



**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MIGRATION AND
GLOBAL STUDIES - [IJMGS]**

**PUBLISHED BY
CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE IN MIGRATION AND
GLOBAL STUDIES**

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 1, January 2021

ISSN: 2782-7534

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief

Godwin Sogolo

Editor

Hakeem I. Tijani

Editorial Members

Abdalla Uba Adamu, Bayero University Kano, Nigeria

Marek Hrubec, Centre of Global Studies, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic

Mbare NGom, Morgan State University, USA

John A. Bewaji, The University of the West Indies, Jamaica

Rasheed Olaniyi, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Grace Jokthan, National Open University of Nigeria

Copy and Production Editor

Felicia Oamen – National Open University of Nigeria

Executive Administrative Assistants

Blessing Alabi

Samuel Egege

Toyin Asonibare

Business Managers

Zubair AbdulKareem

David A. Abbah

ISSN: 2782-7534

Editorial Brief

The Centre of Excellence in Global and Migration Studies (CEMGS) is a 2019 Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TetFund) intervention that commenced operation in March 2020. It was founded by Professor Abdallah Uba Adamu, who from 2016-2020, was the Vice Chancellor of National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN). This Journal is one of the academic publications of the Centre that is deemed crucial to fulfilling the vision of the founder. We should note that global migration and mobility has become part of human history and cannot be divorced from developmental plan, economics, politics, social life, and education of the citizens. Both internal and external migrations have come to influence who we are, what we do, and our future. NOUN's CEMGS is therefore a milestone in the history of the institution. The Centre serves as the fulcrum of research on migrations, both internal and external; and its conceptualisation, contextualisation, and decolonisation as essential to multidisciplinary analyses of global studies.

The International Journal of Migration and Global Studies (IJMGS) is a critical and Afrocentric-centred Journal that engages theories, concepts, and real life narratives on migrations in the locale, national, or global dimension. The Journal articles are policy oriented, adaptable for teaching, and solution driven in analysis; they are useable nationally and globally.

With several factors responsible for internal, intra-regional, continental, and global movement of peoples, the Centre with the birth of its academic Journal, hopes to sustain documentation of experiences through arts methods, science and health methods, other social science methods for use in the classroom, policy making, and for experiential learning.

It is hoped that the articles in this maiden edition, and subsequently, will fulfil the purpose, rationale, and aspiration of the Journal.

Hakeem I. Tijani
Editor

Global Dialogue of Cultures: Migrating Cultural Patterns from a Philosophical Perspective

Marek Hrubec

Centre of Global Studies,
Czech Academy of Sciences

Abstract

The article deals with a philosophical analysis of migrating cultural patterns in order to articulate a global dialogue of cultures, mainly in relation to Africa. It analyses a potential for consensus among cultures by means of an intercultural dialogue. It is therefore, a contribution towards overcoming the confrontations among migrating cultural patterns, and the eradication of the coercive imposing of interests and values onto other cultures and civilizations. The article demonstrates that an intercultural identification and satisfaction of common needs and interests across individual cultures that recognize each other is one of the effective forms of resistance against people being misrecognized. However, this requires a formulation of common needs and interests based on the needs and interests of individual cultures and the dialogue among them. Concerning African cultures, the relevance of Africa has recently grown in the world, mainly in demographic, economic, and political terms. BRICS and several other countries, including Nigeria, which have been on an economic upswing within a plurality of modern patterns over recent decades, have been influential in the development of African countries in the multilateral context, in the South-South cooperation and well as in relations to Western countries. There are mutual interactions of migrating cultural patterns there. The article focuses on the mentioned issues from the local to larger (regional, continental and global) levels in line with traditional and modern African cultural approaches. It also examines the cooperation of these approaches with other cultures, if and when the latter enlarge their perspectives by opening up a global polylateral point of view.

Key words: intercultural, cultures, dialogue, Africa, global

Introduction

Members of different cultures interpret their needs, interests and values in different ways. Therefore, it is not at all surprising that we are confronted sometimes with conflicts among people from different cultures in the world. In this article, I will concentrate on the issue of respect of different needs and interests, and, at the same time, on the issue of some common needs and interests regarding the potential for consensus among cultures by means of

an intercultural dialogue and polylogue.¹ The article may be considered as a contribution of global studies towards overcoming the confrontations among cultures and civilizations and to the eradication of the coercive imposing of foreign interests onto other cultures. I would like to demonstrate that the intercultural dialogue on needs and interests migrating across individual cultures is one of the effective forms of resistance against people being misrecognized. However, this requires a formulation of common needs and interests based on the needs and interests of people from individual cultures and the dialogue among them.²

In the first part of my article, I will briefly discuss the topic of conflict and dialogue; in the second part, I will focus in a critical hermeneutic way on the intercultural and inter-civilizational nature of this discussion; in the third part, I will concentrate on the specification of my idea by analyzing the African interactions with major countries and macro-regions of the world which have different cultures. In the final part, I will conclude my article by focusing on cultural patterns, by stressing a mutual respect among different cultures and a potential transcultural consensus.

