather than staying in a country that gives them small chances for self-actualization.

The same situation happens when an employee is transferred from the main office to a foreign branch of the company and vice versa. Having accepted the terms and conditions, the employee leaves the habitual place, longing for new horizons. Nowadays, it is not places themselves that are wanted to be discovered by the nomads, it is the opportunities of these places. The system of transnational organizations does not accept neither the borders of the countries, nor their sovereignty. The Chinese philosopher Zhao Shifa mentions that the antiglobalist movement expresses the new modern capitalist crisis: it is the opposition of capitalist globalization (Mantatov, 2009, p. 176 [own translation]). Often, Russian and Vietnamese citizens identify transnational corporations’ reclamations of their market with invasions.

The aim of the corporations is to find their place or niche in the economy of the country. Owners of the corporations hardly find this process as invasion. It is business, not a war.

Total economic integration makes people nomads because borders of the countries become transparent under the influence of the transnational corporations. It does not matter where an employee comes from – Russia, Serbia, Brazil, China, he becomes a nomad because he is not in his homeland but also not in a new home yet. Being in a new country, he will look for a new home, but somehow or other this process takes quite a

---

1 The information from UNCTAD, FDI Statistics (2009).
time and until this he is thought to be a nomad. The target country of a nomad will benefit from him, as described below.

Nomads’ vision and activities open new markets and possibilities for economic development of the countries they choose. They extrapolate their ambitions, manager talent, human resources and their own vision from ideas and projects to products. They bring new values to the world and develop competitive products in other countries, helping world economy.

Maksymilian Faktorowicz, known as Max Factor, created the most famous cosmetic brand in the world. We know only its name; see successful lines of products and expressive advertising campaigns. But what is about the roots of the worldwide brand? Despite the fact of the emperors respect, he left the Russian Empire and went to the United States of America, from where his business grew to a global brand existing until today.

Jan Boris Koum, a citizen of the USA, born in the Ukraine, created WhatsApp. In 2014 the startup successfully was acquired by the IT-giant Facebook.

So, the kind of discrimination of the citizens who were born in the countries the nomads move looks as a counter-evidence of all written above. From the moral side of the question, it looks unfair. But we should not forget that it is competition caused by legal people’s wish to make their life better, build a career and succeed in something. It is not clear what a catalyst of human resources in foreign country is. It may be better conditions for business, higher salary, lack of state pressure that means civilized relations between government and business, consumer culture, financial aspects, developed business infrastructure and many other variants that are able to provide comfortable life. It is hard to count all reasons, but the general one of migrations is to find better place to live.

\[2\text{ More in Basten, 2008.}\]
2. Technological Progress

“Industrial revolution has been lasting since 1950 till nowadays. This phenomenon accelerated technological progress.” (Kulagin, 2015 [own translation])

Modern technologies appear as a result of using power resources. This leads to the development of further technologies. Life on our planet or on some of its parts in particular is not possible without technological progress. That is why developed countries are the destinations of dissatisfied people regarding their living conditions. In these countries they can find comfort and coziness they have been dreaming of for so long.

Technological progress plays an important role in people’s lifestyle, in forming their mentality and realization in society. According to the idea of the evolutionism, a man goes further and further and finds something new in everything.

Therefore, technical progress is able to make people’s life easier, give them new opportunities and deepen their outlook.

Technological progress is the key feature of comfort. If a person cannot satisfy his or her needs in his or her native country, he can find more comfortable place where it is possible to get something he or she needs.

3. Expansion of Global Democracy

World democracy and the expansion of its standards make public pay attention to the new standards and think of changing political regimes to improve life standards. But the citizens of countries like KPDR (Korean People’s Democratic Republic) are not able to change standards because of the governmental authority.

The example of leaving the house of violence is the childhood of Yan Kum. He was born in Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. When he was 16, his mother, grandmother and him moved to Mountain-View, California. According to his words (Chernikova, 2014), totalitarian society of Soviet Union did not let someone show freedom of speech and personality. He remarked that the USA and its democracy allowed him to realize his abilities and ambitions.

World democracy gives various directions for development without limiting one’s potential. Democracy does not make people obey. It gives
the possibility to choose what you really want, define priorities and achieve your goals. And, of course, the personality, interested in self-development and actualization, prefers the democratic society.

In 2010 famous Russian social network “VK.COM” created the poll. The question was the following: “What country would you prefer – a country that controls and cares about its citizens or the country that does not care about people and allows any ways of achieving their targets?” (the poll is deleted). On the one hand, a country that cares about its citizens creates a sense of unity. But on the other hand, not everyone accepts the suggestion like this. So, 70% of respondents chose the second option. We can say that there are a lot of possibilities for personal development in democratic countries. Maybe, that’s why many Chinese technical specialists chose the USA to go and work for successful startups and corporations.

The definition of nomadism has a negative side according to the political context of Ukraine and Far East. These events alarm and create aggressive background in our society. But in most of the causes, Attali’s definition of nomadism does not look like a threat of national sovereignty or economical points. It just helps personality to find himself or herself and, of course, acquire home. Should we be aggressive to people who do not interfere in our country with their own laws? Unfortunately, excessive criticism, social aggression and stereotypes paint nomads black.

People are different, according to appearance, views etc. Personal mood should not be demonstrated and should not agitate others against strangers. Personal opinion should not hurt people with another color of skin, or political or religious views. All negative must stay inside, because modern society is a complex system with a lot of problems. And we need not make it worse. It looks like we destroy our home by ourselves with xenophobia or abhorrence. For example, we can see a kind of such destruction in anti-migrants demonstrations. (RT, 2016) According to Jean Piaget’s, “egocentrism is the inability to differentiate between self and other”, so and human being is egocentric. Also, any kinds of discrimination are a form of limitation of human rights.

Countries should be prepared for waves of immigrants and be able to predict and assess consequences of such phenomenon, but not state that immigrants’ countries are guilty in behavior of their citizens. And if we

---

3 The United Nations conventions and declarations.
find some ideologies (including communism) irrelevant, why not provide all democratic amenities for personality? But anyway, first of all, we must test our hypothesis…

4. The Effects of Man-made Disasters

According to many people’s opinion, the worst event of human’s life is to lose home. Every year we see people looking for a new place to live in, because their own dwellings are in danger of natural disasters. Nowadays, migrations are mostly caused by nuclear disasters (Nagasaki, Chernobyl, the flood in Khabarovsk, Fukushima nuclear station). Destroyed cities make people leave like nomads and force them to find new homes.

Also people appear to have a desire to forget those tragic events, run away and never see their ruined houses again. The USA found out new oil – shale one. The citizens of one city reported that they got oil instead of water out of their tub. And it was really flammable. The shale oil corporation in fact damaged the nature and destroyed houses of many citizens. People had to leave.

Having lost their home, people move towards an unknown world. To great sorrow, political situation and “hot news” by federal channels incept the negative ideas and moods into mass, coloring millions of innocent and struggling people in the color of national enemies. Most of people do not think about other people’s trouble. Their consciousness recognize innocent people as enemies because TV and mass propaganda do its work successfully and earn what they deserve. To get governmental support in times of great need is one of human rights. No state can refuse to help them. His or her appearance or citizenship are not valid reasons. As for ‘life hackers’ who used to live for money of fair taxpayers, we can provide social politics with a kind of motivation that will make them find a job, or become like rich fair taxpayers.

