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Theoretical Perspectives

Contemporary work on the relationship between minority cultures¹ and globalization²—a relationship presented as a dialectical/dialogical one by Makere Stewart-Harawira in her book The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization³—offers today new and hybrid perspectives on the challenges of globalization. Texts that deal with that relationship are characterized by the multifarious connections they formulate between a multiplicity of knowledge communities that defend culturally grounded social and political philosophies and a multiplicity of knowledge areas (literature, history, philosophy, sociology, political theory, international relations, etc.), which allows for the diversification of viewpoints on the topic of human development in today’s global context of economic, political and cultural systematization.

This variety of perspectives that highlight the local and global issues of minority cultures in the face of global phenomena allows for a diversification of the topics addressed by “mainstream” global studies literature and encourages the development of new strands of reflection which have not been given enough space so far in the literature that evaluates and critiques globalization processes. The inclusion of so-called “minor” perspectives⁴ from across the

¹ Within the context of this publication, the term “minority” refers to cultural communities (mainly diasporic communities and ethnic groups) that have suffered, and still suffer today, from multiple forms of discrimination and which have experienced therefore a lack of social, economic, political opportunities and a lack of recognition/representation within their located geopolitical spaces.

² Globalization: set of practices imposed from the top-down that subordinate people (groups, communities, nations) to profit-driven values, or more broadly, to reductive capitalistic notions of development. Thomas D. Hall and James V. Fenelon see the contemporary world system as a “globalizing version of late industrial capitalism, intensely pursuing the neoliberal project of a system run entirely by market principles, tempered only by parallel efforts to keep current elites in powerful positions,” Indigenous Peoples and Globalization: Resistance and Revitalization (Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2009), 123.


⁴ Although the majority-minority divide which implies contrasting cultural frameworks is slowly collapsing as social movements and literatures across the globe are becoming increasingly culturally multifaceted.
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globe in the reflection on globalization expands the analysis on, and illuminates certain aspects of specific contemporary global phenomena which are oftentimes deleterious to human evolution as the concrete expressions of hegemonic, homogenizing forces created by profit-driven value systems. In “Globalization, Minorities and Civil Society,” Koichi Hasegawa describes the different facets of globalization: in a society that does not limit itself to the nation-state but has taken on a global/international perspective, capital, information and labor move across borders thanks to the development of means of communication—a movement that fosters political, social and cultural change at global and local levels.

Minority groups’ living conditions and cultural evolution have been historically intertwined with the development of global order and have suffered from early to present phases of globalization. Minority groups are often cited as victims of global processes since global forces increasingly dictate the fate of local communities within nations and their regions. However, they are rarely consulted for the techniques or technologies of accommodation and resistance they have implemented as a response to global processes both at local and global levels. Mainstream globalist literature does not yet offer analytical space to so-called cultural minorities in the process of questioning the values and practices of globalization. As a matter of fact, as Duane Champagne argues in his foreword to Indigenous Peoples and Globalization: Resistance and Revitalization, “Most contemporary theory does not conceptualize the existence or presence of indigenous peoples, let alone offers a theory or conceptualization of the cultural, political, social and territorial continuity of contemporary indigenous peoples and nations.” He further argues that

---

5 In the book he has edited with Timothy Sinclair, Approaches to World Order, Robert Cox defines hegemony as “an order within a world economy with a dominant mode of production that penetrates into all the countries and links into other subordinate modes of production. It is also a complex of international social relationships that connect the social classes of the different countries. World hegemony can be described as a social structure, and economic structure, and a political structure...[It] is expressed in universal norms, institutions and mechanisms which lay down general rules of behavior for states and for those forces of civil society that act across national boundaries, rules which support the dominant mode of production” (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 137.


contemporary theories of social change should include indigenous people—and I would broaden the scope of his analysis to include minor cultural groups in general—to bring the diversity of human experience and societies into current reflections and studies on future possibilities of human development. This diversity would allow for the study of multiple “patterns of change” in the past as inspirations for patterns of future possibilities beyond contemporary, homogenizing global discourses of cultural and economic expansion. Such discourses preclude the transformation of current global social and economic systems into less exploitative, less invasive and more humane, collective, distributive patterns of development beyond Western/colonial and neo-imperialist forms of cultural domination.