Such an interpretation, which is a contribution to creating global 'unity in plurality', is not entirely a matter of course. The attention of most people is focused either purely on intercultural dialogue and the issues of cultural plurality, or only on common interests and the issues of the universality of civilization of all human beings. The attempt to create a connection between both types of discourse can help the individual cultures as well as humanity.

Conflict and Dialogue

¹ See the Forum for Intercultural Philosophy *Polylog* that organizes research discussions across nations and cultures <http://polylog.org> and also the polylog journal *Zeitschrift für interkulturelles Philosophieren*.

² First, I follow my analysis in *An Intercultural Dialogue on Trans-cultural Issues*. In: Axford, Barrie and Huggins, Richard (eds.). *Cultures and/of Globalization*. Cambridge Scholars 2011, pp. 14-35. Then, I try to articulate Africa in multilateral relations which I

plan to develop in detail in my analysis of Africa in a polylateral world in the process of formation.

There are frequent intercultural conflicts in the present global situation which is characteristic of a high number of interactions of people from different cultures in the fields of economy, communication or other types of cultural interaction. This does not always mean a state of war. Conflicts take on diverse forms from the cultivated to aggressive ones (Amason 2003). Although the confrontation of cultures and civilizations leads to the polarization and culmination of the conflict, the intercultural dialogue among cultures attempts to contribute to their mutual recognition (Eisenstaedt, 2002).³

These forms of conflict resolution did not develop as separate entities but stem from the development of mutual conflict relationships between people and the requirements for their resolution. The process of misrecognition of certain groups of populations in the long term historical perspective causes their justified dissatisfaction and articulation of their claims for recognition. At the same time, some types of misrecognition might be initiated by artificial conflicts which are invoked for the purpose of the legitimization of particular power structures or for the purpose of unjust economic interests among others. Despite the fact that some confrontations between cultures are fictional because they are forced upon people without any essential connection with the reality, a possibility of 'self-fulfilling prophecy' has at least a partial influence on the transformation of these conflicts into serious and real confrontations. The example may be the artificial unnecessary conflict between the West and Islam. The relationships between people are then formed as a complex of real and fictitious conflicts.

People react critically to the disadvantages which they face, and in this way they map the problems that need to be resolved. In the background of their experienced reality they notice also positive fragments of reality and try to develop them. In a relatively favorable environment, the criticism of current forms of misrecognition and attempts to correct them may be realized in the form of a cultivated intercultural dialogue.

Intercultural dialogue attempts to identify the current social norms through critical discussion and create new ones that might be shared by

³ On the value of the role of dialogue, in other words, communication in relation to recognition see: Taylor (1992); Fraser, Honneth (2003).

individual cultures in a universal way. Because the interaction does not often concern only *two* cultures and therefore a *dialogue* in the literal sense, it is more precisely a *polylogue*. Such a broad concept of the discourse cannot in the least supplement the solutions to all the social, economic, political and other related problems. What can be done is nevertheless to provide conditions for an important intercultural framework for working on these problems.

The discourse which is the subject of my analysis contains two fundamental elements. The first one relates to the forming of a dialogue 'from below' from the perspective of various cultures and their relationship within human civilization. The second element is in the form of some common needs and interests which may be the global outcome of this type of dialogue for humanity (in the United Nations, for example). This kind of approach, which is gradually formulated and subjected to many comments from individual cultures, could be the unifying and universal element (An-Na'im 2002). In short, the objective is to reach a commonly shared '*trans-cultural*' consensus of humanity through *intercultural* means in order to replace the current supra-cultural situation which is not universally accepted.

Cultures and Civilizations

What does it mean to talk about the dialogue which is supposed to be *intercultural*? The adjective may be initially read as an umbrella term which covers the relationships among individual cultures or civilizations or culture/civilization circles. This definition raises the question about the relationship between the words *culture* and *civilization*. The preliminary answer might be to define them as synonyms but under the condition that the limits and any possible misunderstandings are clarified before using these terms. Their frequent inter-changing is not only the case in the Western languages. For example, there is also the Arabic word *umran*, which has had a prominent place in the teaching of Ibn Khaldun from the 14th century. It can be translated either as civilization or as culture.