Furthermore, deviant behavior of a guests of a country who lost their homes and want to find new ones in a foreign land, is not a way civilized people live. First of all, people should be grateful to countries and their citizens that allowed them to find a refuge. It is a key point of a civilized human being, but not barbarian-like behavior. The words ‘guest’ and ‘host’ have the same letters at the end, but not beginning and meaning…
5. Population Growth

Population growth leads to weakening capacity of the country to provide citizens with everything they need. So, when generations grow, many people cannot find jobs or define business sphere for themselves because of said lack of jobs.

This phenomenon is the reason not only for a lack of job places, but for the territory crisis as well. It made the Party of CPR (Chinese People’s Republic) limit the number of children families can have. It is impossible for China to accommodate more than 1.4 billion people. Therefore, people leave China and find new places for life and work. Many Chinese people live in South-Eastern Asia and North America and get things and services that China cannot provide with.

Exponential population growth pushes away a lot of people from their homeland searching for a better place for personal space. According to the CIA’s ‘The World Factbook’, there are currently 7 billion people in the world. The diagonal line is going upwards predicting the intensive growth of the population in the near future. It is the natural order of things, is not it?

6. Blue collars are not in demand

As I have mentioned above, technological progress makes our life easier sometimes even replacing different spheres of life and work, giving us to enjoy our time. However, it doesn’t look so perfect as we think. Robotized technologies, super speed manual labor have a bad influence on blue-collars – they lose their work places. Often, blue collar workers do not belong to middle class society. That’s why they need a stable life. But to a great sorrow, their stable life is in danger: multifunctional soulless robots are more accurate, effective, faster than people.

A good example is given in the film ‘Charlie And The Chocolate Factory’. Little Charlie lived with his parents and grandparents on the outskirts of the city full of skyscrapers. One day the father was fired. The chocolate factory of Mr Wonka did not need manual labour. So, the man and his family could hardly meet their needs.

Robots are not perfect enough to become humans’ competitors, but they become in demand rapidly. In 2015 the automatic hand for assembly
of Volkswagen cars killed a worker because of program failure. (The Guardian, 2015)

People, accustomed to working manually, have to live in endless nomads’ way to earn money. China, countries of South-Eastern Asia and South America are good for blue-collar workers who need a job. Also they should pay attention to young European startups that need manual labor because they can’t afford automatization of the working process yet.

The evolution has no mercy. One day, even promising and prospective transhumanism will be extruded by much more powerful androids with own brains that were made by last humans. And before the age described by Isaac Asimov in his “I, Robot” (1950) comes we cannot exclude labor evolution, because it goes slowly, not like a revolution. But despite the fact technological progress, we and our next 2–3 generations will not see robotized philosophers. So, today robots do not have enough power to extrude manual labor. That’s why blue-collar workers have to find job in different places of the Earth.

7. Modern Mainstream

Non-stop development and education are promoted by the information environment of our society. Companies promote nomadism without realizing it. The idea of a borderless world is conveyed in pictures, advertisements, books, films and even learning foreign languages. As mass media say, we possess freedom.

People see in that more than just a life. It is a real freedom connected with intercultural communication, self-improving and self-identification with the world civilization. Kah Kyung Cho supposes that “the West teaches us how to earn money, but the East shows us how to live.” (Mantatov, 2009 [own translation]) It is true because the east is a place of morality and wisdom. From B. K. Uggla’s point of view, “to build bridges is better than to build walls” (Mantatov, 2009 [own translation]). And we see these ideas are used in the advertisements of different tourist and aero companies. People share their impressions about travelling. In this way, they create and activate the idea of going to Thailand, unknown Finnish countryside or Bali to open an absolutely new world, feel culture and get unforgettable and priceless experience. And lifestyle consumerism here
goes to the background like in “The Joneses” with David Duchovny and Demy Moore and plays a role of emotional infection.

Individualism and group egoism get stronger every day. Conception of dividing personality and society into two different groups shows the results. Social progress is impossible if people are not ready to accept that the world can be different. From the experience of history, we know that changes can go fast if society is ready. Jean Goffi says that moral society is the kind of society where people follow social morality. (Mantatov, 2009 [own translation]) Nowadays, individual and group egoism makes stable development impossible.

This mainstream is viral. It is full of adventure spirit⁴ that makes brave people leave their home and move towards unknown world for new impression, inspiring people around them. It looks like a kind of voluntary advertising of tourism. We spend money not to own, but to get new emotions we can share absolutely free.

We are nomads because there are many exchange programs at schools and universities. And they put the idea of nomadism into our mind. Probably, many of us do not notice that they would prefer to do business activities in South-Eastern Asia and live there because of the culture specifics of the region, surf everyday, ride a moto and live in an inexpensive house instead of a penthouse on 5th Avenue. This is a new lifestyle we have got. It is uncontrollable. We just agree with it and want the life screens show us. Our homeland seems to be clear for us and we go to discover unknown places…

To sum up, nomadism is a normal process for all times. There are casual catalysts of nomadism apart from 7 basic ones. They are not so transparent because they are able to build big structures and become common. They are elements of freedom for our days if we compare them with compulsory migrations in ancient world. They are positive and negative for a personality and world in the whole. We explore the space, but have not explored our Homeland. We become the generation of renters to buy experience, not things and goods. I can only hope that all this is for creating priceless database that will allow humanity to make the greatest step in evolution.

We cannot stop it or run away from this phenomenon. Often, we do not understand how advertising technologies persuade us to join progressively growing community of curious loners and begin our trip right now. And the most remarkable thing is to come back with changed consciousness or stay in foreign country forever. So, such movement caused by craving for impression and emotions, is commonplace for information-oriented society…

It is wrong to say that the Great Migrations is over. Migration is a permanent and unstoppable process. Usually, it was caused by climate. Nowadays, transnational corporations made migrations a usual process. There are many arguments that defend migrants and migrations and show mostly positive sides for countries migrants go to.

So, on the one hand, countries get human resources. We have already talked about robots instead of blue-collar workers, but there is no tendency of manual labour extrusion. That’s why blue-collar workers have to find job all over the world. As for countries they choose, they should be ready for such human resources and be responsible for new people who come to work hard. Also countries should provide better life conditions for their working guests, because countries get their time and power. It looks like equal barter.

On the other hand, countries may have a demographic problem. Migrants are not supposed to be a adequate kind of solution. They have got choice, and they often choose to support demographic policy in chosen countries. That sounds well. Countries can look like defenders for discriminated people or peacemakers without weapons, using their actions at the world political arena. Because of millions of information sources, it is hard to find relevant characteristic of modern migrants, nomads. We should not forget about artificial reality from TV and radio that successfully strikes public mind. Speaking about public mind, first of all, we need to consider ordinary citizens who interpret distorted facts into fascist-like relation. Actually, it is much harder to give it without offence and creating negative public mood and opinion about migrants. That’s why migrants will be under the sword of Damocles after entering foreign country. But critical thinking is the best weapon there because only dividing common facts into logical parts and analyzing them, we can find out the root of any problem. So, there is the way to prevent xenophobia. Innocent migrants become ‘scapegoats’ because our society used to hang tags. And after negative actions of a handful of foreign people the whole nation becomes
the enemy number one in the people’s mind. However, it is nice to see when stereotypes fall down, and we see busy migrants who work hard and create the present, the world around us, the world we live in.

The consequences of modern nomadism are ambiguous. As we have already considered, J. Attali sees it a way of bringing bright colors and personal expression into daily routine. But another point of view states that this phenomenon brings the gift box with mad and insane actions for conservatives, if we talk about personal side of nomadism.