The purpose of this publication is to bring to the forefront of global studies these new perspectives that address the relationship between globalization and the experiences of cultural minorities worldwide, and these literatures that take into account other, so-called “minor” cultural perspectives that prove crucial to the necessary process of questioning contemporary global values and practices and complicating current debates on the causes, consequences, future of globalized practices in a variety of fields: politics, education, culture, the economy, etc. These new literatures on the relationship between globalization and minority cultures seek to reformulate this relationship on new bases by relying on the possibilities of a cross-cultural exchange between divergent, and sometimes utterly contradistinctive, praxes. The goal here is to develop new theories and practices of transculturality that link different theoretical and cultural spheres in order to formulate new discussions and propositions about appropriate responses to give in defiance of the adverse effects of globalization—such responses imply a review and critique of the theoretical foundations of globalization and the subsequent formulation of more humanist theoretical bases to global practices in all areas of human development.

The historical theme of structural continuity, a crucial theme in the literature about resistance to present neo-colonizing/globalizing forces, has been taken up by citizens of nation-states who, given the global crisis in progress, are looking for ways to survive and resist a whole network of anti-democratic and destructive global projects, while at the same time relying on constructive global practices and tools, such as technologies of communication, to publicize and counteract the many instances of political, economic and cultural violence worldwide. It is therefore appropriate to reflect upon the links, the common features, the possibilities for developing collaborative projects between minor and mainstream alter-globalization movements in the fight

8 Hall and Fenelon, ix.
against the deleterious aspects and effects of globalization, with the hope
to see the differential space between “minor” and “mainstream” make room
for renewed forms of intercultural relationships and new definitions of
citizenship—a citizenship grounded in “glocal” politics, aware and critical of
the global processes at play in the workings of local communities, and suffi-
ciently “global-savvy” to use the tools of globalization in order to limit its nega-
tive effects.

The point is not to idealize or glorify the experiences of minority cultures in
the face of change, nor is it to deny the value of existing critical reflections on
globalization that are rooted in the history and experience of so-called main-
stream cultural groups. The point is to strike more connections between differ-
ent experiences in order to think up the best alternatives to problematic global
systems in place and to a way of life brought about by global life patterns that
is not satisfactory anymore to the majority of world citizens. These alternatives
may come out of local/ “minor” cultural practices and experiences which can
influence global systems positively and help so-called modern societies ques-
tion the political, economic and cultural ontology of the present world order.
The goal is to complicate current debates in a variety of fields on the causes,
consequences, future of globalization processes, without co-opting or harness-
ing the knowledge and practices of minor cultural groups to try and improve
existing human systems of knowledge and development, which would be an
aporetic process as one cannot simply apply a new set of cultural practices to
systems of development that have historically relied on other practices to
grow. Such a process would not question contemporary global systems of
knowledge production and dissemination as it would simply erase the histori-
cal specificity of group evolution (whether “minor” or mainstream), a specific-
ity that needs to be surveyed and understood so that productive and
constructive intercultural exchange between cultural groups can happen in
the future. The texts gathered in this publication participate in this process of
intercultural global criticism. These texts are spaces that promote the interpre-
tation of theoretical and practical responses given by cultural minorities in
response to global phenomena. They present analyses of the ways in which
these responses participate in theorizing and operationalizing new perspec-
tives, beyond dominant discourses, that question contemporary global praxes
of human representation and development.

A constructive intercultural critical process would involve recognizing the
practical and epistemological alternatives proposed by marginalized cultural
groups whose concepts, principles, models and efforts in exploring new paths
of thinking and living have not been sufficiently explored. As a matter of fact,
dominant theories of modernization have often regarded cultural minorities
as communities that had to undergo inevitable change to adapt to and eventually enjoy the benefits of modern (Western) society, or else be annihilated. The knowledge and practices of cultural minorities have often been dismissed by dominant discourses of human development as having very little analytic or scientific use, as being an impediment to the development of modernity. To participate in the critique of such a deficient scientific rationale is one of the objectives of this publication.

As poet, researcher and political activist Susan Hawthorne argues in an article entitled “Wild politics, beyond globalization,” what we need in order to tackle the global crisis is a “diversity matrix”\(^9\) of concepts and practices put forth by groups and peoples who have been vulnerable to global politics, its economic and trade policies, its corrupted epistemological bases. For Hawthorne, globalization is a “distinct outgrowth of western capitalist and patriarchal systems”\(^10\) that favor practices of disconnection between cultural communities and between people and land resources. Such practices have become structural and they have led to the violation of the rights of groups (whether social, cultural or gendered) that share a “vulnerability to macroeconomic policies, new systems of trade rules and the structures of violence that exemplify globalization.”\(^11\) Hawthorne proposes a new form of global politics, “wild politics,” based on the diversity of human experience and the building of strong connections between communities “with relationship considered more important than profit”\(^12\) and with the re-incription of notions of common good in global decisions about human development. This diversity matrix of concepts and practices that resist hurtful global phenomena exists within cultural communities around the world which struggle locally and globally against the encroaching of global normative structures of power. This matrix represents an inexhaustible resource for citizens, communities, researchers and teachers around the world who are looking for valuable sources of insight into the conditions of human life and seek to articulate new epistemological and practical alternatives to contemporary dominant discourses on human economic, intellectual and social development—alternatives which are greatly needed in times of crisis. Solutions to this global and multidimensional crisis we are facing today are necessarily transcultural and transnational and will require more collective work than the present-day solutions presented to us can allow since


\(^10\) Hawthorne, 253.