Some authors prefer to use the word civilization rather than the synonym approach. Yasuaki Onuma presents this term as more appropriate because the word culture may be interpreted also in a restricted sense in which it speaks

only about art works and works with an aesthetic function (Onuma 1999).
This is certainly corrected

The word civilization is likewise not used in one sense only. On the one hand it is designated to the whole human civilization in the entire humanity, while on the other hand it is designated to just one of the civilizational or cultural circles; it is used for example in relation to the civilization or culture of the West, China, India, Russia, and, of course, the African civilization and African cultures in plural (Benjamin 1973). This process also allows the discussion about the historical development.⁴

It is important to remind us here of the negative history of colonialism which was legitimized by *European universalism* or more precisely by *pseudo-universalism* (Wallerstein 2006). The meta-theoretical viewpoints commit the same transgression which without the contribution of other cultures and from the viewpoint of only one culture, attempt to dictate which social concepts, interests, values and so on, are relevant and eventually should be considered as universal. All these approaches are usually defined as cultural colonialism (Said 1994; Kogler 2005).

One of the related problems, which arise in connection with cultural colonization, is also the cultural particularism. In this respect, the word culture as well as the word civilization can have negative connotations because they both can refer to *Kulturkampf* or the *Clash of Civilizations*.⁵

One way of preventing these kinds of problems is firstly to retain the wider sense of the term civilization, that is to use it only in the singular sense for defining the whole of human civilization and secondly to define the term *culture* by its plural connection with individual societies. The word culture might be seducing to various partial conceptions as I already mentioned, from culture as a collection of art works, to cultural aspects of various areas, for example cultural rights, to cultures which have not developed into complex civilizations and which have not the use of technology and also to cultures as a synonym of civilizations. Despite this wider notion, it is always various partial entities and not culture as a singular whole which is under consideration because culture is not usually thought of as an all-human

⁴ See, for example, Adorno, Horkheimer (1988). Compare with the alternative interpretation by Toynbee (1961).

⁵ Authors who develop these thoughts use these words often as synonyms. See, for example, Senghaas (2007)

culture but rather as various cultures or cultural plurality. Here we might refer to Majid Tehranian who, in his analysis of civilization and resolving of its conflicts, says that it is more adequate to analyze one human civilization and many human cultures (Tehranian 2007).

At the same time we should reject fixating purely on one of these categories, on civilization in a singular sense or on culture in a plural sense. It is necessary to acknowledge both, the differences of individual cultures as well as the common needs and interests which bring humanity as a whole into one civilization.⁶ The key is that in this definition it is possible to respect plurality of opinions and to work 'from below' of individual cultures and aim towards their interconnectedness in one civilization. It seems to be appropriate from this viewpoint to reserve the plural meaning for the word *culture* and the singular meaning for the word *civilization*. At the same time, there is a continuous exchange between the social constructions of these terms. Moreover, I would like to add that the concepts of culture and civilization, which are defined in the opposite sense than I presented here, may also reach a reasonable content of interpretation.⁷ The key is to define positions with the aid of terms and not by fixating on these terms.

The conception of cultures in the intercultural and trans-cultural dialogue also requires a more exact identification of the cultural subjects of the dialogue. In relation to Lawrence Blum, the three categories can be distinguished, although none of which have to be designated definitely and can transform in time (Blum 1998; Ingram 1998). Firstly, it is possible to speak of *an individual* who is formed by a particular culture or *an individual* with a particular cultural identity (identities). Secondly, we may discuss *a group of individuals* specified by particular culture or *group* with particular cultural identity. Thirdly, we can analyze an entire *culture*.

The first category of the subject is not in the centre of attention in the intercultural dialogue because the dialogue primarily follows relationships

⁶ In the similar types of discussions within the framework of the national state, it is usual to differentiate between the politics of recognition or of difference and the politics of universalism or of equality. See Taylor (1994).

⁷ It is possible to say that this is, to a large extent, a matter of terminology and not of content.

See, for example, Onuma (1999).

between larger cultural units rather than individuals. The relationships at the individual level are certainly also important though, in the conflict of entire cultures, millions of individual persons do not enter into discussion but rather the representatives of people who can promote their individual and group interests. Nevertheless, it is important to make sure that the representatives of individual cultures do not represent just their own view and their own culture only marginally. But also in the case when the representatives are successful in representing their culture, they should not represent the mainstream of their culture more predominantly; it is obviously desirable to acknowledge the minority streams as well (Taylor 1994; Senghaas 1998). Within the framework of intercultural dialogue, it is also important to remember significant socio-economic factors.