Nowadays, the “transparent” ethics of nomadism is absent because of blurred targets and ideals of nomads. Only call of duty and anti-xenophobic ‘firewall’ that is critical thinking, can become the solutions of existing problems of nomadism and even prevent possible problems.
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Conflict and Unity are Seen as Natural Satellites of International Communication

Natalya Tarasova

Abstract

This article draws attention to the problem of interaction and communication between different cultures nowadays. There are analyzed historical and philosophical approaches with reference to this problem. The principles of interculturalism and transculturalism are presented as the main postulates of building positive relations between nations. In addition, the Volga region can be considered as a great example of the implementation of these principles. Residents of this region live together for centuries peacefully. Indeed, it is necessary to organize more special joint events for pupils and students, because schools and any higher or special educational institution form basic values that humanity will lean on in the future. However, we should understand the fact that sooner or later the existing culture will be replaced by another one in the world. The world will not exist without conflicts and disagreements.
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The problem of co-existence and interaction of different cultures has a long history, but it is still relevant nowadays. It is a well-known fact that this topic requires further attention in the modern world due to the active interaction of different nations, changing of resident areas by people,
blurring of the boundaries between the social strata of the society. Moreover, it is considered to be a dynamic growth of radical sentiments in matters of inter-confessional relationships (Sinha, 2015). Today this issue has become crucial in Europe. It is high time to reconsider the reality. It is high time to take immediate decisions.

It is necessary to refer to the term “multiculturalism” in order to realize the matter of the current problem and to find possible ways to overcome it. Researchers believe that this the term arose in Canada in the 1960th as the answer to a solution of the problem of management of the bicultural (English–French) country. According to some analysts, it was in Canada where the policy of multiculturalism led to real success and to the decrease of tension in the solution, for example, of the question of the status of French-speaking Quebec (Therborn, 1995).

Looking at this problem in terms of the philosophical and historical and cultural aspects, we can note that there are two theories:

The first group of scientists (N.Y. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, L. Frobenius, A. Toynbee, E. Meyer, E. Troeltsch and others) supposes that there is no single history of humanity. It is carried out in the change of cultures, and each culture has its own self-contained, isolated life. Thus, the scheme of history is not revealed as a one-way linear process, the lines of cultures’ development diverge (Bagdasarian, Chuchaykina, Akimova, Polouektov, Ivanchenko, Chernysheva, 2001, pp. 54–58 [own translation]).

According to the second group of scientists (Voltaire, Montesquieu, D. Lessing, Kant, I.G. Herder, Karl Jaspers and others) there is the idea of universality and universal history. It means that a single line of human development, leading to the creation of universal culture can be traced in the world of socio-cultural diversity (ibid., pp. 58–66 [own translation]).

Furthermore, we can observe the same opposition of views in the 1990s, when multiculturalism began to be ideologized and politicized. On the one hand, the supporters of the left-liberal tradition considered the equality of cultures to be a done phenomenon and fact. On the other hand, their opponents (the supporters of the right conservative views) actively denied the thesis on the equality of cultures. More than that, they continue to be skeptical about the possibility of a constructive dialogue between cultures.

We can observe the collision of opposing views even nowadays. Scientists and experts ask such questions as: “Is it possible the peaceful coexistence and interaction of different cultures? Does the world have rea-
sonable methods to solve this problem?” more and more often (Carroll, 2011).

Despite numerous declarations about the “crisis of multiculturalism”, which are appearing recently in the public and scientific discourse, the question of a harmonious unity of opposites (cultures) can not be closed. Certain problems can be solved nowadays if we focus on the principles of interculturalism and transculturalism. In fact, multiculturalism is supposed to equal co-existence of various forms of cultural life, and, in my opinion, it leads to averaging of different cultures, that is, to the destruction of foundations and traditions in the existing cultural communities. Therefore, it is worth focusing on the politics of interculturalism, which involves creating common cultural code and search for common interests to interact (Pain, 2012). Consequently, the idea of interaction prevails over the idea of maintaining their diversity. Furthermore, we must take into account such principles of transculturalism as humanity education, the recognition of cultural complexity, the ability to listen, mutual learning positive change. In this way, the main idea of transculturalism is “to recognize yourself in others” (Fedotova, 2015, pp. 252–253 [own translation]).

From my point of view, the experience of nations, living on the territory of the Volga region can be considered as a bright example of compliance and effectiveness of the above-described principles of interculturalism and transculturalism.

According to the latest statistics:

The Volga region is home to over 180 ethnic communities. The most numerous groups of ethnic communities are – the Russians (65% of the county’s population), the Tatars, 14%, the Chuvashs (5%), the Bashkirs (5%), the Mordvinians (2%), the Udmurts (2%), the Maris (2%), the Ukrainians (1%), the Kazakhs (1%), the Armenians, the Azerbaijanis, the Komi-Perms. (Tishkova, 2013, p. 7 [own translation])

It is a common-known fact that the population of the region traditionally consists of orthodox christians and muslims.

To be more exact, Orthodox believers make up about 75% of Russia’s population, Muslims – more than 20%. It is home to 40% of the Muslims of Russia. (ibid., p. 7 [own translation])
So what is the activity of the authorities and civil society in the sphere of state national policy of the region?

If we analyze the expert reports (Tishkova, 2013), we will see that the following areas of implementation of this policy are common and most important in the region:

- Ethno-cultural development of the regions and districts\(^1\):
  - For example, Muslim celebrations are recognized as days off in the republic of Bashkortostan. Great celebrations devoted to 1,000\(^{th}\) anniversary of the unification of the Mordovian and Russian people were carried out in the Republic of Mordovia in 2012. (ibid., p. 55 [own translation])

- Support of ethnic and cultural education\(^2\):
  - Currently in the Orenburg region there is known to operate 107 schools where the native (non-Russian) language is studied by 5097 children. (ibid., p. 63 [own translation])

- Development of information space \(^3\):
  - To add to that, such national newspapers as “Ian Vakyt” (Tatar), “Aikap” (Kazakh), “Caravan – Saray” (Bashkir), etc., are published with the support of the Regional Government. (ibid., p. 67 [own translation])

- Prevention and combating nationalism, xenophobia, ethnic and religious extremism; activities aimed at reducing the negative social prejudice against people of different ethnicity and migrants\(^4\).
  - In August 2012, the State Council of Tatarstan adopted a law requiring religious organizations to appoint clergy or choose them only from those who have got religious education in Russia. (ibid., p. 16 [own translation])

---

\(^1\) For example the support of the activity of national creative groups, the organization of celebrations and festivals of national cultures and others.

\(^2\) For example school activities, conducting contests, creative competitions, etc.

\(^3\) For example the edition of “national” (ethnic-oriented) newspapers, TV and radio programs on regional channels, articles in regional newspapers, websites of public ethno-cultural organizations.

\(^4\) There can be seminars, workshops, legal advice, implementation of human rights activities, the organization “School of Tolerance”, etc.
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- Research activities aimed at the study of regional history and culture, the current state of inter-ethnic and ethno-confessional relationships\(^5\):
- Following this way, there was a practice of cooperation of the republican authorities and researchers on the study of ethnic and religious aspects of public life in the Republic of Mari El for nearly four decades. (ibid., p. 47 [own translation])

Besides, the problem of improving the adaptation and integration of migrants is viewed as an independent direction of the national policy in recent years in various regions consider.

