Offprint: *Identity Issues and Intercultural Challenges: A European and Global Perspective on Peace in the World*, Selected Essays, Edited by Luigi Moccia, Abdulaziz Saud Al-Babtain Cultural Foundation, Kuwait, 2017, pp. 31-72

Global Citizenship: How to Approach Identity Issues from an Intercultural Point of View

Luigi Moccia

Abstract

The idea of "global citizenship" is not new, but new and challenging are the conditions featuring today's world in which this idea has come again to the fore. Indeed, nation-state citizenship no-longer exhausts the political, legal and social relevance of citizenship, in the face of phenomena such as the development of trade and financial markets, information and communication revolutionary technologies, massive (diasporic) migration flows, in addition to threats and risks for human security all around our globalised world.

Starting with the awareness of the complexity of these phenomena, the essay focuses on the idea and ideal of global citizenship, looking at it as a long standing idea, but remaining quite controversial and contested as ever. Some various notions are highlighted, from past to present times, of what can be called a cosmopolitan idea of citizenship, by exploring the main aspects characterising its revival in today's world, and pointing to a methodological approach which implies and requires a paradigm shift in the understanding of what means to be "global".

This brings about the issue of cultural diversity as the counter-value of the ongoing globalization process. Indeed, globalisation has pushed forward cross-country flows of ideas, knowledge, people, as well as products and services. However, behind an apparent trend to homogenisation of world, counter-effects have also been put into motion, which lead, not without tension and even conflict, to the emergence of new dynamics regarding cultural and ethical values, social norms and lifestyles that affect individual and group identities. Increased mobility coupled in particular with migration flows have brought others very close to us. These "others" no longer live in

some distant place, but right in our own town or neighborhood. It arises from here the challenge of the cultural diversity, within our ever more multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-cultural societies.
In order to deal with this challenge, European experience may offer some good examples on how to manage diversity as a socio-cultural asset that affects both citizenship and education in a double way: a) the education through citizenship, enhancing the socio-educational value of citizenship as daily practice of living together in community; b) the citizenship through education, enhancing the socio-educational value of the intercultural dialogue at the base of an inclusive social dimension of citizenry.
Ultimately, a new concept and practice of citizenship is thus emerging, that goes beyond the closed and exclusionary scheme of citizenship classically understood in terms of nationality (nation-state membership), carrying out the meaning of "global citizenship" as paradigmatic feature of an open and inclusive society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail, in the interest of peace and security.

1. *A premise to start*

I wish to start with a little poem (of mine), which sounds like a doggerel:

Black and white the world ever follows its track
White and black the world never goes back
Global and local the world is always total !

It would, in fact, be like a memory exercise to reflect on three scenarios, each of which evokes difficulties and, at the same time, the possibility of overcoming them. In a word, three main challenges that we have to deal with in today's world.

These challenges can be summarized as follows.

Global Citizenship: Identity Issues from an Intercultural Point of View

One. The world has changed dramatically since the last decade of past century, getting increasingly connected as fragmented, composite as unequal, uniform as conflictual, creating both positive and negative effects with consequent contradictions and uncertainties. Such context, where globalisation is not the end of history, shows instead the need for finding out a way through, that is in between a world from the past and one in the present, namely a midway which is also a way ahead.

Two. This way ahead to be truly such should look forward in the direction of going beyond globalisation, because globalisation in itself is part of the problem, not of the solution.

Three. The way through goes in between past and present: not so much by succession, as when the new day comes and we clearly see its lights because the shadows of the night have faded away; but much more by implication, as a "no-longer/not-yet" situation. In an embryonic and evolutionary state of things that is expected to evolve under appropriate circumstances towards a certain direction rather than remain in an uncertain transition. Therefore this way is not linear, but circular or bidirectional; that is it moves around and does not go directly, in order to achieve its destiny, whatever it might be.

Having in mind this suggestion, properly understood as a reflective attitude, rather than a theoretical approach of any sort, to the issue of connectivity, complexity and conflictuality (of both real or potential conflict) in our contemporary societies worldwide, we can try to afford this very serious matter, starting with some light curiosities, so to say.

A first one. Did you know that there is an International Registry of World Citizens where you may apply and get the Identity Card of World Citizen!?

Out there in the web, somebody advertises the setting up of this Registry, whose main functions are (as stated in the website page[1]):

[1] http://www.recim.org/ cdm/registry.htm.

- the Registration of persons as World Citizens and issuance of Identity Cards of World Citizens;
- the Registration of territories as "World Citizens Territories";
- the Entertainment of the Council of World Citizens Territories;
- the setting global electoral rolls (in connection with the People's Congress).