The other category which is formed by culturally formed groups of individuals includes in a more restricted sense various cultural groups in a nation state or the majority of the population, and in the broader sense, the majority of the entire population in Europe, in Africa or in other parts of the world. It is the population of the European Union, the African Union, the USA and other countries which have similarly specified cultural, economic and political systems, such as Canada, Australia and so on.

The third category, which is formed by entire cultures or civilizations, if I use this term imprecisely, includes the creations of culturally defined groups, from art works to various social customs and finally to the whole life in the society, which is a collection of various social, political, legal and other entities. In the wider context and from the long-term perspective, it is also possible to add population to these creations which may be considered as a cultural product of itself. Population as it stands does not perceive itself as an object but asserts itself primarily as a creating subject which gradually forms cultural customs, rules and objects in interaction with the related environment.

What would it mean to refer to the third category in an intercultural dialogue which means the entire cultures? Charles Taylor speaks of the entire cultures when he expresses the need to recognize value of cultures which is required not only for a dialogue but in particular for their own life. He says that we should analyze and recognize the equal value of cultures (Taylor

1994). In Taylor's interpretation, the recognition of equal respect to different cultures is analogous to the recognition of the equal dignity of individuals.

We may say that it is also necessary not to slip towards an interpretation which homogeneously ignores various groups of individuals with diverse cultural identity. If we redefine Taylor's formulation by focusing primarily on the equal recognition of *groups of people* which are defined by a particular culture, it will be possible to better understand the requirements of the politics of recognition.

Africa's foreign interactions

After explaining the issue of intercultural dialogue, now I will focus on a specification by dealing with a territorial issue, namely the interaction of Africa and African countries with countries and macro-regions in other parts of the world.

Developing countries, including Africa, have undergone a difficult path to colonial occupation, where Western countries have mostly disrupted African social institutions and used their human (often slave labour) and natural resources for a long time (Kasanda, 2018; Sall, 2013). Following the historical trajectories, some former colonial powers still hold some influence on African countries, although they no longer pursue a colonial kind of relationship (Lucarelli, Langenhove, Wouters, 2013). This new relationship is mainly due to the fact that these countries are still world superpowers or at least powers, rich countries. These are Western European countries that dominate the European Union's policy, and the USA as a key Western country with the biggest influence.

The last two decades are the most important period for the updated stage of interactions between Africa and Europe, mainly the European Union. Since 2000, Summits of Heads of State and Governments have been organized at the level of the European Union (EU) and the African Union (AU), previously the Organization of African Unity (OAU), although inter-regional and inter-macroregional cooperation took place in some form before. The first intercontinental Africa-Europe Summit was held in Cairo in Egypt in 2000, organized by the EU and OAU. The Cairo Declaration and its Action Plan for the coming years were adopted with the vision to create new strategic relations which would help develop Africa: the Africa-EU Partnership. The other EU-Africa Summits followed in 2007 and, then,

always after three years.⁸ One of the last important topics was "Investing in Youth for a Sustainable Future", reflecting a strong demographic change Africa has faced. This topic is currently being elaborated and is emphasized in individual joint activities. In addition to these Summits at the highest political level with adopted Declarations and Action Plans or Road Maps, there are regular ministerial and commission meetings.

The most important is the Joint Africa-EU Strategy which is a platform for relations of African and EU countries. It was approved in the Summit in Lisbon in 2007, and it is supported by individual African and EU states, the EU and the AU. The strategy is implemented step by step via action plans and a road map between Summits. Ten years later, a joint communication for a revitalization of the Africa-EU Partnership was adopted in the EU. There are also regional strategies, dealing with the Horn of Africa or Sahel.

It is relevant to mention also the Cotonou Agreement, established in Cotonou in Benin in 2000, a treaty between the 79 African, Caribbean and Pacific states (APC), including 48 in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the countries of the European Union (originally 15 of them). It is focused mainly on a reduction of poverty even if results have not been too effective yet. However, it stresses principles which focus on different issues (political, human rights, for example) which fragment attention to poverty.

Similarly, other platforms, including the Summits, usually focus mainly on issues that are particularly relevant to the European Union, such as migration, democracy, etc. Nevertheless, cooperation with the European Union countries is important for African countries, but more and more important for them is cooperation with other countries that place primary emphasis on infrastructure and social development. Within the EU, a reflection on this situation only began, in which other countries have taken the initiative and are much more able to agree on cooperation, especially China.

As for other Western countries, the essential role is kept by the USA which has a strong influence over the African continent (Jackson, 2017). In the period after the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, the loss of interest in

⁸ The second EU-Africa Summit was held in Lisbon in Portugal in 2007; the 3rd Africa-EU Summit in Tripoli in Libya in 2010; the 4th EU-Africa Summit in Brussels in Belgium in 2014; The 5th African Union-European Union Summit in Abidjan in Cote d'Ivoire in 2017.