For example, the interdepartmental commission dealing with the questions of attraction and use of foreign workers has been functioning in the republic of Tatarstan since 2008. The Ministry of Labor, Employment and Migration Policy was created in the Samara region. It’s possible to continue the list of such activities in Russia. (ibid., p. 11 [own translation])

The analysis of experience of systematic work in the field of harmonization of interethnic and intercultural interactions shows that today it is necessary to focus on such social groups as pupils and students.

In my opinion, one of the most important prerequisites for the emergence of the problem of interaction of cultures is the upbringing and education of a person. These functions are performed by such institutions as a family, school, college, government, mass media, etc. In fact, the family is the first institution of socialization, which is the closest social environment of a child. The child initially socializes and fits into the society through the family, but the nature of the individual can be formed in the family, too. However, I think that nowadays such institutions as schools, universities and mass media play a major role in the formation and education of a person. After all, parents also studied in school and college. Today the older generation transfers their knowledge to young people, complementing their own life experience. It turns out that this process is cyclical. The school and any higher or special educational institutions form basic values and in the future a human will lean on them, performing certain actions. In this situation mass media serves as a kind of tool for fixing and adjusting these values. Therefore, today these institutions

\(^5\) For example conferences, round tables and seminars.
must come together and unite in the “coalition” for the implementation of quality and effective policy of interculturalism in combination with the principles of transculturalism.

To my mind, this policy exists in the following form:

1. Cultural studies, religious or disciplines, developing knowledge of different cultural communities are compulsory subjects at schools and other educational institutions all over the world.

2. States encourage the establishment of ethnic cultural community organizations (NGOs) and other organizations by students that are actively implementing socially oriented projects aimed at raising the population of respect for the representatives of different nations, prevention of extremism and socio-cultural adaptation of immigrants, provide charitable assistance for needy, organize courses of learning native languages, develop interregional and international cooperation.

3. The world’s mass media regularly produce documentaries and various programs that emphasize and tell us about the identity of different cultures and their significance in the modern world.

But I want to underline again that this policy will be considered effective only if the action between these institutions is agreed.

There is a notable example of experience of Nizhny Novgorod State Linguistic University named after N.A. Dobrolyubov that requires attracting our attention.

In 2011, the Department of educational programs for foreign citizens of Dobrolyubov State Linguistic University supported by the Ministry of Education of Nizhny Novgorod Region organized a regional festival of national cultures “In this big world”. The aim of this festival was to introduce different cultures and traditions to foreigners, as well as to strengthen the position of the Russian language as a language of international communication.

Nowadays, this event has the annual character and involves more and more foreigners. In 2015, the festival was attended by citizens from more than 30 countries (Austria, Azerbaijan, Germany, Egypt, Zimbabwe, China, and others) (The Press Service of Nizhny Novgorod State Linguistics University, 2015).

Traditionally, participants of the festival taste national dishes, discuss problems of different cultures, organize shows of national costumes, as
well as conduct master – classes on making of handicrafts, which are ordinary for one or another culture.

Personally, I think that it is a great model for building a sustainable intercultural dialogue. Foreign citizens not only show their creation to others, but also lead a tolerant dialogue with representatives of different cultures that helps them to understand each other better. Events within festival act as tools – help foreign citizens to get closer to other cultures (find common ground, to be understood and heard) and identify the similarities and differences between them, which leads to a strengthening of relations between cultural communities.

W. Berry and M. Pleasants (1984) found that only confidence in your own positive group identity could provide the foundation for the respect to other groups. Thus, for the existence in a multicultural society, in order to understand and accept others, you must respect their own culture, be sure of its valuable and positive significance. But we must understand that it is very important not to become isolated within the group. It is necessary to be in a constant contact with different cultures.

Furthermore, N.K. Roerich made an excellent point of view about the problem of misunderstanding arising in cross-cultural communication. He believed that the misunderstanding can be destroyed with the help of sincerity; a figurative expression, indicating that “the best way to approach a stranger dwelling – a song. Not at night and with a closed face” (Roerich, 1994, p. 11 [own translation]). Thus, today it is an objective necessity, one of the most important conditions of developing of diverse cultures and survival of humanity to recognize all people such concepts as “tolerance” and “dialogue of cultures”. Forming a spiritual unity is the result of dialogue between contemporary cultures.

Undoubtedly, we shouldn’t forget the most famous quote (“West India Emancipation,” speech delivered at Canandaigua, New York, August 4, 1857) by abolitionist orator Frederick Douglass: “If there is no struggle there is no progress” (Respectfully Quoted: A Dictionary of Quotations, 1989). We must accept the fact that sooner or later the existing culture will be replaced by another one in the world. There will be various global changes – it is named “progress” (development). The world will not exist without conflicts and disagreements. Therefore, to my way of thinking, such variants of acculturation strategies as assimilation of cultures contain large socio-cultural risks and can lead to deadlock. The world cannot be developed where there is only one culture.
In this way, the connection (fighting) of opposing forces promotes the development of all the objects in the world, including different cultures, social systems, the person and his/her spirituality. It is vital to understand that it is a natural condition, not a disease if people have contradictions with themselves and other people. Civilized relations in society imply the attentiveness to these contradictions, forecasting the effects of its resolution, the ability to govern themselves.
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Cooperation changes the world. The possibilities to cooperate have boomed since progress in logistics and communication transformed distances to an almost negligible factor and forwarded globalization. These new possibilities to cooperate come along with both: a chance and a necessity as they hold vast benefits but also urge states to engage in this process to keep up with a competitive world. Even if the opportunities to cooperate are basically given, cooperation cannot always evolve unhinderedly. Conflicts between the possible cooperation partners can occur and state obstacles which may hinder or even fully prohibit collaboration. Occasionally, these obstacles seem surprisingly small. Nevertheless, they may still have a significant impact, even on the biggest players. A phenomenon like that can be observed in the East China Sea. Here, the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) and Japan, the world’s second and third biggest economies, are disputing about a small archipelago. A third party, the Republic of China (Taiwan), also expresses interests in the territory, yet its demands are left aside in the context of this paper which puts emphasis on Sino-Japanese relations. The Senkaku / Diaoyu Islands measure only 7 km² of uninhabited land. Considering the island’s size, the question that rises is: what motivations drive the parties to engage in this conflict? It would be a fallacy to derive insignificance from the island’s modest
Despite its size, the island group has an impact on politics as well as on economics. What consequences are entailed? Are there any mechanisms that can help overcoming such obstacles?

The Island Dispute in the East China Sea ...

Since the 1970s, the PRC and Japan claim sovereignty over the land located between these two states and the Republic of China (Taiwan). Both try to base their claims on historical evidence dating back as far as the 14th century. Japan claims the annexation of terra nullius as part of their invasion of Taiwan in 1895, whereas the PRC argues Japan agreed in returning the territory in the course of its defeat in World War II. Since then, many resolutions about the islands were made, which both the PRC and Japan try to interpret in their own favour. After the war, the islands were administered under the United States Civil Administration of the Ryukyu Islands until 1972. The conflict started gaining pace as preparations for the return of the territory began and large undersea energy deposits were assumed around the islands in the late 1960s. In the following decades, the conflict seemed to accelerate until 2012 and 2013 as more and more provocations were made by the two governments, as well as by private activists.

