PART 1: LITERATURE REVIEW

What does an international musical exchange program hope to achieve in the world? What lives will it touch, what new soundscapes emerge? And what kind of social and cultural impacts does MOVE have in the places it operates? Is this a transformative enlarging of civil society actors and capacity-building for underfunded institutions in the global South; or instead a form of neocolonial voluntourism[6]? What does a decolonized international musical exchange look like in practice? This literature review offers one view[7] on what MOVE hopes to achieve and highlights relevant aspects of the broader context in which it seeks to make meaningful and sustainable change.

MOVE partners know their local contexts best, but it is worth stating a couple of comparative points of analysis to understand how core MOVE objectives relate to national contexts, and to the broader possibilities of civil society engagement. These contexts illustrate why MOVE does what it does, and also explain its focus. Taking the most recent Mo Ibrahim Foundation analysis of relative scores on *Participation, Rights and Inclusion* as a key aspect of governance in Africa,[8] Malawi ranks 24th out of 54 African countries, Mozambique does better, ranking 18th. Significantly, both countries are on a downward trend with regard to improving these areas of life, Malawi down by -7.1 since 2010 and Mozambique -5.1. In Brazil the situation is troubling: the country's gender gap ranks it 22nd out of 25 regional countries (Sader 2020), and recent years have seen an erosion of earlier social gains (UN Women 2021), exemplified by the murder of the black and LGBTQ+ activist politician Marielle Franco in 2018.[9] Meanwhile, Norway continues to sit at, or near, the top of all global indices that evaluate citizenship, gender rights, civic participation and so on. The objectives that define MOVE in-country, with their particular focus on achieving gender equality, therefore seem aligned with a genuine need for more work on gender, inclusion, equality and participation. Comparative data like that provided by the IIAG (Ibrahim Index of African Governance) and UN Women show that social gains are too often short-lived.[10] Projects need to constantly adapt to support these broad policy goals.

Understanding the broad scope of the areas of life MOVE touches upon, and what MOVE represents to its participants (both individuals and institutions), requires a literature that encompasses development studies, ethnomusicology, community music, international relations and more. And it also deserves a literature that – where possible – looks beyond the often-canonical Western authors. This is to take seriously Walter Mignolo's call for scholars to be part of an 'epistemic reconstitution' of the world; not just to challenge the status quo and change the ways it works, but to *think it* differently. Thinking of Brazil's own internal decolonization, the anthropologist Marcio Goldman's provocative article cautions against reductivism, asking us to

> "think of the Afro-indigenous relationship in a way that does not reduce it to a simple reaction to white domination, nor to a mere opposition between two identities - it does not matter if they are taken as "primary" or as constituted by "contrast". On the contrary, it is about thinking this relationship from the immanent alterities that each collective contains and that must be related to the immanent alterities of other collectives, tracing spaces of intersection in which the so-called interethnic relations are not reducible to

reciprocal ignorance or open violence, and neither to homogenizing fusion.' (Goldman 2015; author's translation)

And to be clear, a literature review that was a genuine 'epistemic reconstitution' would not even be on the page; similarly, academic approaches to music education may 'always [be] insufficient with regards to indigenous epistemes, cultures and wisdom' (Kallio 2020: 187). For the academic as much as the practitioner, working decolonially means remembering that,

> 'Interventions from elsewhere, whether from national or international agencies, ethnomusicologists, or community music makers, however well meant, without care risk appearing as ideologies foisted upon communities, rather than as musical behaviors that have been nurtured from within.' (Cottrell & Impey 2015)

But, as Alexis Anja Kallio describes regarding her work with Sámi communities, methodological responsibility also requires engaging even when huge inequalities are evident.

This literature review uses three theoretical lenses to try and bring together this diverse literature and to better understand how MOVE is positioned *within broader understandings of intercultural exchange, development and community music.* What follows is organized in sections, briefly exploring how each of these lenses help highlight what the MOVE project claims to be achieving, and will hopefully help practitioners and participants think a little differently about their work. The three lenses are 'transcultural capital' (TC), cultural hospitality (CH) and embodied participation (EP). Taken together they encapsulate how musicians and producers operate with success internationally, how social and institutional practices help them achieve that, and finally, what a successful exchange program feels like. Other ideas – like cosmopolitanism, charismatic versus careful cultural relations – run through these sections, aiming to situate MOVE both ideologically, and also within the international world of development assistance/cooperation.