\(^11\) Hawthorne, 243

\(^12\) Hawthorne, 255.
these current solutions do not, unfortunately, question the very modes of thinking and organizing life that are foundational to the dominant states and the international regulations under which we live and which have participated in the global crisis. In order to expand contemporary spaces of intercultural exchange and perform real epistemological shifts in dominant discourses about human development, a number of tensions we encounter in contemporary discourses on the relationship between minority cultures and globalization need to be addressed.

One of the responses to the destabilizing effects of globalization has been a conservative return to cultural sectarianism, where so-called dominant cultures resist the influence of so-called minor cultural communities (and vice versa), where cultural identity appears as an essentialist encoding of human identity and cultures are perceived as closed systems of values and practices which exclude the influence of “the foreign” —this protective reaction to global phenomena is a revised, contemporary version of “culturalisme,” a term revisited by Jean-François Bayart in his book *L’Illusion Identitaire*, which describes the crystallization of cultural identity groups and communities as a shielding maneuver against the oppressive effects of globalization. Of course, globalization has also given birth to international forms of identity politics that have had positive consequences on the maintenance of cultural communities around the world, a process that has benefited from the globalization of communication and information technology. However, extreme forms of identity politics have led to the fractioning of cultures—a highly permissive consequence of globalization where cultural segmentation nourishes intercultural conflicts within states and beyond borders.

Lindsay Whaley, in an article entitled “The Future of Native Languages,” argues that “We are in the midst of a massive demographic transformation on our planet—a shift from linguistic and cultural diversity toward linguistic and cultural homogeneity.” She sees globalization as “a process of increasing international integration of economic life” that has in turn caused the increasing international integration of cultural life, which means that globalization has produced hegemonic cultural spaces that have demanded of local structures and communities drastic adjustments and forced their assimilation into a global cultural pattern at the expense of local languages, local cultural patterns and local concerns.

---

14 Translated as “The illusion of cultural identity.”
16 Whaley, 969.
Thus we can certainly argue that globalization is an ambivalent phenomenon, filled with contradictions and tensions, with highly deleterious or sometimes desirable aspects and outcomes. Globalization has produced hegemonic systems of influence carried by multinational corporations that homogenize human development—the terms disneyfication/disneyisation or macdonaldization of society have become popular to describe this phenomenon. Globalization has created transcultural interfaces that have led to conflicts between communities. However, it has also facilitated the internationalization of media and communication industries and has increased cultural interconnectedness across borders, thus offering opportunities for cross-fertilization of cultural values, experiences, patterns, etc. Moreover, human and ethnic rights movements across the globe have become leading forces in the fight against permissive global phenomena by using the global tools and institutions at their disposal. The Internet has become a tool for the development of global indigenous movements as it has strengthened access to information, foreign policies, audiences, despite its undeniable distorting influence; in the political and legal domains, international institutions have been called upon to address minority issues worldwide as ethnic social movements have increasingly influenced world politics and worked toward ideals of transnational democracy. In the process of challenging markets and institutions that sought to crush them, these movements have deconstructed and redefined the scope of these global tools and institutions as well as a number of their foundational principles.

In his book *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*, S. James Anaya, a professor of human rights law and policy at the University of Arizona, traces the

---

17 Alan Bryman, “The Disneyisation of Society” (1999). <http://www.canyons.edu/Faculty/haugen/Disneyization%20of%20Society%20Article.pdf>, visited on 9 August 2013. The Disneyisation of society is “a process by which the principles of the Disney theme Parks dominate more and more sectors of society. It is presented as comprising four aspects: theming, dedifferentiation of consumption, merchandising, and emotional labour.”

18 According to George Ritzer, the McDonaldization of society is “the process by which the principles of the fastfood restaurant are coming to dominate more and more sectors of [...] society” and the four dimensions of McDonaldization are efficiency, calculability, predictability and control. In George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 1993), 3.

history of indigenous rights movements. He argues that before the modern era of human rights, international law was shaped by state actors—colonial or postcolonial states—and so favored the colonizing forces controlling the states. This has changed rather recently and international law, though still state-centered, is “now pulled at by a discourse directly concerned with individuals and even groups.”

