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ABSTRACT

Ethnic or cultural identity, seen as a permanent essence, constitutes a contemporary version of racism, formulated in terms of new social races. It is “a misleading and faulty concept” (Jean-François Bayart, 2005:31).

There is no identity, but rather history. Nationalism, founded ethnically, serves as a peculiar case of ethno-mania and, inside a democratic context, plays as an anti-democratic force, a reactionary strain. There are no homogeneous ethnic groups, but rather societies, internally pluralistic. They are historical actualization of a universal cultural pattern, always open to intercultural flow. Ethnicity and nationality as discursive performative constructions manifested through the achievements of speaking subjects. That is, ethnic and national identities are unpredictable and unstable cultural productions with which we identify. They are not universal or absolute existent ‘things’. Rather, ethnicity is a cultural accomplishment. Therefore, nationalism and ethnicity can be obstacles to the emergence of an integrated and pluralistic world.
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METODOLOGY: Cultural and historical analysis
Our cultures have developed on “an obsession with the concepts of Identity and Ethnicity” (Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay, 1966:156), driven mostly by wrong reasons, making a dubious treatment of facts, misunderstanding similarities and differences. An anthropological and sociological examination of the concept, guided by its various theories (essentialist, objectivist and subjectivist), shows that a coherent description cannot be found. A comprehensive study of social and cultural differences points to the conclusion that there are no pure ethnic groups and, according to the populations genetic, the idea of having a homogeneous ethnic group or race can be socially dangerous. Discourses of ethnic centrality and marginality are commonly articulated with those of nationality. History is strewn with examples of how none ethnic group has been defined as central and superior to a marginal “other”. Nazi Germany (1933-1945), South African apartheid (1948-1998), Rwandan genocide (1994), and the ethnic cleansing in Bosnia (1992-1995) are among the most clear-cut examples of this phenomenon. However, the metaphor of superiority and subordination is also applicable to our contemporaneous political landscape; in Myanmar, Rohingya Muslims are facing persecutions (1978-ongoing) and in Europe, many right wing political parties promote discriminations against Roma and Dom people. In 2013, Bulgarian professor Ognian Saparev, dean of the Plovdiv State University, in an inflammatory article “The Gypsy Conspiracy of the White Color”, suggested to ghettoize Roma due to their (supposed) unwillingness to follow state laws and to be meaningfully integrated. Thus, ethnicity has been closely allied to nationalisms that conceive of the nation as sharing a culture and requiring that ethnic boundaries should not cut across political ones. Diverse intellectual traditions contributed to the diversity of racial ideologies. Since the eighteenth century, many historians, linguists, folklorists, and philosophers had been increasingly attracted to racial explanations for the development of different human cultures. They attempted to clarify the murkiness of the distant past, or simply the complexities of human behavior, with facile explanations that sought to reduce the intricacies of history down to the interaction of racial stereotypes. Often, these explanations relied on mysticism, spiritualism, and intuition as the understructure for the racial ideology. For these spiritual racists, an irresolvable problem remains: racism by definition assumes the existence of a link between biological differences and behavior. Otherwise, there would be only ethnocentrism, with the possibility that those of different racial groups could assimilate into the superior culture, creating a cross community. Biological racism also grew out of the eighteenth century, through Enlightenment science’s fascination with studying newly discovered organisms (or human groups) and classifying them in an ordered hierarchy. It is important to distinguish among heterophobia, stereotype, and racism. Zygmunt Bauman in “Modernity and Holocaust” (1991), defined Heterophobia as:
“That diffuse (and sentimental rather than practical) unease, discomfort, or anxiety that people normally experience whenever they are confronted with such ‘human ingredients’ of their situation as they do not understand, cannot communicate with easily and cannot expect to behave in a routine, familiar way” (1991:84)

This discomfort is, following Bauman, a manifestation of anxiety arising out of finding oneself in a situation that can be neither controlled nor influenced.