This macro level is significant, because culture in general has become increasingly visible within discourses on cultural relations, and international donor programs, extending from heritage to music and hosting mega-events like the European Cities of Culture Program (now copied in Asia, Latin America and Africa). Where previously economic and labor-market approaches have failed, culture is the 'magic sauce' that will strengthen civil society and catalyze renewal. It is a heavy expectation with a limited amount of evidence to back it up (see: Nermond, Lee and O'Brien (2021). So, the bigger question is, can a project like MOVE – grown from the altogether rather more socially-focused, and arguably less geopolitically compromised, objectives of NOREC – sidestep these expectations and deliver meaningful and sustainable change?

Lens 1: Transcultural Capital

This lens helps understand what makes international artists and partners (and indeed development sector staff) successful. Originally used by Ulrike Meinhof and Anna Triandafyllidou (2006) to describe how migrants use knowledge, skills and networks to adapt to their new contexts, transcultural capital

'emphasizes the fact that such networks, ties and indeed transnational/transcultural skills that immigrants acquire become a form of social and cultural capital for them. […] it emphasizes the social and cultural skills that become part of one's way of life rather than the accrued transnational human capital useful for doing business.' (Triandafyllidou 2008)

Derived from research on migrant Malagasy musicians in Europe, they show how cultural cosmopolitanism[11] and an ability to leverage ethnic identity to their advantage enables musicians and artists to build their careers, 'for many artists the strategic potential of their transcultural capital emerged as an ability to play the ethnic-diasporic and the cosmopolitan card at the same time' (Glick-Schiller & Meinhof 2011: 30). For the musicians Meinhof worked with, they saw their own use of transcultural capital 'as both a creative necessity *and* a limitation, a nostalgic identification *and* a strategic tool for surviving as a professional musician' (ibid.; emphasis in original).

It is worth emphasizing that transcultural capital can be equally useful for the migrant musician returning home: Chalcraft & Hikiji (2019) describe how the Mozambican singer Lenna Bahule both developed and then leveraged her Mozambican transcultural capital when she worked in Brazil, to then deploy her international and Brazilian transcultural capital to launch new projects back in Maputo. Similarly, this kind of capital – which can be considered both a sensibility as well as a skill-set, or even a repertoire as much as marketing strategy – is developed and deployed by all participants in a project like MOVE. A Norwegian in Malawi may leverage their relative exoticism in the teaching they offer, a program director uses transcultural capital both to market their offer to local participants (in Projeto Guri or Music Crossroads), as well as for international volunteers, and indeed transcultural capital helps secure other collaborations and funding outside of MOVE or the JMI family.

Transcultural capital works through, and takes advantage of, cultural difference. Significantly, in recent years the MOVE project has increasingly framed its objectives around *interculturality,* and it is worth reflecting on how this concept relates to earlier terms that were used to manage cultural difference through policy and cultural work from heritage to music education.

Interculturalism is a concept that has increasingly displaced multiculturalism within policy circles and indeed within the development sector. Multiculturalism was seen to have failed as a policy, often reinforcing group boundaries and fueling an identity politics that ate away at broader solidarities, catalyzing ethno-nationalist movements (Cantle 2008). What is significant in these critiques is how cultural forms – like music, food and dress – had been coopted by advocates of multiculturalism, but were often little more than window-dressing, failing to address the deeper systemic inequalities that foster racism and prejudice within societies (Kymlika 2010).

Instead, for scholars like Zapata-Barrero (2017), whilst as a policy agenda multiculturalism was previously useful in establishing ideas of 'equality, power sharing and inclusion', it simply can no longer describe the 'super-diversity' of most contemporary social realities. Consequently, the value of *interculturalism* is how it is 'aimed at fostering communication and relationships among people from different backgrounds'; interculturalism is different because rather than emphasizing the importance of recognizing rights, it sees contact and dialogue between groups as essential to fostering mutual understanding (Zapata-Barrero 2017: 7).

Given the expectations of community musicians as having potential to facilitate socially-engaged and transformative musical encounters, there are obvious parallels with how interculturalism as an idea reflects the working methods of CM practitioners. As *interculturalism* has displaced multiculturalism as an anti-discrimination policy paradigm, it advocates for a 'diversity-based common public culture' (ibid.: 13). This helps locate an international music exchange program like MOVE as one of the agents of such a public culture at the international level.

Interculturalism is enacted and strengthened by individual musicians, educators and program directors through the ways they develop and deploy their own transcultural capital. More than this, transcultural capital provides an opportunity to actually evaluate the benefit of these intercultural exchanges: not so much on artistic content, but whether the international volunteers (and indeed JM Norway as coordinating partner) help local paid staff members as well as local musicians and community organizations (in-country civil society) to develop their own transcultural capital.