African countries prevailed partly in the USA. There was a groping era in which it was automatically assumed that the USA was unilaterally determining global developments and that there was no need for any further specification of this approach. The situation changed after September 11, 2001. A reductionist securitization approach in the "war on terror" begun to be applied to African countries. Africa was perceived by the USA administration in a reductionist way as a territory near the Middle East, a terrorist threat to the USA after 9/11.

The Bush administration in the first decade of the new century faced emerging multilateralism with the influence of Muslim countries, but only the Obama administration wanted to take multilateralism at least partly seriously and not merely as a response to 9/11. Obama was initially a promise to change access to Africa for many because of his origin. There was an ad hoc summit - Africa Leaders' Summit with politicians from 50 African states, hosted by the USA President in Washington, D.C., in 2014. However, the main focus was USA oriented: security and investment.

The further reorientation occurred only with the advent of Donald Trump. In 2018, the USA announced three principles related to Africa: trade, security, political influence. It means, firstly, the prosperity which was meant to be advantageous primarily for trade with the US; secondly, the security under which Trump sees the fight against terrorism; security issues in Africa remained essentially the same from the USA perspective as after 11/9, i.e. terrorist issues.

As for the relationship among African and other developing countries, the revitalization of interest in African countries was linked to the multilateral period of the BRICS formation (BRICS Information Portal, 2020). India, as a member of this group, initiated the first India-Africa Forum Summit (IAFS). Summits, held with Heads of States and Governments approximately once every three years as official international meetings, are held alternately in India and Africa: the first took place in New Delhi in 2008, the second in Addis Ababa in 2011 and the third and fourth in New Delhi in 2015 and 2018 respectively. They provide incentives for cooperation in the fields of politics, trade, investment, education, medicine and development aid. Both India and Africa each have approximately 40% of the global poor.

They therefore constitute the main areas of the world where efforts to eradicate poverty are very much needed. While it creates great future

potential for understanding the mutual needs of India and mainly the sub-Saharan Africa, so far cooperation has been limited because of the gradual transformation of India under the Modi administration.

Further cooperation of African countries is with Russia. While after the WWII in the post-colonial period the Soviet Union had a number of strongly developed relations with some African countries, after the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, these relations cooled (Shubin, 2008; Yordanov, 2016). The Soviet Union disintegrated and its successor, Russia, had many problems with itself in the 1990s. After the subsequent consolidation of the situation in Russia, approximately since 2000, mainly the emerging BRICS multilateralism and the subsequent development led Russia to seek new outlets in Africa again.

Development of relations between Russia and African countries confirmed relevant Russia-Africa Summit which took place in Sochi in 2019, with the adoption of the final Declaration dealing with the mechanism for partnership and cooperation in the fields of politics, security, energy, trade, economic, legal, technical, humanitarian and information issues. Participation at the Summit was truly representative. All 54 African countries were represented at the event, of which 43 were presidents or prime ministers. In addition, the participation included more than 3,000 representatives of business and other organizations. The summit is also a testimony that Russia is aware that world powers (EU, US, China, etc.) already have developed new relations in Africa. It finds a political alliance with some African countries primarily in the emphasis on non-interference in the internal affairs of individual cooperating countries, which is a kind of critique directed at some Western countries and international financial institutions such as IMF and the World Bank (Declaration of the First Russia - Africa Summit, 2019).

There is certainly an economic potential for Russia-Africa cooperation, as Russian exports to sub-Saharan Africa are almost non-existent, it is only over 1% export, and to North Africa around 2%. Since Russia is a developed industrial country with a strong tradition of arms research and production, cooperation with African countries has been largely realized as arms trade in recent years. It is active in Nigeria, Libya or the Central African Republic.

The summit is scheduled to take place every three years, so the next one is expected in 2022.

Nevertheless, China is the country that has had the new most intense relations with African countries recently. With its strong economic development and various social programs that lifted 800 million Chinese people out of poverty during the last 40 years (which is the highest number in human history for such a short time), China is an inspiration to follow for many African countries and a partner for cooperation for all of them (Allison 2018).

Since around 2000, we may say that a new era of China-Africa cooperation started. China, the world's largest developing country, is active in developing cooperation with other developing regions of the world. It seeks for better relations than Western countries pursued in the colonial era and also in the contemporary global system since the beginning of the 1990s. This is apparent also in the China-Africa cooperation.