“Heterophobia may appear as either a realistic or unrealistic objectification of such anxiety – but it is likely that the anxiety in question always seeks an object on which to anchor, and that consequently heterophobia is a fairly common phenomenon at all times” (1991: 87)

A stereotype is a preconception regarding a specific group of people. Stereotypes are usually viewed as negative, but they need not be so. Racism is connected to both heterophobia and stereotyping but it does not collapse into the other two terms. It sprang out in the early modern period, and spread throughout the intellectual and political worlds of nineteenth- and twentieth-century in Europe and America. Out of all the pain caused by hatred and injustice in history, there has sprung another, more hopeful narrative. It is a narrative written by people who fought the notion of race fostered by and national traditions, and especially by the model images of the ideal and pure man. The notion of race “cannot be readily re-signified or de-signified, and to imagine that its dangerous meanings can be easily re-articulated into benign, democratic forms would be to exaggerate the power of critical and oppositional interests” (Paul Gilroy is quoted in “Esotericism in African American experience”, 2000:354).

Enrico Corradini, believed that nationalism was rooted in nature. In his book “L’unità e la potenza delle nazioni” (1922), ventured that:

“The nation is a physical, ethnic, historical, spiritual, and political entity. Above all it has a body. It has a people (razza) and a territory. It is not a pure, natural race, but a historic, mixed race. The two so-called Latin nations, Italy and France, have races of very different historical mixtures. The historic Italian race still presents the spectacle of numerous different regional races. In the young nations we observe the merging of the most diverse races that have emigrated from everywhere” (1922:330)
Accounts of the violence with which modern rationality has been associated as *zweckrational* (Instrumental and social action), can be a useful tool to test and qualify the explanatory power of theories of culture and identity that have arisen in quieter, less traumatic circumstances.

The modern studies of social and cultural differences point towards the conclusion that ethnicity and race are misleading terms, falling outside a science conceptual framework. Cultural identity as a discursive formation, dispersed in time and space, varies in forms of statements and spreads across a global surface of differentiated geopolitical contexts. These phenomena can be investigated through “the analysis of their coexistence, their succession, their mutual functioning, their reciprocal determination, and their independent or correlative transformation” (Ronni Lessem, 2010:282) and by a linguistic approach to understand “the workings of the human mind” (Akira Okrent, 2009:260) because “to speak a language is to take on a world, a culture” (Frantz Fanon, 1952:38). This paper aims to address the general crisis based on the notion of community by examining the ways that migration and integration in this globalized era is stoking a particularly virulent and hideous form of racism. A form rooted in a xenophobia that is implemental to redefining the terms of nationhood and its political expression in citizenship. Racial identity is still an important component of social appraisal, and this continues to disadvantage people. Nowadays we believe that some of the controversy over the state of racial matters arises from a new, more cloaked form of differentiation that define it as a social marker. This is more difficult to detect in part because it is no longer set on a biological definition of race and the overt stereotypes and caricatures that grew out of it. Albeit race clearly remains a strong prognosticator of life opportunities but its public face is now covered by an ever-changing camouflage that obscures its force. This celebration of an existing contradiction (the belief in the possibility of equality within a vastly unequal society) permeates our societies. As Richard Delgado points out

“*the bundle of presuppositions, received wisdoms, and shared understandings against a background of which legal and political discourse takes place. These matters are rarely focused on. They are eyeglasses we have worn a long time […] we use them to scan and interpret the world and only rarely examine them for themselves*” (2002:160)

Failure to critically challenge the lens with which we see the world makes the myth of meritocracy predominant in our understanding of the workings of social institutions.
IDENTITY, COMMUNITY AND STRANGERS, a relational problem

Many popular songs include a component called the bridge. It is a turning point, a space where a song marks what came before and what is to follow. This bridge offers arguments about why place matters, about why culture counts, and about how history takes place. It seeks to take stock of the obstacles to democracy, dignity, and decency posed by the race spatial imaginary discussed. Latterly, there has been an unprecedented concern with cultural difference in relation with cultural identity, in both academic research and political debates. It is important to understand that a crisis of the nation state can undermine the structural integrity of its communities.