The Registry of World Citizens is the only organization in the world authorized to distribute identity cards of World Citizens directly to individuals or through its accredited "centers"; and, as a "world civil registration service", is working to establish the “global electorate”.

A second curiosity, may be, of a greater socio-cultural interest is from BBC news. According to a BBC World Service poll (such as reported by Naomi Grimley, 2016): “*People are increasingly identifying themselves as global rather than national citizens*”.

The relevant data are quite impressive. Pollsters GlobeScan questioned more than 20,000 people in 18 countries to ascertain that this trend is particularly marked in “emerging economies”, where people see themselves as outward looking and internationally minded. More than half of those asked (56%) in emerging economies saw themselves first and foremost as global citizens rather than national citizens. In Nigeria (73%), China (71%), Peru (70%) and India (67%) the phenomenon is more widespread.

By way of contrast, however, it must be added that the trend in the industrialized nations seems to be heading in the opposite direction. In these richer nations, the concept of global citizenship appears to have taken a serious hit after the financial crash of 2008. In Germany, for example, only 30% of respondents see themselves as global citizens.

How to interpret this seemingly paradoxical statistic datum, apart, of course, from the fears of richer populations of being submerged by flows of migrants?

One simple interpretation is that global citizenship is not just about numbers, in the sense that is not a matter only for polls and statistics.

Its understanding requires some insights in various directions and at various levels, including manifold topics (history, philosophy, ethics, sociology, economics, politics, law), phenomena (such globalisation, of course, especially in the field of production and finance, regional integration processes, migration flows), new technologies and communication modes (ICT, social media), actors (international institutions and agencies, nongovernmental organisations, civil society), down to apparently minor, yet potentially highly influential factors (such as, to mention just one in the educational field, study abroad programmes or student mobility).

Within this multi-level and interdisciplinary context, global citizenship becomes relevant in a plurality of meanings, getting value much more as a cultural attitude and vision or else as a way of thinking, than as one single concept to be understood in itself.

In the light of this premise, the paper will be articulated in two parts.

The first one (§§ 2 to 4) will focus on the idea and ideal of *global* or *world citizenship*, looking at it as a long standing idea, very old and one that has recently come back into fashion, but remaining quite controversial and contested as ever. Some various notions will be highlighted, then pausing to consider the revival of such idea in more recent times, its relevance, together with its main drivers and dimensions, ending with an emphasis on the value of global or world citizenship as a conceptual framework useful to rethink identity issues in the face of the growing world challenge of cultural diversity (or "super-diversity" as it has been called with regard to the complex phenomenon of contemporary global migration), but also highlighting a methodological approach which implies and requires a paradigm shift in the understanding of what means to be "global".

The second part (§§ 5 to 10), starting from the need posited by such challenge for a methodological paradigm shift, will focus on the cultural diversity management through education to inclusive citizenship as an example of (the need for a) redefinition of citizenship as a plural and pluralist concept, whose feasibility is being experi-

mented in the context of the post-national and multicultural era, regarding in particular Europe's efforts and policies to build «a society in which pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men prevail» (as stated in the Treaty on the European Union, art. 2).

2. *Global citizenship: some quotes and notes at random (from past to present times)*

One of the most famous quotes concerns a Greek philosopher of the III c. BC, who is supposed to have said, when asked where he came from, "*I am a citizen of the world*" (Diogenes of Synope or the Cynic, ca. 404-323).

In short, this sentence marks the origins of what can be called a cosmopolitan idea of citizenship: global citizenship as substitute for or alternative to local (territorial) citizenship.

According to Diogenes philosophical and idealistic version, world citizenship can be understood as personal self-identification with the rest of humanity. World citizen therefore is who has a sense of belonging to the world community.

But another cosmopolitan version, less idealistic, yet with strong ethical implications, was conceptualized, again since ancient times, by a Roman philosopher, politician, lawyer and famous orator (Cicero, 106-43 BC).

According to Cicero ethical version, world citizenship (although not so named) existed alongside a series of differentiated group affiliations of more limited scope, starting with an inner group and going through larger groups.

The inner group is, originally speaking, the *gens*, corresponding to family (in a wider meaning); next comes the *civitas*, the city or local community as the place where we enjoy a complex set of economic, legal and political relationships with fellow citizens; up to the *natio* or people as national community of language, customs and

ethnicity; finally stands the *humanitas* as the fellowship of all peoples with each other, the humankind, constituting the outer group founded on the possibility of universal communication between peoples resulting from and through *comitas gentium*: the "friendship" between peoples.