Lens 2: Embodied Participation

This literature review assumes, but does not criticize, a fundamental aspect underlying the MOVE program: music and music-making activities[12] have a positive impact on individual wellbeing, and this radiates out to the communities involved. For, as Tia DeNora (1999) argued, personal music consumption can be an important – often crucial – part of individual social agency, an 'aesthetic reflexive activity of social creation and maintenance' (1999: 32).

Cultural activities are seen to have particular value in places of protracted conflict; in her ethnographic description of music-making and peacebuilding in Israel and Palestine, Shoshana Gottesman (2017: 13-15) details how successful projects need to create dialogical spaces that explore vulnerability and allow for mutual witnessing, thus creating greater understanding between groups, building new communities. This is important for musicians working towards intercultural peacebuilding and towards reconciliation as part of a decolonizing musical process. Doing so, to respect and often draw attention to the rights of indigenous people, their cultural heritages, and as a way of working with people marginalized or othered (see: Higgins and Willingham, 2017; Howell 2018; Jourdan 2020; Rakena, 2019). As discussed below, these expectations of cultural activities to strengthen civil society, and to rebuild communities who have been traumatized by violence, institutional racism and neglect, are based on cosmopolitan ideals. Whilst also for those working through music education (including community music) this as an opening to challeng[e] educational institutions […] to re-evaluate their curricula and pedagogical approaches (Miettinen, Westerlund and Gluschankof 2020: 177) and comes as a responsibility to critique, regarding whose voices are raised, how and why through '[p]articipation in shared learning [that] has the potential to work towards emancipation and empowerment' (Bartleet and Higgins 2018: 11).

Music education, like others types of arts education, frequently use the celebrated Brazilian pedagogue Paulo Freire. Freire's work remains a touchstone (see Gottesman 2017), but its popularity in the development world often sees his work watered-down: out goes the

revolutionary potential of his pedagogy in favor of keywords like 'emphasizing dialogue, the affirmation of student experience, and the decentralization of power in the classroom'. As McKenna emphasizes, we do well to remember too that Freire cannot just be reduced to a methodology, his pedagogy was also a radical politics of revolutionary change. He was more interested in *problem posing* rather than *problem solving* (McKenna 2013: 449). Yet, one of the lasting critiques of much development work is its temporal rigidity, a reliance on funding-cycles, the simplistic projectization of complex realities which instead need flexibility in order to improve.[13]

Many describe the potential in creative activities to transform livelihoods and worldviews. The question is perhaps how much the collective experience is also maintained and developed, despite a focus on the self and on individual self-improvement. On the practical level this is about making sure music education, indeed any education, is socially constructive, and socially constitutive for the people and communities it educates, what was originally termed 'culturally responsive teaching' (Pirbhai-Illich *et al.* 2017). Significantly, revisiting the theory she had first laid-out in the 1990s Gloria Ladson-Billings (2014) now prefers 'culturally sustaining pedagogies', and the methods by which this can be achieved are still disputed. Projects that are culturally sustaining within local contexts may need to work on multiple fronts: as Cottrell and Impey (2015) demonstrate in their work in the iSimangaliso Wetlands Park, South Africa, this is to work not just with music itself, but find broader ways to engage locals. For example, activities like 'community archiving' can become part of a process that creates shared knowledge, and a 'heritage' approach helps embed such activities locally (ibid, p. 534).

Whether 'culturally constitutive' or 'culturally sustaining' it is embodied participation that can be central to the success of how community music practitioners – MOVErs – interact with communities. More significantly still, in the context of international exchange this can directly facilitate cosmopolitan consciousness and awareness. For example, in her study of Projeto Guri in the early 2000s, and specifically with young offenders in FEBEM (a juvenile detention center in São Paulo), Rose Satiko Hikiji notes how encountering and interacting with different social classes in an educational context in different spaces expands knowledge of the rest of the world as it also helps to build another sense of the self (Hikiji 2005: 164, 173). Hikiji describes this 'broadening of horizons' (*ampliação de horizontes*) as one of the most important impacts on the lives of Projeto Guri participants from low income and marginalized backgrounds. Significantly, participants also see this in the music itself:

> 'What matters here is to be a musician, not a rock player or a samba player. To be a musician, you have to learn everything. What is important is technique. Repertoire doesn't matter. Breathing matters.' (Hikiji 2005, p.160, author's translation)

In this way – socially, spatially, bodily, musically – MOVE projects that maximize their community interaction,[14] perhaps unconsciously demonstrate the cosmopolitan imaginary in action. And they do so through embodied face-to-face experiences. This *experiential* side to MOVE is a unique feature of the program, given the long-duration of the volunteer experience.