The notion of Cultural Identity is often the central issue in which many debates evolve, a hybrid product reflecting human societies. We believe in its existence, we need it, to define ourselves against the otherness. We do what we are told and as Weber noted:

“The honor of the civil servant is vested in his ability to execute conscientiously the order of superior authorities, exactly as if the order agreed with his own conviction. This holds even if the order seems wrong to him and if, despite the civil servant's remonstrance, the authority insists on the order” (Max Weber, 1997:178).

The concept has been (ab) used to give bedrock to distinct rights, claims (also legal pleas) or grievances, to make legit privileges, violence and coercion. The malleability of identity, as the ability to define the self in a large spectrum of ways, leads us to a form of cultural politics based on a re-definition of persons and social situations. This praxis of re-signification is not opposed to, indeed is correspondent to, a political culture of institutions and social initiatives. Identity is a process of becoming, created by points of difference and similarity. The political nature of identity is a production of multiple, fractured and hybridized identities, in a variety of forms and ways. Identities are performative and discursive, through discursive practice, which enacts that which it names via reiteration and citation of conventions and norms. Notably, subjectivity and identity mark the composition of persons in culture and language. “There is no essence to be discovered, rather, cultural identity is continually being created within the vectors of distinction and resemblance” (Chris Baker, 2008:30). Forgetting the historical and the relational based structure of the term, we think of it as a fixity. The cultural constraints are so powerful, built into the system in such fundamental way that we are frequenting operating with complete integrity and goodwill, believing that we act with objectivity. Most biased choices arise from internalized preconceptions, from introjecting specific system of values, because the most obvious, important realities are often the ones that are
hardest to see and talk about. Stated as an English sentence, of course, this is just a banal platitude, but the fact is that in the day to day trenches of adult existence, banal platitudes can have a life or death importance because we are socially constructed beings. It is noteworthy that the natural invisibility of causal connections in a complex system of interaction lead us into a praxis that we do not usually analyze, because “the 'distancing' of the unsightly or morally repelling outcomes of action to the point of rendering them invisible to the actor” (Zygmunt Bauman, 2003:80). As aforementioned, we commonly introject specific cultural elements, unconsciously incorporating them as part of our beings. When we study the notion of Self/Identity, we can see the power relations buried within the concept itself and by extension the power relations within the discourses that use the idea of it as an implied premise in their argumentations. For example, a state can exercise moral and educative leadership on our bodies, through a political anatomy and a disciplinary machinery. Power is not only a negative mechanism of control but it is also (mostly) productive; it can produce or manipulate the notion of self. The body and the mind are the sites of disciplinary practices that bring subjects into being.

The “disciplinary power” (Foucault, 1974), marks the human body as a substance to manipulate and train. Discipline always provides a positive economy, in which the social body supersedes the natural one. These practices have deep and lasting material consequences on an economic, political and social level. They create an efficient (social) machine. As Stuart Hall (Hall,1966 and Bill Ashcroft, 1995) pointed out:

"Where Africa was a case of the unspoken, Europe was a case of that which is endlessly speaking—and endlessly speaking us. The European presence is that which has positioned the black subject within its dominant regimes of representation: the colonial discourse, the literatures of adventure and exploration, the romance of the exotic, the ethnographic and traveling eye, the tropical languages of tourism, travel brochure and Hollywood, and the violent, pornographic languages of ganja and urban violence.” (1995:437)