China and Africa together account for about 2.6 billion people, about the third of all the planet's inhabitants, and this number is not limited in the future. The cooperation between China and Africa has recently deepened, especially under the New Silk Road, i.e. the Belt and Road Initiative, over the past years since 2013. The cooperation is developed in many areas: in economic, political, cultural, educational or scientific spheres, including programs on poverty eradication. The long-term platform for developing relations with these two macro-regions of the world is the *Forum on China-Africa Cooperation* (FOCAC) (Csizmadia, 2017).

The last FOCAC Summit held in Beijing in 2018. The extraordinary support for the event was expressed by the United Nations Secretary General Antonio Guterres as the Special Summit guest: "This Forum on China-Africa Cooperation is an embodiment of two major priorities of the United Nations: pursuing fair globalization and promoting development that leaves no one behind of a rule-based system of international relations supported by strong multilateral institutions" (Guterres, 2018). It is also in line with the African Development Agenda 2063 and the UN Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development (Czirjak, 2017).

In the short space of this article, of course, I cannot give a complete account of the relations of African countries or the African Union with other countries and macro-regions of the world (Nagar, Mutasa, 2018). I can add

that other regional powers with global ambitions, namely Japan and Turkey, have recently held a summit with African countries as well. These summits

seek to gain greater influence on the African continent in the globalized world, which, thanks to its demographic growth and its associated economic development and potential, is an attractive place for trade and various forms of cooperation.

Interactions between Africa and Latin America, in particular Brazil, have become an increasingly important reference point in recent decades as well (Abidde, 2018). Progressive governments in Latin America in general since around 2000, and particularly Brazil, have recalled the common fates of people during a period of historical injustice linked to slave trade between Africa and Latin America. The import of slaves to Brazil and other countries, mainly from West Africa, was one of the most brutal stages of human history. These repressions did not remain unresponsive and faced persistent resistance and brave anti-slavery struggles with many rebellions, such as those made by the Quilombos, the Brazilian settlements of escaped slaves. At the same time, this historical reflection was a recent opportunity for greater cooperation between Brazil and African countries in the framework of South-South cooperation (Afolabi, 2016).

Furthermore, I can add the well-known fact that, historically, the influence of Arab traders and hence the Arab culture, including the language, was very important for Africa. Indeed, the development of Swahili on the east coast of Africa and in related regions is an eloquent example. Trade, and more generally interaction with the Arab world, continues to this day, including the influence of Islam in the areas of religion, culture, and politics. However, since this influence is less institutionalized, it requires a different kind of analysis from the one I used in this text, focusing on the institutional interactions of Africa and the outside world.

Towards Africa's Engagement in the Global Dialogue of Cultures:

African countries have changed from within and have had to face a number of external influences in the global system in its dialogue of cultures.

External global influences are usually stronger in Africa than in other continents because of various economic and political weaknesses in this continent. While it has to deal with remnants of the past foreign interactions, at the same time, it cooperates in a better way with countries in the context of multipolar tendencies.

Africa has gradually tried to create its own model of social, economic and political organization. Although it sees inspiration in developed European countries, there are also examples to follow in Asia and Latin America in South-South cooperation. Understandably, the biggest focus in Africa is on economic and social development (building roads, ports, hospitals, schools, poverty eradication programs, etc.), ecological sustainable development, and political cooperation when possible. And Africa finds inspiration in other parts of the world as well (Beck, 2009; 2017), including the United Nations (Muldoon Jr. Et al. 2011; Muller, 2013)

It should be seen that the agents are not only individuals, social groups and African countries, but also the entire African regions or macro-regions, both in terms of their internal development and in terms of their foreign interactions. There have been already existing regional communities there: Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), Arab Maghreb Union (AMU), Community of Sahel-Saharan States (CEN-SAD), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), East African Community (EAC), Southern African Development Community (SADC), Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS/CEEAC), as well as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD - Horn of Africa, Nile Valley, Northern part of Great Lakes), etc. (Rudahindwa, 2018). 54 of 55 African Union countries outlined a new treaty on The African Continental Free Trade Area which started being valid for ratifying countries in 2019. It is a document written for purposes of the specific internal trade among African countries which extremely underdeveloped. African countries and Africa as a whole have their own characteristics, which present both specific problems and specific opportunities.