Lens 3: Cultural Hospitality

If transcultural capital enables MOVErs to operate between countries and to grow and develop their leadership skills, what conditions are needed in society at large, and in cultural institutions to help internationally-minded musicians and arts professionals achieve their goals? Is there a common worldview that links them together? Crucial to realizing the potential of projects like MOVE are a set of universalist assumptions about culture, the most foundational being cosmopolitanism. The idea is often seen to have its roots in Immanuel Kant's reworking of the ancient Greek Stoics, and critics of cosmopolitanism often see it as Eurocentric, based in the contradictory promises of the European Enlightenment.

When MOVE describes its goals as to 'Increase international and intercultural competence in Norwegian life' (JM Norway, Report 2018 - 2019), or 'Provide youth with opportunities to increase intercultural learning' (MC Mozambique, Report 2018 - 2019), beneath keywords like interculturalism lie foundational ideas about global consciousness and the value of cultural exchange. In other words, cosmopolitanism. Particularly, a kind of cosmopolitanism where cultural work is always a social good. Indeed, cosmopolitanism appears to be part of an inherited and often unconscious worldview that inspires western/northern NGOs and their workers to initiate programs, and to train for work in the field. As Barbara Heron describes in her revealing critique of her own experience as a white, middle class female Canadian development worker:

> 'In our decisions to go overseas can be read the themes of morality, planetary consciousness, and a sense of entitlement and obligation to intervene elsewhere.' (Heron 2007, p. 22)

That mixture of a global imagination and entitlement describes a cosmopolitan consciousness, but one that depends on a western worldview that often takes its own superiority as implicit, translating this into a moral duty to intervene. However, for those who might argue that this Eurocentrism is typical of cosmopolitanism, it is worth remembering cosmopolitanism has other historical roots, and also other iconic and often radically anti-colonial exponents, from Jamal al-Din al-Afghani, to Rabindranath Tagore and the Martinican scholar and psychiatrist Franz Fanon (Inglis 2019, p. 44). In other words, a cosmopolitanism ethos is not *de facto* synonymous with a colonialist and Eurocentric one.
,
Ethnomusicologist Steven Feld's exploration of 'jazz cosmopolitanism' in Accra offers a nuanced perspective on how 'vernacular' (Werbner) and 'discrepant' (Clifford) cosmopolitanisms describe cultural exchange. In all these varieties, it is worth trying to identify where people speak from, (Mignolo's 'point of annunciation'),

> 'Are we talking about non-elite forms of travel and trade in a postcolonial world, as in the case of the Senegalese Mourides … or of non-European but nevertheless high cultures produced and consumed by non-Western elites, such as those of the Sanskritic, Urdu, Persian or Ottoman worlds? … [And] how are we to place minority elites in new postcolonial nations who struggle to defend their vernacular cultures, and seek justice through multicultural citizenship ...[?]' (Werbner; cited in Feld 2012, p. 230)

Cosmopolitanism therefore needs to be seen as plural, with cosmopolitanisms therefore culturally circumscribed, contingent, with power not always running down a global North-South axis. And as a further reminder that cultural appropriation may not be a simple zero-sum game of the West 'consuming' the Rest for its own benefit, let's believe the Brazilian singer-songwriter Caetano Veloso when he defended his music against accusations of Tropicalistas suffering Western cultural imperialism by simply apeing foreign models. Re-using the Brazilian idea of *cultural cannibalism* (Oswalde de Andrade 1940), Veloso argued that, no, '*we* are eating the Beatles and Jimi Hendrix' (Jáuregui 2008, p. 546, cited in Burke 2009, p. 39; emphasis added). If Veloso was right, then cultural cosmopolitanism, hybridity, do not necessarily have to be abandoned in favor of a purist 'decolonializing': rather the inequalities of each context need to be carefully worked on. For example, how should musical forms born of racialized labor exploitation be handled: as heritage, or products of socio-economic aggression? As shown in Carvalho's analysis of Mozambican Makwayela, derived from the labor-migration experiences of generations of Mozambicans working in South Africa's mines and the decolonial struggle, but also the unique social context of Maputo, and FRELIMO's[15] 1978 National Festival of Popular Dance, a musical form can appear quite extraordinarily contradictory and yet be unifying: African and foreign, modern and traditional, rural and urban. Thus, Makwayela,

> 'was to play an important role in the expression and articulation of national identity. Makwayela evidenced incorporative properties that allowed its use as a syncretic ideological tool. … both Makwayela and Mozambique were modern, African (but not exclusively), communal and proletarian.' (Carvalho 1999, p. 179)

Given such complexity, finding pedagogical solutions for 'decolonizing' is problematic. As Figueria notes,

> 'How can curriculum designers and instructors be inclusive of difference in a way that actively disrupts its commodification at the axis of neo-colonial political and economic relations, both of which unavoidably inform student (and instructor) worldviews …[?].' (Figueroa 2020, p. 42)

As he advises, achieving decolonialized pedagogies is as hard (if not impossible) a task as decolonizing academia itself, but this is still not a reason to give up trying.