The offshore location plays a decisive role in this affair: engaging in this conflict can be seen as an auspicious undertaking since a relatively small amount of funds is required for the archipelago’s defence, yet potential strategic and economic gains related to this realm are appealing. Of particular interest is the exclusive economic zone, 200 nautical miles around the islands. The included fishing rights and the use of the seaways around it is of minor interest compared to the large energy deposits. The International Energy Agency expects around 100 million barrels of oil, the same amount of natural gas and even more, yet undiscovered oil fields in striking distance (cf. Eich and Leonhard, 2013).

... in the Light of International Relation Theories

Taking one step back from the obvious interests existing around this dispute, provides a different approach to the topic. A number of well-known international relation theories attempts to give an approach on the ever-
last question: why do international players act as they do? How are governmental actions and (foreign) political attitudes shaped? And, why do conflicts emerge?

Republican Liberalism tries to explain the behaviour of the state based on state-society relations and the structure of the institutions (cf. Riemer, 2006). This perspective assumes that escalating military conflicts cause net costs for the society as a whole. Further, that “the more unbiased the range of domestic groups represented, the less likely they will support policies that suppose high net costs or risks on a broad range of societal actors” (Moravcsik, 1997). So let us have a glimpse at the political inner life of the contrahents to comprehend their external demeanor. The PRC is governed by the Communist Party of China (CPC) which combines all competences of political, economic and societal decision-finding under its roof. These decision-making processes either take place in small committees or are the subject of highly ranked members. Beside the communist party, there are no other groups holding substantial political power. Accordingly, the range of represented groups in the Chinese state is strongly restricted. (cf. BTI, 2016) A different picture can be highlighted in Japan where the decision-making process of the constitutional monarchy rests upon a parliamentary cabinet system. Unlike in China, there is a clear separation between legislative, judiciary and executive power (cf. Lin, 2014). Following the prediction of the hypothesis, it can be expected that Japan is more risk averse, avoiding behaviours which can entail high net costs to a broad range of its domestic society. The PRC, on the contrary, would be a risk-seeker. This thesis seems vindicable: an analysis of the respecting governmental behaviour revealed actions of the PRC as combative whereas actions of its opponent Japan showed only little aggressive behaviour, even though Japan’s defence budget was increased during the hot phase of the strife.

It stands to reason that differentiated political and institutional systems offer an effective inclusion of broader interests. However, it is questionable whether this reference on system-immanent characteristics supplies a sufficient picture and approach on a foreign political topic. The overall question is: why do states even snooker themselves in these situations? Is it a matter of insatiability? Neorealists suppose that states are in a constant struggle to enlarge their power capacities for a safe position in the international system since power resources promise safety and the ability to assert oneself (cf. Ditzel and Hoegerle, 2011).
If we now connect this neorealist approach to the island dispute, we can suppose that the possession of the islands would generate an upgrade in power capacities for each of the parties. Taking the ideas of Neorealism into consideration, we cannot but pose the question whether we have an ‘anarchic system’ demanding for strong national leadership which builds up barriers, hinders cooperation and prevents our states and thus our world from coalescing? It is true that Neorealism had to face many objections in recent years. Criticism says this theory is not able to grasp our international system with its newer multipolar tendencies in its complex entirety. Nevertheless, the approach that intergovernmental relations are decisively shaped by deepest mistrust, despite of common organizations, gives thought-provoking impulse to someone who is engaged with inhibitory factors in terms of transnational cooperation.

Are states pushed to be predators and perpetrators as they are victims of an insecure system in which they are trying to maximize their sovereignty and safety? Taking this for granted the solution would be “simple”. An international law system would have to be developed to take away the system-immanent greed for power resources. Too sad, bright minds from the ancient Greeks to the emerging Netherlands and the pre- and post world wars were not able to find the perfect solution. For good reasons: Different cultural areas may have divergent values, various subjects of international law may have divergent interests. As Nobel laureate Thomas Schelling revealed with his concept of *Focal Points*, divergences like this complicate situations between two actors and may hamper the creation of a unitary system due to the lack of a sufficiently broad common basis (cf. Behnke, 2007).

But is the picture really as black as Neorealism paints it? Presumably not. Especially in our now multipolar and globalized world the longing for manifold cooperation aside of negative integration arises – not least since welfare maximization is a commonly shared interest of most nations. Nowadays, economic wealth is generated through commerce requiring far more cooperative qualities in leadership. Following this idea, it seems highly interesting to investigate whether the political confrontation about the islands is an obstacle for the (economic) cooperation between the People’s Republic of China and Japan.
Small Islands – Big Impact?

Intergovernmental Aversion –
An Obstacle for Economic Collaboration?

How can cooperation between states be measured? We stick to the economic dimension and allege that resources, products or services sold from one state to the other, whether through governmental or private actions, may be interpreted as an act of cooperation. As trade amongst developed countries usually is a product of free will, a cooperation benefit on both sides can be expected. These acts of cooperation will be reflected in the bilateral trade figures, so that their magnitude is suitable as a measure for transnational (economic) cooperation.

The economic relationship of the PRC and Japan is extraordinarily important for both states: The PRC is Japan’s most important trade partner, Japan is the PRC’s second most important trade partner. Together they account for about a fifth of the global GDP. Driven by an increasing aversion toward the opposing country, a conflict could lead to a harsh decline in cooperation in matters of trade.

If we assume that Chinese general export restrictions for rare earth metals not intended to be offending Japan in particular, the dispute did not lead the involved to impose trade restrictions on the counterpart.

The question is whether foreign policy can determine economic cooperation and if so through which channels? In a similar case, Fidrmuc et al. (2003) showed it can indeed, even if no restrictions are imposed.

In a previous student research project, we conducted an econometric analysis of the island dispute. Despite a few limitations of our approach we had to accept, the outcomes showed evidences for a negative impact of the conflict on the trade relationship during the dispute’s peak time from August until December 2012. During this period in September, right after Japanese activists occupied the islands the Japanese government bought three of the five islands. Though the Japanese regime emphasized their intention to prevent Japanese nationalists from buying the land, it triggered a boycott of Japanese products by the Chinese. In September 2012, the sales of Japan’s biggest automobile manufacturers Nissan, Honda and Toyota declined by 35 percent, 41 percent and 49 percent compared to the same month of the previous year (Associated Press, 2012). The dramatic decline can be explained by the obviousness of the Japanese origin of these products. Therefore, the public opinion is vitally important for the sales volume of Japan’s exports. Additionally, a huge decline
in tourism between the countries was observed. JPMorgan estimated a loss of 0.8 percentage points in Japan’s GDP growth due to the territorial clashes and the contentions at that time.

Though PRC’s exports to Japan did not experience a downturn like this, it would be wrong to suppose the PRC could not suffer from bad relations to Japan. Taking into account that the effects of the conflict will evolve completely in the long term, attention has also be paid to foreign direct investments activities. The PRC needs Japan as its largest foreign direct investor. After the dispute’s hot phase, FDIs from Japan in the PRC fell sharply in 2013 and 2014. The decline cannot only be traced back on the tensions between the countries. The rise of Chinese wages as well as the Yen’s depreciation may also be considered as main drivers. Nevertheless, especially through declining FDIs even bigger effects must be expected. A reliable and precise estimation on how big the economic losses triggered by the island disputes are, will take more effort but it can be concluded that the conflict had and will have a significant negative impact on the Sino-Japanese economic cooperation.

Can Trade Serve as Remedy?

Throughout history, commercial concerns were the major incentive for interaction between unlike cultures. Commercial objectives are shared so intensely that they can create cooperation and may maintain intense relations and exchanges between nations if the political dimension is not able or willing to do so.