International law has been, in the past 40 years, more and more influenced by the demands of minority groups beyond borders; groups that once were objects of discussions have now become real participants in a transnational dialogue that concerns them and everyone on the planet—such as the right to self-determination, a concern shared by world citizens who bear the disastrous social consequences of the economic dependence of states on global financial institutions. The point here is that “minor” cultural groups have produced major change by establishing a strong foothold in the international system through a language of human rights that has dealt with inequalities on local and global scales. They are forcing the law to reform itself and take into account the demands of groups that are not culturally or politically dominant within states; they are forcing this very normative space of inquiry and regulation, the law and its connected institutions, to morph from a space of cultural hegemony into a space of transcultural democratic development, which is an important—though slow and always imperfect—shift for minor, ethnic, indigenous, autochthonous, first nation communities around the globe and for all communities and groups that are defending human rights beyond states, on a global scale, through protests and critiques of the global phenomena that are putting the interest of a few above the interest of the whole.

The undesirable effects of globalization are being placed in check today by the people who have been the most vulnerable to them and who have built global alliances based on shared social and cultural traits or ethical postures in order to resist dominant global strategies that have had dire consequences on their lives at local levels. In his article “The Globalization of the rule of law and human rights” Steven T. Walther writes, “As global corporations and other economic entities continue to become more powerful (even now many are more powerful economically than some nation states of the UN), there will likely be an increased pressure toward requiring them to adhere to minimum standards of ethics and to discharge certain responsibilities toward society, including respect for human rights.”

---

future, the role of cultural communities worldwide that have been challenging deleterious global phenomena at local and international levels and working on the diffusion of power through society against global tendencies to concentrate it in the hands of a few, is likely to become prominent.

In the midst of the present global crisis, responsible political discourses point to the necessity to bridge gaps between cultural communities within national spaces and across borders in order to improve the social and political conditions of individuals and communities worldwide. The goal is to create more spaces of cultural transition, of intercultural relationality, of equal participation in discourse by developing models of participatory or deliberative democracy where non-dominant cultural groups would be involved in the formulation of “an intercultural public space,” an expression coined by political scientist Michael Rabinder James (we could also cite the expression “multicultural public sphere,” coined by Francisco Colom González in his essay “Intercultural Justice and the Public Sphere”). Such a space is “critical for the democratic accommodation of cultural difference.” This space of intercultural relationality is to replace the spaces of cultural segmentation in and around which we live today, where cultural groups are clearly hierarchized in public and political discourses regulated by dominant cultural communities and are not given equal access to decision-making processes. The development of intercultural spaces is part of a process Dharm P.S. Bhawuk has coined “global community psychology,” which is a model of knowledge (created from Hindu cultural insights) where new, global intercultural forms of knowledge “or etics have to be grounded in the specific cultural contexts or emics” and are produced by learning from untapped cultural resources, by moving beyond limitations of the traditional configurations of one’s intellectual and cultural world and by acknowledging the necessity to use multiple paradigms, multiple worldviews. This model of knowledge relies, according to Bhawuk, on

---

22 The expression appears in the title of one of Michael Rabinder James’ articles: “Tribal Sovereignty and the Intercultural Public Space,” in Philosophy and Social Criticism 25, n° 5 (1999), 57–86.
24 Colom Gonzales, 4.
“the multi-paradigmatic approach”\textsuperscript{27} to knowledge production, an approach that values non-Western theoretical positions. The goal here again is to keep formulating new epistemological and practical alternatives to contemporary dominant discourses on human development and question the very ontologies upon which these discourses have been erected.

For teachers and researchers worldwide, this epistemological question is crucial. In the academic realm in France, we are struggling with an education system and corresponding institutions that are organized upon clearly delimited areas of knowledge or professional disciplines (English, history, sociology, chemistry, biology, etc.). These knowledge areas are disconnected and grounded in a culturalism that is both disciplinary and social, despite the high level of consciousness in teachers and researchers as to the necessity to lead students and future researchers on the path toward transdisciplinarity and transculturality so as to help them shape creative and transformative research and teaching methods adapted to a more and more complex, interconnected and pluralistic world. Today, teachers and researchers are responsible for making their methods of inquiry and reasoning more relevant than those offered by professional disciplines that still rely on methods of inquiry that remain cognicentric, highly ethnocentric—sometimes quite pedantic—and encourage principles of separation and dichotomy. In a study entitled “Teachings from the Deep South: North–south Contributions to Integral Education,” Adrian Villasenor-Galarza argues that “nowadays the value of transformative, holistic and integral approaches to education is slowly being recognized” even though “our education systems still perpetuate recalcitrant biases based on fragmentary conceptions of self and world”\textsuperscript{28} and knowledge. In this study, he begins to explore the place of indigenous practices from the global south and the role they can play in bettering education programs which rely on a multidimensional model of education and push students to go beyond traditional, disciplinary, anthropocentric methodologies of knowledge acquisition. Such transformative projects which emphasize the necessity to formulate new research methods in a transdisciplinary and transcultural context are slowly developing and the specific features of these programs are designed to help students use their imagination and their creativity as well as a multiplicity of knowledge traditions to conduct creative research that deals with the concrete issues we are facing in these times of global crisis—a crisis that impacts the cultures of education around the world and the national communities that