Africa as the whole continent is a relevant macro-region. There have been integrational Pan-Africanist tendencies (Soyinka et. al, 2015) which established the Organization of African Unity and later the African Union (Desta, 2013). Projects in the African Union are supported by the African Development Bank and other institutions. 50 years after the important year 1963 when 32 African newly independent countries signed the Organization of African Unity, a new agenda inspired by redefined Pan-Africanism came into existence: Agenda 2063 (Agenda 2063, 2015). The idea is to achieve

significant development on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of this year of African independence. Agenda 2063 is a 'collective vision and roadmap for the next fifty years', which should accelerate development activities. These are: the eradication of poverty and the provision of housing, education, infrastructure and whole economies, among others. This includes efforts to „continental unity". There are a number of conditions that must be met in order to achieve this transformation. According to Agenda 2063, the following prerequisites must be ensured: finances for development, accountable leadership, ownership by the people, responsive institutions, democratic developmental states, attitudes for Pan-African interests and values of solidarity and integration, and the concept of priorities and Africa's global position, local approach to development. The project is a very general blueprint. In order to make it real, it has to be specified in two ways. First, it is important to identify the main principles within the basket of needs, interests and values mentioned in Agenda 2063 which the African people really consider the most important ones. Second, it has to be specified regarding material resources needed for making it possible in practice.

The above-mentioned current regional and macro-regional entities in Africa are in fact an example of such potential (sub) models. At the same time, cooperation and integration will also be network-based, as the future society will be more digitally interconnected, and it will increasingly be possible to establish cross-continental cooperation between previously unconnected partners.

Conclusion: Towards respect of the individual cultures and global transcultural consensus

Multiple interactions of African countries and regions and well as Africa as a whole with other macro-regions of the world, represented by the European Union, the USA, China, Russia, India and others, is the specification and application of the idea of dialogue. In continuity with the explanation I offered above, it is possible to say that the connecting element between the macro-regional *cultures*, which are primarily tied to culturally defined

groups of individuals, and the *civilization* in terms of the entire humanity is the *intercultural dialogue*. The significant feature of the intercultural dialogue is the effort to find, first, a mutual respect among dialogical partners, and, second, a certain *trans-cultural* feature in common which might be shared by all cultures and therefore by the entire human civilization (Mbiti, 1990; Gyekye, 2004; An-Na'im, 2002; Honneth, 2015; Dussel, 2008). The effort to agree on certain commonly shared fundamental cultural patterns migrating across individual cultures makes an international and transnational arrangement a significant topic.

The formulation of commonly shared limits of this kind presupposes mutual understanding between the participants of the dialogue (Schmied•Kowarzik 2002; Holenstein 1999). Every individual culture has its own specific features which are not shared by other cultures. This does not mean that the dispute is absolute and that there is no space for mutual inspiration and overlapping of categories which might be articulated for the purpose of consensus on a specific issue. These overlapping and universally shared categories may be considered as cultural constructs which follow on from similar approaches to similar problems which are encountered by various cultures; they could also be cultural universals (Wiredu 1996), if we use the terms of Kwasi Wiredu. Whatever the basis of this is, there are long-term circumstances for culturally created universals on a global scale due to the fact that none of the larger cultural circles are isolated and they do influence each other. The global trends of recent times only encouraged these encounters between cultures. This fact is not an evidence of a kind of shared unity; nevertheless, it is a testimony of at least an awareness of common problems which cannot be ignored, such as climate change and other environmental problems or global financial speculations which caused the 2008 global financial and economic crisis. Despite the fact that the list of these problems is by no means identical in all cultures, there are certain relevant overlaps. Although the hierarchy of these issues is not identical between cultures, it is the subject of the discussion itself which can lead to particularly fruitful results. One of these outcomes is a definite level of consensus in regard to mentioned ecological and financial problems but also elimination of wars, elimination of poverty, and other relevant issues in Africa.

References

- Abidde, Sabelle Ogbobode, ed. (2018). *Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean: The Case for Bilateral and Multilateral Cooperation*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Adorno, T. W.; Horkheimer, M. *Dialektik der Aufklärung*. Frankfurt, M.: Fischer, 1988. (1st ed. 1944).
- Afolabi, Niyi (2016). *Ile Aiye in Brazil and the Reinvention of Africa*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Agenda 2063. (2015). Addis Ababa: Africa Union Commission.
- Allison, Graham. Beijing's anti-poverty drive has lessons for all. *Telegraph*, 28 August 2018.
- An-Na'im, A. A. *Cultural Transformation and Human Rights in Africa*. London: Zed Books, 2002.
- Amason, J. P. *Civilizations in Dispute. Historical Questions and Theoretical Traditions*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Beck, Ulrich. (2009). Critical theory of the world risk society. *Constellations* 16, 1, pp. 10-22.
- Beck, Ulrich. (2017). *The Metamorphosis of the World*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Benjamin, N. Civilizational Complexes and Intercivilizational Encounters. *Sociological Analysis*, 34, 2 (1973), p. 79-105.
- Blum, L. A. Multiculturalism, Racial Justice, and Community: Reflections on Charles Taylor's "Politics of Recognition". In: Foster, L.; Herzog, P. (Eds.). *Defending Diversity*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1994, p. 175-205.
- Blum, L. A. Recognition, Value, and Equality. *Constellations*, 1 (1998), p. 53, 57 nn.
- BRJCS Information Portal (2020). <http://infobrics.org/> Retrieved: 26 March 2020.
- Csizmadia, Norbert. (2017). *Geofusion. Mapping of the 19th Century*. Budapest: PADA, pp 162 - 170, 106- 112.
- Czirjak, Rahel. (2017). Africa: 2050. *Hungarian Geopolitics*, No. 2, 2017, pp. 134 -139.
- Desta, Mengiste T. (2013) *The long march to African unity: Achievements and prospects*. Addis Ababa: Shama Books.
- Declaration of the First Russia-Africa Summit*. Sochi, 24 October 2019, No. 30.
- Diamond, J. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. W.W. Norton, 1997.