Focusing on the conflict may effect an inner political conformity through the mechanism of negative integration. For the sake of this, it enhances an opposing relationship between states stressing differences in external regards. To regain full cooperation benefits, an approach which moves the focus from the difference to the commonalities might be fruitful. A cultural approach is here to be understood as a better understanding of the counterpart and not in the sense of assimilation and reduction of cultural diversity.

Shared interests and values can especially be found in economic matters since democracies and non-democracies may have similar concerns for a functioning national economy. As we saw public opinion influences the degree of international economic cooperation. David Lipton (2016)
from the *International Monetary Fund* stated that the fear of costs can dominate public opinion, if the economic benefits are not clear. Objective research using a more profound approach than ours should carve out the benefits of cooperation, to the extent they exist. The obtained results shall contribute the public debate. If there is public awareness of economic advantages, one could assume that political differences have to become more and more intense to entirely inhibit relations between nations and cultures.

There is hope, that a large consensus of shared values and foundations will arise out of an intense economic interweavement, more precisely, profitable trade for all parties concerned, which will make the culture approach and the transcultural dialogue easier and more fruitful to hold.

This is not to be seen in the sense of neoliberal effusiveness for economy and trade as an almighty anything-regulating tool and panacea but rather as an useful instrument when politics alone is insufficient, or even a failure. It can serve through two dimensions: a catalyzing effect for an intercultural approach or a defensive impact that decelerates escalation and prevents processing a possible stumbling block politics cannot ignore. In the worst case it comes as a cultural imperialistic vehicle, while in the best case merely as a bridge between cultures and nations meeting on eye-level – a common *Focal Point* in an ocean of discords and discrepancies.
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Knocked off by a tree branch, Guatemalan refugee Elvira Lopez fell off the train “La Bestia” (The Beast) on her way from the southern Mexican border to the United States in 2013. The incident cost her right leg as well as having to spend several months at the “Jesus El Buen Pastor” shelter in Tapachula, Mexico, before continuing her trip. Elvira is one of the more-than-half-a-million Central American refugees that travel annually on top of freight trains across the 2,400 km that separate the Guatemalan border from the United States (cf. Dominguez, 2014). The journey is not only dangerous because of the risk of falling off the train, Mexican criminal gangs constantly attack, rape, and kill many of the Central American refugees that cross through their controlled territories. “[..] based on accounts from victims and witnesses, the CNDH [Mexico’s National Human Rights Commission] documented 214 cases of mass kidnapping [of Central Americans] from April to September 2010, involving a total of 11,333 people” (BBC, 2011). If they are able to go all the way to the U.S. border, their next challenge is to cross the heavily-secured fences and to evade American border patrols. Elvira’s story, published by The Atlantic (cf. Taylor, 2013), takes place in Mexico but her
quest for a better life is not very different to that of the Middle Eastern refugees travelling to European countries such as Germany, or to the Rohingya and Bangladeshi refugees travelling by boats to Thailand. The governments of Mexico, Germany and Thailand, guided by Enrique Peña Nieto, Angela Merkel and Prayut Chan-o-cha respectively, have followed different policies to address the current refugee crisis which affect their countries. Still, migration flows continue to be uncontrolled – or rather controlled by human traffickers – and even worse, human rights violations have been denounced in all three cases. In these three countries, local NGOs have been the stakeholders able to efficiently alleviate some of the direct necessities of many refugees. It is the purpose of this essay to argue that leaders of these nations, and of all of those concerned by the issue of mass migration, must find ways to cooperate in order to exchange those good practices that have been proved successful and to learn from and support local NGOs (or private organizations) due to their on-field expertise. The analysis will be segmented by country, followed by a case study comparison and concluded with several proposals for cooperation beyond traditional means in respect to refugee crises.

I. Mexico

“You get to Mexico and you understand that hell extends beyond Honduras.” (Yenesis Martin, 17 years old – Solis and Corchado, 2014)

President Enrique Peña Nieto assumed office at the end of 2012, bringing back the power to the “Partido Revolucionario Institucional” (‘PRI’, Institutional Revolutionary Party), which had governed the country from 1929 to 2000. Central to his campaign were a series of reforms which promised to bring Mexico into the twenty-first century. The crucial, and controversial, reforms such as those regarding education, energy, and mass media sectors have been both praised and harshly criticized both by national and international academics as well as politicians. Despite these promises, Peña Nieto’s government has taken minimal steps in order to address the flux of Central American refugees crossing Mexico’s southern

---

1 See The Economist, 2014 and Mexico Institute, 2015.
border illegally, most of them with the United States as their destination country.

In 2014, American migration authorities detained 162,700 Central American refugees near the border with Mexico, in 2015 the number declined to 70,400. On the other hand, Mexico’s migration police stopped 93,000 refugees in 2015, a rise from 49,800 during the previous year (cf. Editorial Board, 2015). The relationship between the drastic changes of these figures is clear, Mexico is enforcing tighter measures on migration.

‘‘Mexico is doing the dirty work, the very dirty work, for the United States’, said Tomas Gonzalez, a Franciscan friar who runs the ‘72’ shelter for migrants” (Breitbart, 2015). The Mexican government has been under severe pressure from Washington to stop Central American migration into North America, treating the issue more as a Mexican problem rather than an American one.

In July 2014, President Peña Nieto, next to his Guatemalan counterpart Otto Perez, announced a new plan to deal with the migration issue. Part of this plan included special medical services for refugees, better cooperation with Guatemalan authorities, and the creation an office of migrant attention to ensure humanitarian help and human rights protection to Central Americans (cf. Resendiz, 2014). This move is particularly interesting as it paves the way for Mexico to cooperate with one of the refugee source countries, rather than just with the United States. This point will be discussed further, being one of the good practices available for other countries around the globe dealing with mass migration.

Despite Mexico’s strengthening of its border patrol system in the south of the country and the aforementioned reforms, refugees continue to cross the nation in a life-threatening journey. In June 2015, 20 men armed with guns, attacked a group of 100 refugees who were travelling on top of a train across Veracruz. A sum of USD$100 was demanded of each person in order to be allowed to continue. Only 44 of them did, the other 56 ‘disappeared’ (cf. Woody, 2015). The systematic human rights violations of refugees are reported regularly by NGOs in Mexico and refugees themselves. “‘When you live in Honduras, you quickly learn that anywhere and anything is better, but then ‘you get to Mexico and you understand that hell extends beyond Honduras,’ Yenesis says. Children as young as 9 years old were abused” (Solis and Corchado, 2014).

According to the Mexican newspaper El Excelsior, 25 percent of refugees who travel through Mexico are attended by NGOs and several asso-
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associations working with the Catholic Church (cf. Espinosa, 2014). One of the most famous cases has been that of “Las Patronas” (The Bosses), a group of 14 women who, on a daily basis, dole out free food to those who travel on top of freight trains. This group, sustained entirely on private donations, has done this work for over 15 years and was awarded the National Prize of Human Rights in 2013 (cf. Mayorga, 2013). Many NGOs and academics have also criticized Peña’s failure to recognize the severity of the levels of migration coming from the south, shown by the way in which the issue has not been prioritized in the national agenda (cf. Solís and Corchado, 2014).