In our age a strong sociopolitical problem aroused by the need of strengthening cultural identities, ethnic identities and national identities. To this end, we privilege diversities than promoting similarities. The hardening or our positions create a cultural sclerosis, leading in practice on a xenophobic approach to diversity (diversity is considered a dangerous support for globalization, linked to the dilution of national identity and cosmopolitanism), legitimizing social exclusion and racism. This is because identity is not in fact merely some fragile communal-psychic attachment, but a considerable dimension of institutionalized social life in modernity. Particularly in the dominant form of national identity, it is the product of deliberate cultural construction and maintenance via both the regulatory and the socializing institutions of the state; in particular, the law, the education system and the
media. The de-territorializing force of globalization thus meets a structured opposition, the everyday minute reinforcement; the continuous routinized flagging of national belonging, particularly through media discourse, sponsored by developed nation-states. Transnational migration is increasing along with other aspects of globalization, presumptuously threatening our cultural habitus. It is fundamental to recall, however, that rising rates of transnational migration are related to the creation of state boundaries in recent centuries. It is emblematic the case of Bedouins in North Africa, a semi-nomadic tribe who inhabited vast geographic areas prior the formation of modern Middle-East states. Pastoralists with extensive seasonal herding routes were “transnational” migrants long before state boundaries cut across their pathways. Nowadays, whole categories of people (especially foreigners) are treated as constituting risk. No longer treated as individuals, they are seen as part of a wider class of people to be collectively, neutralized, incapacitated and warehoused. Systematic discrimination against ethnic minorities, indigenous peoples, and women, among other categories, has been documented in judicial systems around the world, including those of long-standing democracies. Scholar Fay Gale (critical legal anthropologist) showed in his research on Australian juridical system (1990) that Aboriginals faced structured legal discrimination and were often severely punished even for minor crimes. Activists Michelle Alexander and James Forman Jr. in their books (“The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness”, “Radical Critiques of Mass Incarceration Beyond the New Jim Crow”, 2012), noted that inside the USA penitentiary system, African-American and Hispanic massive presence demarked a political framework strongly affected by ethnic biases and prejudices; like Aboriginals, they face the most sever legal outcomes and their incarceration rate is extremely high. Luckily, despite the grandstanding of politicians, societies are also being built from below, by new movements in support of freedom and by young people engaged in student initiatives, civil rights campaigns and pioneering new publishing ventures. It is such committed young people who are preserving the fabric of Western and Asian multicultural societies and breathing fresh life into its extra-parliamentary movements and humanitarian traditions. Integration today is wrongly equated with assimilation, the aim of which is a monotonous and homogenous society and not a pluralist multicultural one. Hence, the strike against multiculturalism, interpreted by shortsighted politicians and pundits in search of homogeneity as the foreground of communities closed in on themselves, states inside states, the very antithesis of multi-culturalism. We all fear an engulfing otherness, or mass, that obliterated individuality. This absolute opposition between the individual and the group precludes other understandings of social relations.

“If the mob always threatens to engulf the individual, if society is made up of monstrous and less-than human others, freedom becomes a zero-sum game in which one person’s freedom can only come at the expense of
others. Freedom from the group becomes a legible goal, but freedom within the group seems like an impossibility” (Beatrice Hanssen and George Lipsitz, 2000:119).

The Sino American writer Eric Liu, gives us a (possible) positive view of new emerging forms of localism. In a speech for the online magazine Ted, he stated that (at least)

“in America Civic imagination and innovation and creativity are emerging from local ecosystems now and radiating outward, and this great innovation, this isn't some precious parochialism, this isn't some retreat into insularity, no. This is emergent. The localism of our time is networked powerfully" (2014)