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{27} Bhawuk, 314.
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promote these cultures. In France and other countries worldwide, the intensifying intercultural tensions between so-called dominant cultures and minority groups will eventually force national and international institutions that participate in developing school curricula to question very seriously the cultural paradigms on which these curricula are based as well as the education systems that reproduce them.

In his essay “Transdisciplinary and Creative Inquiry in Transformative Education: Researching the Research Degree,” Alfonso Montuori argues that “scholarship can become an opportunity to create ourselves in and through the process of inquiry and participation—both in a community of scholars and in the wider global community” through the integration of disparate perspectives that will challenge the foundational assumptions of disciplines and of the institutions that harbor them and “engage the inquirer as an active, embodied and embedded ethical participant to the world.” The fragmentation of thought and knowledge into disciplines and into cultural areas is problematic and will have to erode since areas of research that study the evolution of our societies, areas of inquiry that are crucial to the survival of humanity (such as ecology, for example) have to draw on multitude disciplines, from hard science to the humanities, for research and the dissemination of information on that research. They also have to draw on a plurality of cultural dimensions in order to understand the causes and consequences of global phenomena; in the case of ecology, industrial and economic policies, geophysics, biology, environmental analyses help us understand specific environmental phenomena, but explanations for the irrational and maladaptive global human responses or reactions (mainly insufficient) to the imminent environmental disasters predicted by researchers worldwide, are to be looked for in spirituality, in psychology, in literature, in history, in the West, the East, the North and the South, in communities worldwide and their cultural practices.

Culture shapes our identities as individuals, as members of a community, as citizens of a nation state, as citizens of a community of nations, etc. It also shapes our methods of inquiry and knowledge acquisition. Intercultural phenomena serve to reconceptualize cultural identity beyond cultural essentialism, as a relational and evolving creative process of inquiry that cannot be confined to the context of a single nation, a single homogenous perspective,


30 Montuori, 123.
but should be viewed, as Alfonso Montuori puts it, in “a larger, transcultural, planetary context.” Hence the necessity to develop methods of inquiry that take into account the qualities of the researcher and the diversity of methods that can impact the way we produce knowledge. We would not like to reduce the scope of cultural minorities’ fight for recognition and human rights to a study of their methods of inquiry and knowledge acquisition and dissemination, but it has been one important aspect of minority struggles in response to colonization and modernization, and there is a whole body of knowledge and practices coming out of so-called minor cultural spaces which global discourses about knowledge production and dissemination have only begun to take into account.

The diversity of articles presented in this volume suggests nuanced analyses, grounded in particular places and conditions, of how minority groups have been targets, in more ways than one, of globalization and its practices; these articles also describe and analyze the ways in which minority groups are, in some instances, putting beneficial global tools (such as the global media) to good use in their fight against detrimental global influences. Furthermore, these articles investigate the ways in which minority groups are influencing global practices, institutions and knowledge areas by projecting new ideas, concepts, perspectives of inquiry and development onto the global stage and new, contestatory forms of globalisms grounded in transcultural and transnational coalitions, against theories and forms of globalisms imposed from the top by international and state actors.

This publication is the outcome of a conference organized by the CHCSC research group at the University of Versailles Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines, France, in June 2013. The conference, entitled “Globalization and Minority cultures: the role of so-called minority cultures in rethinking the future of modern societies,” aimed at bringing to the forefront of global studies these new perspectives, theories, texts, practices that address the relationship between globalization and the experiences of cultural minorities worldwide and show both the real and potential influence minority knowledge can have on the world. The fact that this conference took place in France is of particular significance when we know that France is still very much “in denial” when it comes to recognizing the importance of “its” minority population, although this population is, quite visibly, shaping the contemporary multicultural architecture