2. Germany

“But when I stepped in Europe and I saw the situation I realised that this is even more difficult in Europe, more than the journey.” (Ahmad in Mcneill, 2015)

According to Forbes (2015), Germany’s Angela Merkel is considered to be among the five most powerful people in the world. As such, Merkel has been at center stage in the refugee crisis currently affecting the European Union and parts of the Middle East. Her government’s response has been overwhelmingly favorable towards refugees, especially to those coming from Syria. Merkel’s handling of the crisis, that is; to open the doors of her country to hundreds of thousands of refugees, earned her a place on the Nobel Peace Prize shortlist. The Telegraph considered her as the “firm favorite” for the award, despite the domestic opposition she faced due to her laxation of migration policies (cf. Huggler, 2015).

Considered the worst refugee crisis since World War II; the flow of people fleeing Syria, Afghanistan, Somalia and Eritrea towards Europe, especially Germany, has spiralled out of control. In an interview with Germany’s vice-chancellor, Al Jazeera, the German vice-chancellor stated that; “One million people may arrive in Germany seeking refugee status this year, up from the record 800,000 arrivals its government had earlier predicted” (2015). As Central American refugees in Mexico, those trying to cross to Europe face incredible dangers. One of the most common routes taken is through the Mediterranean, where refugees pay smugglers to cross the sea on cramped, unhygienic boats. UNHCR’s (the UN Refu-
Refugee Agency) spokesperson, Melissa Fleming, said the Mediterranean is the “deadliest route for refugees and migrants”, as at least 2,500 people have perished at sea during this year alone (cf. UNHCR, 2015). Other routes such as the journey through Turkey and the Balkan countries also pose threats to refugees. Human traffickers very often deceive asylum-seekers and apprehend people asking for huge ransoms in exchange for their release, yet another similarity with the case of Mexico.

Conflicting with EU regulations, Germany and other member-states reinstated border controls after flows of people became unmanageable, drastically changing Merkel’s “open-door” policy which lasted merely a few weeks. Though several EU meetings and forums have taken place in 2015 to deal with the crisis, none of them have been at the international level (beyond Europe), including the source countries of refugees. As winter arrives to Germany, the threats of the cold weather are imminent for the asylum-seekers that are still homeless. Statal governments such as that of Brandburg have installed insulated tents, but NGOs have criticized the move as unsustainable. Bern Mesovic from Pro Asyl, a Frankfurt-based NGO, has suggested wooden cottages that can be easily assembled as a better solution (cf. Scholz, 2015). “‘Tents, even those so-called winter-proofed tents, are not sustainable or decent accommodations,’” (ibid.) said the president of the German Red Cross.

3. Thailand

“If, after having lost everything – including my whole family – because we are Rohingya Muslims, [the government] still don’t [sic] recognise me as Rohingya in my own country, then I might as well be dead.” (Anonymous – Ali, 2013)

In May 2015, mass graves were discovered in southern Thailand, similarly in Mexico, 60 mass graves were found in the same year (cf. Badcock, 2015). Most of the bodies belonged to Rohingya refugees who had been murdered by human traffickers. The Thai government, under the rule of former army officer Prayut Chan-o-Cha, detained 85 people in relation to the case of the mass graves. Thailand also agreed to extend humanitarian assistance to asylum-seekers and even organized a convention on Rohingya and Bangladeshi refugees to find solutions to the issue (cf. Chambers,
2015). But Rohingyas, coming mostly from Myanmar, are still victims of systematic abuse and a continuous lack of support by Southeast Asian governments, including Thailand, which has even been accused of siding with traffickers. “The fact remains: the line between security officials and human traffickers in Thailand has become increasingly blurred. And Thailand has yet to be held accountable” (Chambers, 2015).

CNN reported in May 2015 that neither UNHCR, nor NGOs knew how many refugees were stranded in boats along the Malaysian and Thai coasts, but estimates rose to above 6,000 people. Though authorities and human rights groups provided food and water to the “boat people” their cause has not been addressed properly by anyone. “Malaysia, Thailand and Indonesia are currently refusing to accept the ‘boat people’ – men, women and children who remain on ships, with rapidly dwindling provisions” (McKirdy and Mohsin, 2015). Despite meetings among some ASEAN member-states on how to deal with this crisis, no commitments were made, and as in the previously analyzed cases the refugee source countries have been left out of the majority of the discussions.

The Bangkok-based NGO Equal Harmony Project and the Arakan Project have been at the frontline of the Rohingya cause (cf. Kelly and Stoakes, 2015). Dedicated to help refugees left behind by smugglers in boats in the sea, these NGOs have risked grave dangers by criticizing the steps taken by government officials. In Thailand, the law of lèse-majesté prohibits any criticism against the monarchy or the head of state, and since Chan-o-Chan took power, prosecutions for this crime have increased (cf. BBC, 2015). Therefore, civil society groups helping refugees face double threats, attacks by human traffickers and criminalization under Thai laws.

4. Case Study Comparison

As seen by the previously analyzed cases, there are similarities that can be drawn from these three refugee crises. First, human traffickers have been able to evade police controls and continue to transport refugees across borders. These smugglers have committed systematic human rights abuses towards their “clients” and in the three cases they operate in similar ways, asking for huge ransoms in exchange of liberation, and fleeing and leaving behind the refugees when authorities approach. Despite the dangers faced from traffickers, refugees continue to use their
services because they provide the only paths towards the destination countries, paths that governments themselves create when enforcing harsh migration and/or asylum policies.

A second similarity is the lack of inclusion of source countries in the forums that deal with the crises. The convention organized by Thailand on the Rohingya refugee situation only included Indonesia and Malaysia, excluding Bangladesh and Myanmar. In the case of Europe, meetings have mostly taken place among EU members-states and in some cases Balkan countries and Turkey. Despite the instability of the governments of Syria, Afghanistan, Eritrea and Somalia, they must be included too in the discussions on how to deal with the refugee flows in order to reduce human rights abuses and other risks of the journey towards Europe. In Mexico, although certain cooperation has taken place with Guatemala, as the migration plan of 2014 previously mentioned, most collaboration has actually been with the United States (cf. Boyer, 2015), instead of with source countries such as Nicaragua, Honduras or El Salvador.

In terms of differences between these three cases, there is a subtle but rather important one that has not been sufficiently analyzed, and it is the proper use of the word “refugee”. In the case of Mexico, this term has been systematically avoided by the government; this is because the Mexican administration deliberately insists that Central Americans crossing Mexico are economic migrants, not refugees. This, despite the fact that most of them are actually fleeing from the violence which affects their countries, “[t]he isthmus connecting North and South America continues to lead the world in murder rates, with four of the top five rates in the world in Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador and Belize” (Kane, 2014). In the cases of Thailand and Germany the word “refugee” has been more adequately used, reinforcing the urgency of these crises and attracting more attention to them.

With regards to the approach taken by the governments of Thailand, Germany and Mexico towards the refugee crises, the results have been significantly mixed. In Germany, the head of state has been at the frontline of the response and Merkel has even risked her party’s support in order to attain her goals. In Thailand and Mexico the response from the national authorities has not been nearly as visible as it has been in Europe and authorities keep on systematically underestimating the severity of the situation. NGOs have provided assistance to refugees in ways governments have not been able to do, but in the three cases, not enough state
support has been given to them. These civil society associations need backing from authorities to continue helping, not obstacles as Thailand’s already discussed lèse-majesté law.