This can be contested, arguing that scattering phenomena (due to a globalized economy) enervate communities. True, people are networked powerfully but they are also, physically dispersed. What is clear is that our world is undergoing a massive “schöpferische zerstörung”, a “creative destruction” (interesting the analysis of Joseph Schumpeter in “German Kapitalismus, Sozialismus und Demokratie”, 1942) where new forms of economy, create new forms of humanity. In this global maelstrom, we are all nomads, facing otherness, alone. After having contemplated upon the destruction of Rome, Saint Agustin of Hippo said that Christians wander as “on pilgrimage trough time and space looking for the Kingdom of Eternity” (Paul du Gay,1996:20). Like pilgrims we move, through adversities, searching for a promised land. We face the same desperation of Gonzalo when he yelling at the tempest (of life): “I now would give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of barren ground, long heath, brown furze, anything.” (William Shakespeare, The tempest, 1:2). When pilgrimage is a necessity, the safety of a warm house becomes a dream. In a post-national globalized context what it is important, is not the notion of difference (per se), but what binds people. Indeed, particularly since the 1990s, the very prominence of the debates on diversity, on socio-political inclusion and has become a symptom of this general crisis of community, and a grantor to our contemporary impasse. In the absence of a clear consensus about what constitutes a national community, a common identity, in the current era of economic globalization and transnational migration, it was foreseeable that the cause of this general angst seemed to be immigration. It became a symbol of the severance of communities (and their cultural localisms), the crippling of historically sanctioned identities, the fraying of the sense of belonging, the promotion of unacceptable change. To undermine the importance of these tendencies is socially harmful and both analytically inept and intellectually dishonest. It stokes the politics of fear on which governments have grounded a catchall anti-immigrant and antiterrorist legislation. “There's a big degree of illiteracy and functional illiteracy” (Noam Chomsky, 1999:386) in our nations and this dysfunctional core
is helped by embedded media that promote conventional thinking and state propaganda. For the American sociologists Charles Taylor and John Dewy intellectuals are “ideological managers,” the “more intelligent members of the community” (1994:202) complicit in controlling the organized flow of information. This cannot only erode civil liberties but can also undermine the very democratic values that our countries vaunt. Any given social or legal boundary should be porous. Porosity is endlessly variable and adjustable. Controls would become the exception rather than the rule, and would stand in need of stringent justification and so become subject to international standards of fairness, justice, and legality.

“We ought to come as close as the true poets do to the yet hidden human possibilities; and for that reason we need to pierce the walls of the obvious and self-evident, of that prevailing ideological fashion of the day whose commonality is taken for the proof of its sense. Demolishing such walls is as much the sociologist’s as the poet’s calling, and for the same reason: the walling-up of possibilities belies human potential while obstructing the disclosure of its bluff” (Zygmunt Baumann, 2013:259).

Multiculturalism advocates understanding of social diversity. The notion of multiculturalism (and the consequential openness) refers to a specific political ideology in which the state should not set a leitkultur. Harald Kleinschmidt (1996, “Migration and the making of transnational places”) thinks that we should unpack the nation-state itself: he indicated the political view of Yasmin Soysal (1994), who has argued for a de-territorialized personhood (against the jus soli) as jurisdictional condition for the apportionment of citizenship rights rather than nationality. This is a call for a post national model of citizenship that “confers upon every person the right and duty of participation in the authority structures and public life of a polity, regardless of their historical or cultural ties to that community.” (Guadalupe, 2010:20). This is a cosmopolitan ideal of citizenship, which captures Robert Fine’s principle that human beings can belong anywhere (2010) This is to look towards an idea of membership of the Marshall McLuhan’ global village, a borderless global community, such that to be a free and equal member of that global community, to be an equally powerful participant within it, is deeply connected with one’s freedom of mobility throughout it.

“I take it that one of the great projects of twenty-first-century political thought is to develop new models of transnational and global political order that can provide not only effective security and welfare provision for citizens, but that can also become the object of people’s reasoned loyalty; to construct, in other words, new forms of transnational democracy” (Duncan Ivison, 2008:212).
Removing the notions of race or ethnicity does not mean that the cultural construction of specific groups of human beings need to be undermined and lost. It should only encourage seeing all people as multi-faceted social actors. Wayne Baker highlighted in his work “The Humanities in the Western Tradition” (2002) that the concept of hybridity has proved useful in highlighting cultural mixing and the emergence of new forms of identity.

CONCLUSION: IDENTITY, A DISCURSIVE RIDDLE

Identity is an elusive concept, often misunderstood or politicized. Understanding the complexities of the notion requires insights from various academic disciplines. By consequence, debates on identity and alterity faced an increasingly proliferation in major anthropological, sociological and linguistic works. The interdisciplinary nature of the subject has produced spin-off movements that share the same theoretical dilemma on how to determine its (liquid and multi faced) nature. Identity is volatile; it changes with the shift of the social arena and audience, hence its fluidity, poiesis of new selves. It is analytically wrong to accuse modernity (or post modernity) to have disembodied our identities, they were born as problem, a discursive one. There is also strictly connection between politics and language that goes through propaganda, literature and embedded journalism. Its categories create the ground of national ideologies bypassing the institutional levels of government, hierarchy and bureaucracy, it intersects at on emotion-laden nodes as part of our social being. Our Identities can inhabit a multiplicity of worlds, creating new social lexicons. The Αγορά (Agora /Social Space) is properly the space of significance by which identities and selves are able to orient and re-create themselves through symbolic interactionism. Alexander Ferrari Di Pippo (2002) wrote that,