31 Montuori, 132.
32 Centre d’Histoire Culturelle des Sociétés Contemporaines (Center for the Study of the Cultural History of Contemporary Societies), CHCSC, research group in cultural history at the University of Versailles-Saint-Quentin-en-Yvelines.
of the French Republic. Today, still gangrened by white patriarchal elites that hold onto both political and economic power and have actively participated in the ghettoization of minority populations throughout the 20th century, France does not, however, hesitate to position itself on the international scene as an unswerving global actor and role model in promoting democratic values across borders. The contradiction between this aura of global political respectability that national (or international) actors seek to build and the reality of their social and political actions toward specific populations inside and across borders, is one of the many paradoxes that readers will find articulated and critiqued in the articles to come. Indeed, these texts bear witness to the theoretical and technical capacity of “minor” communities to uncover and offer alternatives to globally unreasonable thinking processes and behaviors that do not seek the resolution of deadly contradictions (human survival versus environmental destruction, international collaboration versus nationalist policies, the preservation of cultural diversity versus global cultural homogenization, etc.). They bear witness to the role minority cultures can play in shaping our global future.

Overview of the Volume

The articles presented in this publication are organized into six parts. Part I, “Reconceptualizing the role of minority cultures in a global context,” addresses the philosophical role of minorities in deconstructing dichotomies (colonized/colonizer, minor/major, etc.) and critiquing concepts that have sustained problematic perspectives and practices of globalization which the authors of these articles seek to dismantle. This theoretical repositioning is key to understanding the new forms and practices of globalisms enhanced by “minor” philosophies and cultural practices worldwide.

Part II, entitled “Minority cultures and ‘glocal’ political resistance: thinking new models of identity and citizenship,” brings forth the role of minority groups in countering “modern,” national and global political forces that promote monolithic and reductive models of identity and citizenship. As a response to imposed politics of assimilation or alienation, minority populations have nonetheless managed to elaborate means of resistance with the local/global tools at their disposal, showing the way to those who seek to redefine the conditions of human (and other) life within new, humane political frameworks. The last article in this section deals with one of these means of resistance: the law. It discusses the development of legal support to minorities, and thus the complexification of the role and content of the law (both national
and international) and its evolution in protecting minority (and more globally, human) rights locally and globally. One of the questions raised by the author of this article is, can contemporary national and global legislation and the official bodies that ensure the application and respect of the law participate today in the alter-globalization effort? Can the law and legal institutions really be carriers of change, equality, prosperity for minorities (and citizens in general) within and beyond state borders?

In Part III, “Minorities’ economico-environmental struggles,” authors address the battles “minor” cultural groups are waging today as they look for solutions to resolve the contradiction in which modern societies have been caught, that is the global need to protect the environment, human rights and life in general versus the fulfillment of the noxious economic and energetic requirements of modern life. The articles in this section address, in a very sincere and unrestrained manner, the crisis of sustainability nations around the globe are facing today, the history of that crisis, the ways in which minority groups have been and still are victims of that crisis and the paths they are choosing to resolve the (above-mentioned) contradiction which stands at the heart of the crisis.

In Part IV of this volume, “non-homogeneous forms of cultural development: the linguistic paradigm,” authors analyze the role and place of minor languages in the contemporary global context of linguistic homogenization. The articles gathered in this section of the volume negotiate quite expertly the relationship between minority groups’ fight for social and cultural survival within the regional communities they inhabit—a need partially fulfilled in the process of preserving “minor” languages—and the global responsibility to oppose the hierarchization or leveling of languages in the era of linguistic homogenization. In this section, the issue of linguistic sur/re-vival is connected to broader issues of gender and cultural representations.

Part V, which is entitled “Art as resistance,” addresses the role of artistic productions in promoting non stereotypical representations of minority groups and acknowledging the roles these communities play in developing sustainable cultural and economic models of development that are based on the merging of consciences and practices from “mainstream” and “minor” knowledge frameworks.

Finally, in Part VI of the volume, “Literary dismantlements of global/colonial domination,” specific fictional spaces of globalization are analyzed in order to critique and deconstruct the colonialist framework that has historically shaped the relationship between specific (so-called “dominant” and “minor”) cultural groups. The articles in this section, beyond this critique of the colonial manipulation and acculturation of so-called “minor”
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communities, also participate in constructing new, productive globalist literary spaces where new possibilities for intercultural connections, beyond cultural dualities and oppositions, are revealed.