This more articulated version was thus based on a socio-ethical hierarchy of human relationships, whereby human beings are identified and identifiable first as family members, then as fellow-citizens, strictly speaking, further as members of the same nationality (tribe or language community), and finally just as members of the humankind.

With regard to this version, one may then observe that contrary to the cosmopolitan idea of global citizenship, where the membership to humankind comes first, the idea of different group affiliations puts first the local and national membership, but links it together with *humanitas*.

In modern times, however, thanks to the Enlightenment movement (XVIII c.) the original cosmopolitan version has prevailed.

A good example of replacing nationalism with a sort of "universal patriotism" in the name of the humankind comes from a forerunner of comparative legal and political studies, in such terms:

> *If I knew something that would serve my country but would harm mankind, I would never reveal it; for I am a citizen of humanity first and by necessity, and a citizen of France second, and only by accident* (Charles de Montesquieu, 1689-1755).

This same attitude was echoed across the Atlantic by an American revolutionary in his appeal to human brotherhood:

> *The world is my country, all mankind are my brethren, and to do good is my religion* (Thomas Paine, 1737-1809).

During the XX c., a critique of this revival of world citizenship, according to the philosophical spirit of an imaginary common home-

land of all mankind, was expressed in terms related to real politics as the only context in which the idea of citizenship, properly understood as membership of a territorial polity (local or national), has its true roots and meaning, being expression of the individual freedom; in line with a famous saying according to which is the air of the city that makes people free (*Stadtluft macht frei*).

In this respect, no one can realistically be a citizen of the world in the same way in which stands as citizen of his own country (state-nation); whereas philosophy may conceive of the earth as the homeland of mankind, is politics that deals with men, as nationals (citizens) of single states, and are the laws of such particular states that positively establish the fences which "protect, and limit the space in which freedom is not a concept, but a living, political reality" (as critically argued by Hannah Arendt in pointing out to the disconnect between human rights and the civil-political rights related with the belonging to an organized human community, skeptically commenting on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, because "no one seems able to define with any assurance what these general human rights, as distinguished from the rights of citizens, really are").

But coming to present times, it is noticeable a renewed relevance of the cosmopolitan idea of global citizenship, such as evidenced under many aspects.

In particular, a political as well as socio-cultural relevance of global citizenship stands out in the agenda of international organizations concerned with sustainable development and dialogue between cultures, regarding specifically the issue of cultural diversity.

Reference may be made to Unesco World Report, "Towards Knowledge Societies", 2005:

> *New awareness of global risks such as climate warming or the erosion of cultural diversity, together with the advances made by the concept of sustainable development, point to the emergence of a global citizenship.*

More recently, according to the resolution adopted on September 2015 by the General Assembly of the United Nations ("Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", Declaration, at n. 36), it is affirmed:

> *We pledge to foster intercultural understanding, tolerance, mutual respect and an ethic of global citizenship and shared responsibility. We acknowledge the natural and cultural diversity of the world and recognize that all cultures and civilizations can contribute to, and are crucial enablers of sustainable development.*

And in the New Millennium Goals (under the section of "Sustainable Development Goals", Goal 4, "Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all", at n. 4.7), we read:

> *By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development*.

3. *Global citizenship: its drivers and dimensions*

At this point it is noteworthy that the idea of global citizenship has developed thanks to various drivers and across a variety of socio-political and cultural dimensions, such as (to list the main ones):

- international law of human rights (legal relevance);
- emerging global civil society (political relevance);
- everyday life (socio-economic relevance);

- education, from schools to universities (educational relevance).

To begin with this latter dimension, educational relevance, not surprisingly international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs), activist movements and civil society organizations in general are promoting global citizenship as their mission, offering education courses to this purpose.

For instance, if one look at the Curriculum for Global Citizenship set up by Oxfam, it can be observed that *global citizenship education* (GCE) is beginning to supersede or overarch thematic fields such as multicultural education, peace education, human rights education, education for sustainable development and international education.

In the field of education it is worth also noticing how study abroad programmes at university level have been focused particularly on thematic issues connected to the idea of global citizenship.

But to compete the picture let's add some other notes on each of the other previously mentioned drivers/dimensions through which the idea of global citizenship it seems to take shape.

International Human Rights Law

Public discourse shows that a culture of global citizenship is emerging in connection with a culture of universal rights, as a culture characterized by a commonality in the recognition of the centrality of human rights as fundamental rights of the person (human being) regardless of and, however, beyond any state-membership.