- Dussel, E. (2008). *A New Age in the History of Philosophy*. The World Dialogue between Philosophical Traditions. Soul: XXIIth World Congress of Philosophy.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. ed. (2002). *Multiple Modernities*. New Brunswick: Transactions Publishers.
- Fraser, N.; Honneth, A. *Redistribution or Recognition?* London and New York: Verso, 2003.
- Guterres, Antonio. (2018). *Secretary-General's remarks to the China-Africa Cooperation Summit*. The United Nations Secretary-General News, Beijing, September 3, 2018.
- Gyekye, Kwame. (2004). *Beyond Cultures: Perceiving a Common Humanity* (Ghanaian philosophical studies, 3). Washington: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.
- Holenstein, E. *Menschliches Selbstverständnis*. Frankfurt, M.: Suhrkamp, 1999.
- Honneth, Axel. (2015). *Freedom's Right*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Jackson, Donna Rose. (2017). *US Foreign Policy in The Horn of Africa: From Colonialism to Terrorism*. New York: Routledge.
- Ingram, J. Comment on Lawrence Blum. *Constellations*, 1, 5 (1998), p. 69-73.
- Kasanda, Albert (2018). *Contemporary African Social and Political Philosophy: Trends, Debates and Challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Lucarelli, Sonia; Langenhove, Luk Van; Wouters, Jan, eds. (2013). *The EU and Multilateral Security Governance*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- Mbiti, J. (1990). *African Religions and Philosophy*. London: Heinemann.
- Muldoon Jr., James P.; Aviel, Joann Fagot; Reitano, Richard; eds. (2011). *The New Dynamics of Multilateralism: Diplomacy, International Organizations, and Global Governance*. New York and London, Routledge.
- Nagar, Dawn; Mutasa, Charles, eds. (2018). *Africa and the World: Bilateral and Multilateral International Diplomacy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Onuma, Y. Towards an Intercivilizational Approach to Human Rights. In: Bauer, J. R.; Bell, D. A. (Eds.). *The East Asian Challenge for Human Rights*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, p. 103-123.
- Rudahindwa, Jonathan Bashi. (2018). *Regional Developmentalism through Law: Establishing an African Economic Community*. New York: Routledge.
- Said, E.W. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York, Vintage, 1994.

- Sall, Ebrima. (2013). The study of Africa in a multipolar world. A perspective from within. In: Engel, Ulf; Ramos, Manuel Joao, eds. (2013). *African Dynamics in a Multipolar World*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, pp. 195 - 216.
- Schmied-Kowarzik, W. (Hg.). *Verstehen und Verständigung. Ethnologie - Xenologie - Interkulturelle Philosophie*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 2002.
- Shubin, Vladimir. (2008). *The Hot 'Cold War': The USSR in Southern Africa*. London: Pluto Press.
- Senghaas, D. (1998). *Zivilisierung wider Willen*. Frankfurt, M.: Suhrkamp.
- Senghaas, D. *On Perpetual Peace: A Timely Assessment*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.
- Soyinka, Wole; Amin, Samir; Selassie, Bereket Habte; Mugo, Micere Githae; Mkandawire; Thandika. (2015). *Reimagining Pan-Africanism*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers.
- Taylor, C. *The Ethics of Authenticity*. Cambridge, MA, and London, 1992.
- Taylor, C. *Multiculturalism. The Examining the Politics of Recognition*. A. Gutmann. (Ed.). Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Tehrani, M. *Rethinking Civilization: Resolving Conflict in the Human Family*. London-New York, Routledge, 2007.
- Toynbee, A. J. *A Study of History*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1961. (1st ed. 1934).
- Wallerstein, I. *European universalism*. New York, New Press, 2006.
- Wiredu, K. *Cultural Universals and Particulars: An African Perspective*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1996.