Part I: Reconceptualizing the Role of Minority Cultures in a Global Context

In “From anthropophagy to glocalization: a hundred years of postcolonial responses to globalization,” Jacques Pothier puts into historical perspective the relationship between actors of globalization (throughout colonial and postcolonial times). He disrupts the traditional colonizers/colonized, major culture/minor culture dichotomies and hierarchization, acknowledges the active role of so-called minority (sub-)cultures in shaping intercultural relations and communities and asks for new perspectives and a new theorizing of the state and space of power relations in today’s global world, where stronger intercultural relations between mainstream and “minor” cultural groups can potentially become new tools to address the challenges of globalization. In “Mondialisation, minoritarité et conscience altéritaire,” one of the two texts in this collection presented in their original language (French), Emir Délic develops the notion of “conscience altéritaire” (consciousness of the other) in order to address a crucial issue in today’s global world, that of the epistemological predominance of Western thought in all areas of life that have a global dimension. The author points to the absence, from the public scene, of knowledge perspectives that are not born into traditional Western epistemological poles, and to the necessity to take into account these perspectives in order to create new forms of intercultural relationship, beyond binary oppositions, as well as new epistemological positions through which to deconstruct these binaries, so as to start living and seeing the world multidimensionally. Finally, in “Reflexive minority action: minority narratives and new European discourses,” Tove H. Malloy analyzes the ways in which minority groups influence global/European discourses on democracy-related issues through reflections and actions that seek social change in the midst of a crisis that has consequences on minority groups and citizens in general. Change involves crucial political acts such as a redefinition of the very methods of dealing with the effects of globalization on European citizens and a redefinition of the role of the institutions that are responsible for coping with these effects—processes that Tove H. Malloy has coined “reflexive citizenship acts” and which rely on new discourses of political action based on intercultural and transnational exchange.
Part II: Minority Cultures and “Glocal” Political Resistance: Thinking New Models of Identity and Citizenship

In “Indigenous peoples and national self-image in Australia and New Zealand,” Adrien Rodd tackles an issue that has both local and global roots and repercussions: the redefinition of national identity in the face of global phenomena. The author analyzes the role of Indigenous people, in these two neighbour countries, in reconceptualising definitions of national identity in a globalized context against monoculture—a process in progress around the world since the framing of common, collective national identities which would nonetheless make room for cultural differences is an issue that modern nations are facing today. In “Globalization and Resistance: the Tibetan case,” Molly Chatalic discusses the contemporary status of Tibetans as colonized or exiled people that have led the historical fight against Chinese imperialism and struggled against the imposition, by the Chinese, of destructive forms of modernity. Tibetans hope to conduct their relationship to modernity and globalization on their own terms and the author analyzes the ways in which they are resisting imposed forms of modernity by using the global tools at their disposal to access and produce knowledge, communicate on their political status and struggle and respond to Chinese invasive and destructive economic activities and political violence, thus presenting an inspiring model of global citizenship to the world. In “Can the Afghan diaspora speak? Diasporic Identity in the shadow of human rights,” Shirin Gul Sadozai and Hina Anwar Ali reflect upon the characteristics of the social and legal identity of the Afghan diasporic community living in Pakistan. Through both a theoretical reflection on the place of minorities in national communities and an analysis of narratives from Afghans living in Pakistan and Pakistanis interacting with them, the authors analyze the strategies of resistance developed by Afghan refugees in Pakistan as they try to define their place and identity in a country where “the global ‘imaginaire’” (a term coined by the authors) adversely influences the local and global image of Afghans. Finally, in “Protecting minority population in Europe with European law,” Coralie Fiori-Khayat discusses the role of the European Union in protecting minority groups facing discrimination at local levels, showing how national issues involving minorities are being dealt with at the global level and are influencing the evolution of international law. Minority rights in Europe are protected by a body of law and the authorities that ensure the implementation and respect of the law. Although the author brings forth the effectiveness of this global legal apparatus, she also points to its limitations and the necessity to continue the effort in promoting democracy and freedom—the moral cornerstones of EU—for minor cultural groups that seek recognition, respect and citizen rights.
Part III: Minority’s Economico-Environmental Struggles

In “Feudalism and integration of the Native Peoples of Peru in the worldwide economy,” Natividad Ferri Carreres explains how Spanish colonization initiated the earliest period of worldwide globalization through the transposition of the feudal system to the “new world.” She examines to what extent the colonial/feudal structure has survived in the relationship between the Indian communities and the institutions of the actual Peruvian society, fully integrated into our global economy, and how in spite of that structure, legal rules promoting consensus between economic needs and cultural preservation of indigenous people afford rural and indigenous communities access to development and protect indigenous rights and Peruvian lands against multinational companies. In “Re-singing the world. Indigenous pedagogies and global crisis during conflicted times,” Makere Stewart-Harawira dissects the tension between global economic development/global governance and the preservation of indigenous/human rights and the environment. As a context for that discussion, the author draws a picture of the historical evolution of indigenous fights for cultural and environmental rights and analyzes the importance of that fight in the process of resolving the complex crisis of sustainability countries around the globe are facing today. Finally, in “‘Idle No More’: Indigenous People’s coordinated reaction to the twin forces of colonialism and neo-colonialism in Canada,” Ryan Duplassie analyzes the scope of Canada’s revolutionary “Idle No More” movement, an Indigenous political and social contemporary response to national and global forms of political and economic imperialism. The author assesses the ways in which “Idle No More” serves as a platform to organize and share information about Indigenous concerns in Canada, mainly human and environmental ones. He shows how this local movement turned global has led to connections and collaborations between indigenous and non-indigenous people in Canada on issues of preservation and economic sustainability.