Cosmopolitanism is not however a radical program for change like that advocated by Paulo Freire. Is this a problem? Can cosmopolitan ideals and imaginaries be compatible with approaches to international music exchange that seek to decolonize their activities? Or is this yet another example of the expectations heaped on culture to catalyze social change?

Decolonialism has gained further visibility in mainstream politics in the West, following the revitalized interest created by the Black Lives Matter movement. Yet academic interest in decolonizing extends back at least 50 years (anthropology likes to think it began its critical self-reflection in the 1970s onwards), and has had a varied impact across disciplines. Whilst 'decoloniality' was initially developed by the Peruvian sociologist Anìbal Quijano, many scholars borrow Walter Mignolo to understand what decoloniality means in practice:

'"delinking" (detaching) from the overarching structures of (Western) knowledge in order to engage in an 'epistemic reconstitution'. Reconstitution of what? Of ways of thinking, languages, ways of life and being in the world that the rhetoric of modernity disavowed and the logic of coloniality implement. The failure of decolonization during the Cold War was due, mainly, to the fact that the decolonization did not question the terms of the conversation, that is, did not question the structures of knowledge and subject formation (desires, beliefs, expectations) that were implanted in the colonies by the former colonizers.' (Mignolo 2017, p.7)

Significantly, such an 'epistemic reconstitution' bears heavily on one of the key components of international music exchange programs: education. For, as the Kenyan author Ngugi wa Thiong'o observed, 'At the center of epistemic freedom is demythologizing of both the idea of Europe as a teacher of the world and the idea of Africa as a pupil' (cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2018: 6). For a number of African scholars and philosophers (e.g. Achille Mbembe, Oyèrónkẹ́ Oyěwùmí, Dani W. Nabudere, and Ali A. Masrui), education has long been part of the persistent problem of coloniality:

> '[The] Berlin conference of 1884 was effected through the sword and the bullet. But the night of the sword and the bullet was followed by the morning of the chalk and the blackboard.' (wa Thiong'o 1986, p. 9)

Music educators have been looking for ways to decolonize their own practice. Might using (once radical, now *de rigeur*) pedagogies like Paulo Freire's be enough to decolonize music education in development? Or is the need for 'epistemic reconstitution' greater, so that the programs themselves are conceptualized and programed by participants from Southern countries? How might we describe and envision a decolonized MOVE program?

Decoloniality has its critics, not least because it is at times difficult to define what it is (e.g. is decoloniality a decolonializing decolonialism?), and because the breadth of Mignolo and Walsh's thinking flattens historical detail, and oversimplifies without really detailing how different decolonial ontologies work (Davies 2021). It is also very much focused on the individual; self-transformation will be the solution:

> 'The battlefield for overcoming racism and sexism is, then, at the level of the enunciation […] Liberation is through thinking and being otherwise. Liberation is not something to be attained; it is a process of letting something go, namely, the flows of energy that keep you attached to the colonial matrix of power, whether you are in the camp of those who sanction or the camp of those sanctioned.' (Mignolo & Walsh 2017, p. 148; cited in Davies 2021, p. 401)

This ambiguous and somewhat idealized description does not offer meaningful steps to making decoloniality work; rather, considering MOVE's implicit cosmopolitan ethos, it is useful to imagine what decolonizing through cosmopolitanism looks like. And here another theoretical lens can help flesh-out what decolonial approaches might look like.

'Cultural hospitality': here we encounter and contrast two uses of 'cultural hospitality', a term used differently on either side of the Atlantic. The first comes from the Director of the ICCM,

Professor Lee Higgins, the second from the Congolese/ São Tomense musician, Yannick Delass, someone this author has worked with in São Paulo.

Significantly, it was hospitality that was at the root of Kant's cosmopolitan vision, he wished that states 'would respect the law of "universal hospitality"' (Inglis 2019, p. 46). Hospitality has the advantage of being a human disposition that we can imagine and envisage, rather than a theoretical maze few are able to understand. Lee Higgins (2012) uses *hospitality* as a way to describe how community musicians work. Through employing the use of the term 'intervention' as a way of working with groups of people often framed as 'participants', the lens of hospitality offers a way of think about how socially motivated musical goals interact with the people and places that musicians encounter. Beyond this, in keeping with earlier notions of Christopher Small's 'musicking' (1997), hospitality can also be a way to think about the how musical participation represents people's musical heritages and the perspectives that influence how this is understood. Broadly however, hospitality can be a way of framing, music making that is flexible, open-ended, and welcoming of cultural diversity. It is the *unconditional* intentions of this hospitality that the Higgins' theoretical ideas have resonance:

> 'Hospitality begins with the welcome. […] It is an ethical action toward a relationship to another person. This type of hospitality suggests unconditionality, a welcome without previous calculation.' (Higgins 2012, p. 108)

In this way *hospitality* leaves space for new ways of belonging, and it fosters a community in-the-making. The educator/organizer is the agent of this hospitality, and thus the architect of shared experiences and – ideally – greater social cohesion. However, Higgins brings these possibilities to us with a warning, suggesting that the musician has a responsibility to 'question and challenge dominant forms of practice' (2012, p. 6). For Yannick Delass, the broader political and institutional context and capacities are part of what enables, or constrains, cultural flourishing:

> 'When you talk about hospitality from a people, it's one thing. When you talk about hospitality from a country, it's another thing. […] when we say that there is no cultural hospitality, this does not exist. Public institutions, the laws, are not prepared to welcome the music of other nations. Any proposal to promote culture that does not have [the possibility of registering with] the RNE [National Registry of Foreigners] means that it ignores immigrants.' (Chalcraft & Hikiji 2020)

Here, the agents are the local community, the ecosystem of arts and performance spaces, and the possibilities (or otherwise) for institutional support that goes beyond the tokenistic. Delass emphasizes that cultural hospitality in Brazil is dichotomized, the general population versus cultural institutions. In his view, those you live among offer cultural hospitality, not just sharing a drink, but a musical curiosity and desire to share music-making activities. By contrast, the cultural institutions of Brazil are either closed, impossible to access for an African musician, or simply pigeonhole and stereotype the incoming artist. Unable to be considered as a singer-songwriter, he found himself time and again performing a role that Brazilian society had written for him: the kind where (well-meaning) cultural institutions invited him to perform, but *only* as a representative of a traditional 'Africa', or as someone linked to the refugee movement. Delass's distinction places the responsibility for continuing racism on cultural institutions, they are both gatekeepers and 'tastemakers'. Within the context of MOVE, cultural

hospitality is both useful as a working methodology for the intercultural process, but also as a tool to identify problems within the cultural infrastructures that may reproduce unhelpful cultural distinctions.

Significantly, looked at through the lens of social mobility, rather than the integration of migrant artists, the situation is not dissimilar for low income socially marginalized Brazilians. For anthropologists like Derek Pardue, reflecting on his work with Brazilian hip hop educators in the late 1990s and early 2000s – this has much to do with the persistent paternalism of the Brazilian state. Despite the years when Paulo Freire was actually Secretary of Education for the São Paolo metropolitan area (from 1989) and the administration's Secretary of Culture pushed forward with a democratizing project of *Cidadania Cultural*, 'cultural citizenship', the underlying relationship between the state and poor artists from Brazil's peripheries remained paternalistic (Pardue 2004, p. 414). Why? Because the state (or city administration in this case) has remained the primary funder of public culture, its processes discouraging broader group formation: working with culture in this way compromises broader social change (ibid, p. 415). And so, it has proved in Brazil in recent years.

Delass's cultural hospitality offers a way of evaluating the differences between societal and institutional openness. But there is something else: the kind of cultural hospitality desired by Delass (open doors, but also open stages without expectations of ethnic performance) is a kind of social capital that might enable 'human flourishing'. However, a key concern for those working through intercultural music projects must also be how *sustainable* this social capital is (Jones & Langston 2012, p. 133). International programs like MOVE offer an opportunity to test the hospitality of in-country cultural institutions, not least by leveraging the transcultural capital of the project itself to encourage authorities to participate.

Development, Cultural Relations, or something inbetween?

How can we place international donor programs aimed at promoting community music and developing the careers and international networks of young musicians and producers? Should we give JM Norway (as with the Scandinavian donors generally), the benefit of the doubt?

MOVE is of course a form of development. However, as a form of *cultural relations* MOVE can be judged differently. For example, for Sustenidos, MOVE has enabled and expanded their existing objectives of internationalizing their regionally/nationally successful program of Projeto Guri; meanwhile for MC Malawi, close and highly supportive links with the Norwegian Embassy show a kind of co-opting by in-country national representatives at the highest level. This *exchange* element is significant. It is something that can be described as a 'charismatic' form of cultural diplomacy. To be contrasted with 'careful' forms of cultural diplomacy: subtle programs that are more interested in actually assisting on the ground than displaying their good work on the international stage (Chalcraft 2020). MOVE amalgamates both: a carefully managed charismatic form of cultural relations.