5. Global cooperation and the application of governance ethics in refugee crises

In order to build up the case of why global cooperation is needed to solve the aforementioned issues, it is crucial to first understand that refugee crises are not just a matter of importance to countries like Germany, Thailand or Mexico, but to every single state in the world. According to UNHCR (2014), at the end of 2014 there were 19.5 million refugees worldwide, and countries considered as “developing nations” hosted 86 percent of all refugees. The countries which the media most commonly cite as host destinations (e.g. Australia, France, Germany, the UK, the United States, Sweden, among others) in reality are not the ones which take the largest numbers of refugees, this despite their economic development and global aid discourse. In the specific case of Mideast refugees, by September 2015, Brazil hosted 1,740 refugees, Armenia 16,000, Uruguay 120 and Argentina 300 families (cf. Holger, 2015), demonstrating that the extension of the crisis is undeniably global. Therefore, the first step towards beginning to solve these crises is to acknowledge that it is a problem which concerns not only a handful of countries, but the entire international community. With this said, I will dare to outline several proposals for cooperation beyond the traditional means. These potential solutions to do not attempt to oversimplify the crises nor to say that the realities of the refugees which arrive to Thailand, Germany and Mexico are the same, but as seen in the case study comparison there are many similarities with regards to the challenges posed by these issues.

5.1 International Forums for the exchange of good practices

International Forums must be organized to address refugee crises in a multilateral way. International Conferences are clearly not a new idea but in terms of dealing with refugee crises these spaces for dialogue have been marked with a lack of inclusion of source and transit countries. In September 2015 the European Union agreed on a system of quotas for a
more fair division of refugees between the member states (cf. Al Jazeera, 2015), a first step towards alleviating the stress on Germany and Sweden. Similar forums should be established involving a larger number of nations. As seen before, Syrian refugees are not only going towards Europe, they have been recently moving towards South America and Central Asia and these regions should be included in the discussions too. Mexico and Thailand have also failed to form solid channels of cooperation with the source countries of the refugees they receive.

There are two examples of International Conferences during the late twentieth century which seem to have been more inclusive, and they are discussed by Gil Loescher, “[c]omprehensive regional plans have also attempted to address the causes of refugee outflows. The 1989 International Conference on Central American Refugees (CIREFCA) and the Comprehensive Plan of Action (CPA) adopted by the 1989 International Conference on Indochinese Refugees are significant examples of this trend” (Loescher, 1996). CIREFCA was formed by Costa Rica, Belize, Guatemala, Mexico, Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador, whilst CPA put together 65 nations. The latter one has been one of the most inclusive forums with regards to cooperation in refugee crises at a global scale, “[t]hough flawed in its implementation, however, the CPA does serve as a model of how interlocking commitments – to asylum, resettlement and repatriation – can promote regional cooperation in response to protracted refugee crises” (Robinson, 2004). Similar forums, being more inclusive, should continue to be prioritized. Notwithstanding the many differences in each case, certain strategies such as the special medical services for Central American refugees suggested by the Mexican government can be successful and helpful in Europe and Southeast Asia. States such as Mexico, Germany and Thailand (and many others) should engage in the exchange of those good practices that have been able to help them to deal with the problem. Agendas should prioritize the topic of human traffickers and how to stop them as it stands as one of the major issues in most refugee crises.

5.2 Correct use of terms

Though Germany (and the EU in general) and Thailand have been using almost systematically the word “refugee” to describe the people arriving into their territories, there is still progress to be done, as some as insist
many of them are just economic migrants (cf. Timmerman in Worley, 2016). Malone argues that “[t]he umbrella term migrant is no longer fit for purpose when it comes to describing the horror unfolding in the Mediterranean. It has evolved from its dictionary definitions into a tool that dehumanizes and distances, a blunt pejorative” later adding “[t]here is no migrant crisis in the Mediterranean” (Malone, 2015). Using the word migrant, as in the case of Mexico, is dangerous as it relieves states from performing their obligation to give asylum to those who seek it. The Mexican government must acknowledge that these are not migrants, but refugees who must be helped according to the international law agreements, such as the 1951 Refugee Convention, which Mexico signed, and binds states to not expel refugees to the territories where their life might be threatened.

5.3 Support for NGOs

States must also learn from the expertise provided by NGOs, who have worked on the field directly with the affected populations and know better than anyone what refugees need. NGOs, along with U.N. agencies such as UNHCR and OHCHR, must also be included in the international forums which discuss these issues. Loescher argues that “[a] preventive strategy must involve practically the entire UN system, as well as regional organizations and NGOs, and requires enhancing these organizations’ capacities to defuse, to deter, and to mediate incipient crises before they may need more serious and costly transsovereign intervention” (Loescher, 1996). International organizations have already built strong ties with NGOs, “In 2008, some 25 percent of UNHCR’s total expenditures were channeled through 636 NGOs, including 162 international agencies and 474 national ones” (UNHCR, n.d.). It is time then for national governments to work in a closer way with civil actors which tend to be more effective due to lower bureaucratic barriers and high levels of trust from citizens.

5.4 Companies and governance ethics

In order to outline my last proposal for cooperation I would like to address Josef Wieland’s book Governance Ethics: Global value creation, economic organization and normativity. “In a sense this book can be un-
derstood as an attempt to describe a modern economy as a cooperation economy. It is an economy which is driven by value creation through cooperation” (Wieland, 2014, p. 48), under this framework, I would dare to say that the modern state system should also be one in which cooperation creates value for everyone. As in many other transnational issues, refugee crises should not be solved unilaterally but responses must be as inclusive as possible in terms of actors in the solution processes. There is yet one actor I have not discussed before in this paper and that is the firm. Wieland argues that firms are “[…] in the terms of the language game of Governance Ethics – a comprehensive governance structure for the enablement of economic cooperation, which make use of local governance structures to achieve this end” (Wieland, 2014, p. 21), therefore why should for-profit firms not be included in the responses towards refugee crises? The term Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has been at the center of the business scene during the last years, noting how firms can behave as responsible actors towards society and the environment. In a global situation where firms are increasingly powerful, but many of them also increasingly responsible, they might prove as well-equipped to help national governments deal with the necessities of refugees. Wieland says about compliance and CRS management that “[t]hese fields of action can also only be judged effectively for an organization because and in as far individual (e.g. personal integrity) and organizational (e.g. a compliance office) resources have been allocated for a precisely defined intended purpose (e.g. fighting bribery)” (Wieland, 2014, p. 19). As another example of intended purpose I would say alleviating refugee necessities. There is little (if any) discussion regarding the role of firms in the current refugee crises, but they could definitely prove to be leading actors in the near future, as the current strategies undertaken by governments and international organizations have not been as effective as they should have.

6. Final Remarks

I would like to stress again that I do not mean to oversimplify the unique characteristics of refugee crises across the globe, nor to say that the three examples discussed in this paper are the only ones which exist at the moment. This text is just an attempt to outline less traditional strategies to deal with these issues; approaches which may prove to be more ethical
and more effective than those applied until now. I have also not talked about the specific role of the citizen in this topic; citizens should and must push their governments in order to adopt more ethical measures in dealing with refugee crises. This is the task pending upon all of us.

References


Past academic approaches to leadership have dominantly dealt with intra-organizational issues in a mono-cultural environment. This might be an appropriate approach to meet the challenges of industrialization; beyond this, however, its applicability is very limited. Today organizations operate within multi-cultural settings determined not only by organizational but also by national culture. New leadership requires productive cooperation in a very fundamental way. Therefore, we need globally accepted ethical norms and legal rules for economic activity, the more so as there is a lack of global institutions addressing such matters. Transcultural ideals can serve as a common bond in decisionmaking processes on crucial issues.
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