Part IV: Non-Homogeneous Forms of Cultural Development: The Linguistic Paradigm

In “Indigenous languages, gender and community organisation in the era of globalization: the case of the Mazatec women of the Naxi-i in Oaxaca, Mexico,” Karla Janiré Avilés González and Angela Ixkic Bastian Duarte examine the experience of an organisation of Mazatec women in Oaxaca, Mexico, to demonstrate how global phenomena can offer ways to escape the marginalization, in its diverse increments, experienced by minority groups. The authors demonstrate that Mazatec women in Oaxaca, Mexico, have reinforced their ethnic and linguistic identity while working
to develop more just gender relations (a crucial contemporary global concern), thus suggesting that globalisation can also be a space of opportunities for minority (sociolinguistic) groups. Then, in “Against the ethnicisation of regional territorial minorities: contribution from the Basque experience in France,” Thomas Pierre critiques the global trend of linguistic homogenization through an analysis of the Basque demands for linguistic and cultural recognition and preservation, a political struggle which could ideally serve as a strategic space for thinking new forms of social, political and intercultural cohesions beyond cultural traditionalisms and global monolithisms.

**Part V: Art as Resistance**

In “Visualizing development with identity: relational aesthetics of indigenous collaborative community art projects,” Pauline Oosterhoff, Arno Peeters and Iris Honderdos deal with issues of representation of minority groups as they analyze two art projects that were developed in 2012 through a collaboration between non-indigenous (Dutch) artists, development and museum experts from the Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam and representatives of indigenous communities, the Benet (Uganda) and the Khasi (India). The authors reflect upon the use of such interactive and collaborative art projects in providing alternatives to stereotypes of indigenous people and stressing their role in national development initiatives. These collaborative art projects offer means of empowerment to indigenous groups which become active participants in constructing representations of their culture and formulating their hopes for the future despite a tense cultural and economic context. In “Communication for social change in indigenous communities: limitations of community radios and other Proposals: Igloolik Isuma Productions,” Bianca Rutherford Iglesias and Concepción Travesedo de Castilla theorize the relationship between communication and human development and analyze the role of audiovisual production (and information technologies) as appropriated tools that allow minority populations to promote their visibility, secure linguistic and cultural survival, assert their identity and defend the preservation of indigenous heritages through sustainable models of development.

**Part VI: Literary Dismantlements of Global/Colonial Domination**

In “L’indianisme au Brésil au travers des traductions, des adaptations et des transpositions en français du poème épique de José de Santa Rita Durão sur la découverte de Bahia: Caramurú. Poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia (1781),”
the second text in this volume published in its original language (French), Alain Vuillemin analyzes the archeology of a concept, “l’Indianisme” (indigeneity), as it evolved in Brazil—an evolution which is traced through the fictional reiteration of a myth, that of the encounter between Tupi Indians and Europeans, in a series of texts that offer various perspectives, some colonialist others more nativist, on that particular myth. The fact that multiple versions of this myth have been told throughout history points to the constant need to question the meaning of (national) identity in Brazil, a questioning that has historically been influenced by the indigenous perspective. In “Spatiality and the literature of globalization,” Sze Wei Ang, in her analysis of Shani Mootoo’s novel *Cereus Blooms at Night*—a text that can be coined a “fiction of globalization”—states that though postcolonial globalization has replaced colonial masters with native elites in “freed” nations, this replacement did not interrupt colonial spatial logic which continues today to define minorities’ experiences. She tackles notions of space under globalization and discusses how they affect the ways in which “minor” bodies are dislocated by strongly anchored colonial notions of space. Space under globalization continues to connote forms of colonial domination and the author’s reading of Mootoo’s text seeks to dismantle globalization’s unequal power relations and the role of inherited colonial notions of space in (re)producing forms of inequality. Finally, in “Tierno Monénembo’s ‘Fula’: between distance and empathy,” Roxana Bauduin traces the intercultural evolution of an ethnic group, the Fulani people, which has managed to negotiate—and thus has been an actor of—its survival through time and space. The history of this people, marked by a tension between the cultural core values of the group and the necessary integration of foreign values and beliefs, acknowledges the power of crosscultural fertilization in the process of surviving change—an often violent process—in a transhistorical context of globalization.
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