Over the last two decades, scholars (and some practitioners) have cast an increasingly critical eye over what international volunteer programs achieve. For many voluntourists - especially those from the Anglosphere - take part in short exchanges where the costs of hosting far outweigh the benefits, and indeed, in some cases, where young (relatively) untrained Westerners work with vulnerable people/communities in the global South, they actively

damage those communities,[16] and also the possibilities of what a conscientious global consciousness might offer.

Critiques of voluntourism have entered the mainstream, most famously when in 2012 the novelist Teju Cole made a series of cutting tweets. These became part of an international media sensation surrounding how the West thinks about the African continent and its role. One in particular encapsulates perfectly what the worst parts of voluntourism represent for many in those communities who are the recipients of development-money largesse:

> 'The White Savior Industrial Complex is not about justice. It is about having a big emotional experience that validates privilege' (Cole 2012)

There are various aspects to voluntourism and international volunteering that could be emphasized here, but generally critics whose focus is on how to create more equitable exchange relationships identify how there is a need for greater 'solidarity, mutual accountability and reciprocity' (e.g. Mati & Perold 2020, p.110). For programs like MOVE where volunteers from the global North do often bring skills that they share, one could also ask whether their *transcultural capital* is something that locals working in the sector (either directly for local MOVE organizations, or for affiliated organizations, community groups, etc.) develop and expand thanks to the presence of the program. Furthermore, when such programs contain significant South-South exchange, does the transcultural capital that develops enable different opportunities as much as it might represent a decolonisation of existing hierarchies?

Place & Local Views Matter

MOVE takes place across multiple localities, and has expanded from its original southern African-Norway axis to include Brazil. The question is does place matter? The geographies of living, practice, performance, and of the exchanges themselves are significant.

For many students in poor peripheries and with limited socio-economic resources, accessing cultural spaces (and cultural programs) remains of huge symbolic significance. An excellent example of this can be seen in the Brazilian hip-hop artist Emicida's 2020 Netflix documentary *AmarElo*: part of the documentary emphasizes the significance of his performance within the Teatro Municipal, a bastion of white cultural privilege in São Paolo, it marked a watershed for contemporary black music in Brazil. The politics of the Right to the City matters for the organizations that host the MOVE program in the global South. MOVE inserts itself into this as a protagonist: it internationalizes and reconfigures how music is practiced in particular social contexts, with impacts on local and international scales.

Each of the partner countries carries a potent mix of stereotypes, but in the more musical versions of these stereotypes – stereotypes levered by MOVE in its programs, deployed even by participants as part of their transcultural capital – what is ignored? What of the often-complicated relationships between music and place, for example where music is seen not as a solution to social problems but is linked to criminality and deviance? In his work in the Rio favela of Maré, Brazilian ethnomusicologist Samuel Araujo (2006) asks the tricky questions of Brazilian funk and how it is classified vis-a-vis others musics. If MOVE is aiming to improve

the lives and music career possibilities of its alumni, how does it engage with music like funk, not just as a soundtrack to favela life, or a eulogy to drug gangs, but as a form of social improvement? Music education seems to ignore forms like funk, or to co-opt them, as with Pardue's hip hop artists in Sao Paulo in the 2000s, working within state programs, or in Mozambican Makwayela in the 1970s.

A question remains then as to whether we misjudge or underestimate place and context. For example, following Araujo's work in Maré, understanding Brazil means recognizing how a society *actually* works. That is, ignore the rhetoric about intercultural exchange, ignore the ideals about a strengthened civil society solving all of a country's ills, and examine how a particular context works in reality, and for the most marginalized in society. In the case of Brazil, according to Araujo, Brazilian society operates through violence - the structural violence of racism, the lived realities of Brazil's poor - and so it is violence itself that *constitutes* society. The apparent counterpoint to this violence-constitutes-society model, is the kind of cosmopolitan world order explicit in Immanuel Kant's treatise, and implicit in the MOVE project's goals of promoting social cohesion, peace and social progress through its activities. But from *local* perspectives, it may not always be clear whether such well-meaning NGO projects properly serve local needs, or that they may even reinforce a lack of agency local communities have in how resources are spent. For the community Araujo works with, locals wonder why government money goes to NGOs and not directly to their schools, to their clinics and community centers (Araujo 2006). The reality for the inhabitants of Maré is that they recognize that all the (publicly-funded and promoted) cultural activities in their neighborhood are explicitly designed to stop them pursuing a living in the drugs trade, a risky business, but one that brings its own agency. Consequently, cultural work in places like Maré can work against the logic that actually determines how people live and survive in these spaces.