“The look is not grounded in the form but the form, the morphe, is grounded in the look. This founding relationship can be explained only by the fact that the two determinations for thingness, the look and the form of a thing, are not understood in antiquity primarily in the order of perception of something”. (2002:65)

The renewed interest of the 90s on it was caused by dangerous centrifugal forces of ethno-nationalism and xenophobia and by their growing political power. Political turmoil and socio-economic conflicts, due to large immigration fluxes, triggered and boosts conflicts inter ethnos (clashing civilizations), fueling fissiparous tendencies. The liquidity implicit in the notion of Identity and its social discursive (self-processing is mostly granted by language) core, makes it unstable (it is a process) and for that, “under siege” when confronting otherness. A logic based on a presumptuous cultural superiority always heralds dangers and sufferance. Human
history is encroached with hideous facts; from racial segregation in North America (beginning-1964) to the Armenian (systematic and premeditated) genocide (1915, Հայ ոց ց եղասպանու թյ ու ն in Armenian) in Turkey. Sadly, the onslaught of Armenian people (1.5 million people died as highlighted by Robert Fisk in his article “Living proof of the Armenian genocide”, 2011) and their consequently diaspora wanted by the Ottoman Turks, is not worldwide recognized. It was the direct precursor of the Jewish Holocaust, a horrific event but its “butchery, mass rape and child killing” (Robert Fisk, “Armenian genocide: To continue to deny the truth of this mass human cruelty is close to a criminal lie”, The independent, 20/04/2015) are still denied by USA and many other NATO countries. It is important to remember that the substantive “genocide” (a methodic extermination of a social group) was invented in 1943 by Polish lawyer and journalist Raphael Lemkin (“Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation”) who witnessed the extermination and described Turkish rivers as blood tinged. A genocide aimed to remove unwelcome people (and their traditions) and to lay down the ground of a mono-ethnic Turkey; a crime against humanity as noted by Richard Hovannisian in "Remembrance and Denial: The Case of the Armenian Genocide".

Asian countries are also guilty of having perpetrated the same racist policies; it is emblematic the destruction of Tibetan culture carried out by the Chinese government (1950-ongoing) with its sub-sequential historical revisionism (it is remarkable the research of Warren Smith, 2009) and the sexual slavery of Korean women (often underage) organized by the Japanese imperial army (1932-1945) as described by Keith Howard in his poignant “Korean Council for Women Drafted for Military Sexual Slavery by Japan” (1996). Intolerance has to be won if we want to co-exist peacefully and henceforth, we need to promote understanding of different cultural loci and reciprocal tolerance. Identities are invented epistemic construction, they are built on discursive practices, thereof no hidden purity can be discovered within. Being based on a cultural dynamism (the “self” implies a process more than a status), they are always “under siege” by otherness but this is not caused by modernity or social contamination; malleability, permeability and changeability are topoi rooted in the notion itself of identity. As an anthropologist and traveler, I see diversity as the most prominent structural element of our multi-faceted world; working outside my country enriched my knowledge and bettered my life; diversity is a humankind heirloom. Inside the Shakespearian play “Hamlet”, Ophelia, after having lost her father and her beloved prince, realizes that “We know what we are, but not what we may be” (Hamlet, act IV, scene 5). In our globalized liquid world, identities can change, leaving us, like Ophelia, uncertain of the future but unlike her, we must not despair, the horizon brings also possibility.

“[…] All things are bound in closest unison,
Throughout the world, by many a mystic thread.
The flower and love, the breeze and reverie,
Nature and man, and things alive and dead,
Are all akin, and bound in harmony
Throughout the world, by many a mystic thread."
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