The revolutionary character of the international recognition of human rights, directly based on the "inherent dignity" of all members of the human family, has deeply affected the traditional concept and practice of citizenship, so far known and exercised in the territorial dimension of single national countries.

For the first time in human history it has been recognized, instead, the existence, in theory as in practice, of an international legal order whose subjects are not only the sovereign states but also the individuals (*iure proprio*) as human beings who are endowed

with the same legal status of rights holders, basically founded on the dignity of the person.

Starting with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948, art. 1: "*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood*". And continuing along a top-down process, so to say, with numerous later treaties, conventions and declarations, through which the signatory states have bound themselves to formally respect and protect human rights at national and international level.

This growing contemporary concern with human rights is to be seen as the product of political and cultural globalisation that emphasizes human rights over and above national citizenship rights, and formally assigns centrality to the individual person over and above nation-states.

A quantitative evidence of the steady progression in the recognition of such rights as a universal principle is given by the existence of 25 international agreements on human rights signed since 1926. Although this international human rights regime still depends largely on states, acting singly or together to make it effective, there are also now *ad hoc* world jurisdictions, such as the International Criminal Court, and independent bodies charged with bringing those who have violated human rights on a large scale to justice.

From the perspective of citizenship understood as a concept built upon the idea of ownership of rights, it has to be acknowledged that, while traditional citizenship grants legal rights on the basis of the individual belonging (by birth, *ius soli*, or ethnicity, *ius sanguinis*) to a particular nation-state, according to a discriminatory rationale aimed to exclude others, human rights imply the opposite universalist rationale aimed to "include all". In other words, the idea at the basis of the universal citizenship envisaged by the international law of human rights is that people outside their home countries may become holders of rights directly linked to them because of the universal value of dignity; so that the coverage of citizenship applies

beyond territorial fences, wherever people in need of protection happen to land.

Therefore, human rights are the most universalized rights of the citizen and can be thus considered as the cornerstone of a global conception of citizenship.

This idea of rights that are not linked to national (territorial) citizenship is most notably true in the case of the rights of refugees. When refugees arrive at the borders of a state and makes a claim founded on the so-called principle of *non-refoulement* – i.e. a claim to be taken in rather than being sent back to a place where their life will be in danger – they are claiming this right as stateless or displaced people, but acting as individuals whose subjectivity is based on the universal value of the person's dignity: as a "citizen of nowhere" and, in this sense, as "citizen of the world". Although, legally speaking, the effect of such vindication will consist in the recognition of a status helping them to overcome their statelessness condition by favoring naturalization and socio-political integration in the host country.

An emerging global civil society

A second driver/dimension involving an idea of global citizenship is represented by the ever-expanding network of international groups and organizations trying to advance political objectives at global level. Bodies such as *Greenpeace*, *Amnesty International*, *Oxfam*, *Médecins sans frontières*, and still many others, are not created by states, neither they are extensions of national citizenship.

The phenomenon thus taking place sees the involvement of non-state actors (particularly INGOs) to put pressure on governments to be more sensitive to global concerns such as health, peace, environmental degradation, global warming, human safety, and to respond to them in coordinated ways, as an answer to new global problems cutting across national boundaries.

These groups/movements are often recognized as elements of societal globalisation and the phenomenon as a whole is referred to as *Global Civil Society*, implying the idea of civic (political) engagement at global level.

Such movements and their global outreach in addition to promote the concept of dialogue among civilizations contribute to further enhancing the global citizenship ideal. When people join such international groups and organizations and take part in their activities, they feel they are acting as world citizens.

A new form of citizenship beyond the nation-state is thus taking shape.

Everyday life

A further dimension is that expressed by the metaphor of the "Planetary Vessel": we are all in one and the same boat!

Global citizenship can be therefore understood and becomes culturally influential as matter of good civic/ethical (social) behavior; in order to try to avoid inflicting harm on others, either directly or by using more than one's own fair share of global resources.

This idea relies implicitly on (a moral principle of) reciprocity, based on the assumption that other people are going to behave in the same way, so to join together the *us* and *their* (as human siblings) in a shared planetary destiny.

An example of this can be seen in the *Earth Charter* (2000), promoted by the Earth Charter Initiative (a global movement and network of people, organizations, and institutions, including Unesco) for its endorsement and recognition at international level.

The letter and spirit of the Charter are clearly inspired by a sense of universal responsibility at the base of global citizenship that embraces an overall of issues listed as Charter's Principles under the following titles: "Respect and care for the community of life"; "Ecological integrity"; "Social and economic justice"; "Democracy, nonviolence, and peace".