This implies something quite profound. If transcultural capital is something that MOVE creates, nurtures and enables in its participants and partners, there is a broader ontological (worldview) issue. Where musical traditions (ethnic, national or regional) are leveraged as part of transcultural capital, what is the impact of institutional practices on how indigenous musical know-how is actually recognized, fostered and empowered? How does this become more than the commoditization of Other musics? For example, we know international music education techniques reflect a Western ontology: how much of a problem might this be? Is the cosmopolitan expectation of development work simply irrelevant to the realities of how musicians operate in social contexts like Brazil's, where systemic racism still excludes the socially marginalized from viable musical careers? This has sometimes even been a criticism of Projeto Guri's work, a program that has been amazingly successful; from 180 students when it began in 1995 to hundreds of thousands, Guri has enabled tens of thousands to *participate* in community music, but has not aimed to create professional musicians. At the age of 18,[17] participants are out of the program and only a very few of those large numbers will benefit from further involvement with the project (Hikiji 2005).

CONCLUSION

As an international musical exchange program, MOVE seeks to empower young musicians and producers, improving the 'intercultural competencies' of all involved. It does so through leveraging embedded and implicit ideas around cultural cosmopolitanism as something that helps form and constitute more inclusive and outward-looking communities. This review shows

that using cosmopolitan ideas is not without problems: the neocolonial realities of development funded and coordinated from the global North remain complicated, and possibly compromising of some of the project's stated goals.

The review has sketched-out how three theoretical lenses can highlight aspects of the MOVE ethos, and how this relates to the social conditions and geopolitical realities it operates in. MOVE is characterized here as a project that straddles development and cultural relations. In this way it carries some of the ideological baggage of Western development work (a 'moral' sense of duty, with a baked-in sense of Western superiority), but also the cultural cosmopolitanism of cultural relations. It straddles too the dichotomy of international projects that are 'charismatic' or 'careful' (Chalcraft 2020), diligently helping young musicians develop their musical, pedagogical and organizational skills, and but also willing to showcase the results of this on stage.

Thinking about the idea of cultural hospitality, Higgins' emphasis on openness suggests a key challenge for MOVE: is the project too focused on individuals? Critics of influential development theories like Amartya Sen's 'Capability Approach' find that wellbeing is still seen to depend on how *individuals* achieve the things society values, but that southern African ontologies, like *ubuntu* (*uMunthu* in Chewa), instead place value on the *relationships* that develop between individuals (Hoffman & Metz 2017). A Norwegian ethnomusicologist whose study of the dance programs of Music Crossroads Malawi sets out how Western individualism is challenged by such ontologies, and how organizations like MC Malawi, and the teachers within it, practice differently:

> 'The concept of uMunthu is important in Malawian arts education, in redefining how traditional expressions can contribute to the community through supporting education, but also in destabilizing colonizing arts practices and education in a society that has been, and still is, under great colonizing pressure.' (Hovde 2019, p. 115)

In Brazil, state-level paternalism often still favors individual self-improvement, rather than the more structural development of new social change, thus making (publicly-funded) arts participation of limited broader social impact. But in seeming contradiction of this, one of the key benefits of Projeto Guri, which has worked with 100s of thousands of individuals to date, is its emphasis on *collective musicking*: Projeto Guri shows the power of collective participation, but the political and funding landscape does not provide long-term support for turning this collective experience into reducing social marginalization and racialized economic violence. Here then might be a further problem: is there an assumption that meaningful and measurable social change desired at the local level – in Area 23 in Lilongwe, central Maputo, Marilia and São José dos Campos in Brazil, in rural Norway – organically feeds through to the international level? Which spaces are transformed?

Stretching Hess's critique of music education to development work, in order to avoid tokenism in tackling broad social inequalities and massive geopolitical imbalances, we should take seriously the risks of simply reproducing a 'Harmonious, empty pluralism' (Mohanty 2003, p.193; cited in Hess 2015, p. 346), something that echoes Teju Cole's cutting tweets cited earlier about the White Savior Industrial Complex (Cole 2012). Working interculturally, in conditions of global inequality and persistent social and institutional racism, may depend on embracing discomfort, becoming comfortable with working through the discordant. Developing

and deploying transcultural capital will likely be part of how MOVErs make creative use of such discordance, and through embodied participation they may be better able to leverage stereotypes and negotiate ethnic and diasporic identities to create the broader conditions for a nuanced and representative cultural hospitality, one where institutions are as open as communities.

MOVErs and alumni might then recognize themselves not just as musical ambassadors, but as agents of intercultural processes, better prepared to tackle broader social inequalities in their musical work. Not a full-blown decolonization of thought, but a more conscious practice, and a catalyst to a re-tuning of institutions, and policies to better realize the social potential of international music exchange.