But quite interestingly, what characterizes such universality is the strict interaction between the global and local dimension, as it is evidenced in the Preamble of Charter, where it is stated:

> *We must decide to live with a sense of universal responsibility identifying ourselves with the whole Earth community as well as our local communities*.
>
> *We are at once citizens of different nations and of one world in which the local and global are linked*.

To sum up the whole argument thus far sketched, one may say that the most common definition of citizenship is still membership of a nation-state: the so-called "passport citizenship".

Yet nation-state citizenship no-longer exhausts the political, legal and social relevance of citizenship in the globalised world.

Global citizenship is emerging at political, legal, social, and educational level, as a concept not-yet established in a definite form (commonly accepted definition), but nonetheless having an ever growing relevance, both in theory and in practice, especially in the case of human rights.

4. *Global what?*

In order to further develop the argument, it is appropriate at this point to focus briefly on the question about the meaning of what is *global*.

To this regard, one could observe, by recalling some points of the initial premise above (§ 1), that what is *global* is:

- *connected* (i.e, interconnected/transborder/sovranational/ cosmopolitan);
- *complex* (i.e., plural/multiple);
- *conflictual* (i.e., diverse/challenging/destabilizing).

To the extent to which connectivity, complexity, and conflictuality (of both real or potential conflict) relate to each other, these basic features make up the *conceptual framework* of globalisation.

It should be also observed that a common aspect to these features is the extra-territorial or spatial dimension within which the strict relationship between connectivity, complexity and conflictuality give shape to globalisation.

In this sense, what is global is:

- constantly in tension between unity and diversity; and

- leading to two opposite, yet complementary scenarios, in a relationship of mutual implication between essence and accident, rule and exception, which can be synthesized, respectively, with a dual formula that works in a double way.

Unity (essence) *in Diversity* (accident), and *Diversity* (essence) *in Unity* (accident).

Whereby, as a result, what is global is:

- bidirectional, moving between unity (as uniformity) as a rule, if not as a target to be reached (at least for the sake of the global market), that means "one size fits all"; and diversity as a rule and ideal in itself that, on the contrary, means diversity as an essential necessity, both in nature as well as in culture.

Taking the direction of uniformity, the formula of "unity in diversity" is leading to a uniform world order: a *flat* world, or, to say it in other words, a world encapsulated *in a cage*, as regards lifestyles, linguistic codes, behavioral attitudes, and the like.

Indeed, globalisation has strongly accelerated in the last forty years the process of homogenisation that has brought about an ever greater uniformity of places, peoples, habits of life and traditions, thus reducing if not destroying local economic and social realities, along with their surrounding cultural diversity.

Therefore, the unity in diversity alone is not enough to balance the world vital biodiversity, without its complementary opposite represented by the formula of "diversity in unity", leading instead to a multipolar world, in terms of a variety and plurality of power centers.

Then, what is global is (should be) properly understood in the *complementarity of its universal and local components* related to competing needs and interests, as:

- a *sustainable planetary diversity* between peoples and cultures.

This comprehensive global concern to reach *unity without uniformity*, and at the same time to preserve and value *diversity without fragmentation*, is (should) be a foundational goal to educate people to *global citizenship*, understood not as a status of membership to anywhere, but as *a cultural attitude locally rooted as well as a universal aspiration functionally aimed to peaceful coexistence*, and as such committed to:

- reflect on issues that matter seriously for the future of humanity and our planet;
- try to become more and more responsible as regards such issues (paradigm shift);
- think global and act local, and vice versa (think local and act global), in the sense and to the extent of the of *mutual implication* of the two terms, as explained just before.

5. *Cultural diversity: policy approaches on how to integrate people and the idea of inclusive citizenship as socio-educational value*

All of that said, it is time to concentrate on a more specific issue concerning the integration of people in the context of an ever-growing complexity and diversity of our societies.

This issue is becoming particularly acute in the European region because not only of migration flows of recent times, but also because of the more traditional policy approaches to the matter pursued in past times in some of the European countries much affected by the presence of community of people from abroad (especially from former colonial settlements).

With an eye on this European experience, it may be observed that more traditional and somewhat old policy approaches look to

cultural diversity as a problem to be solved. Thus, the so-called "assimilationist" approach aims to discourage diversity and to absorb it into the cultural majority of the host country. At the opposite, the so-called "multiculturalist" approach advocates the recognition of minority groups on par with the host majority, but in fact sharing a same, schematic conception of society in terms of contrast between majority and minority, differing only in endorsing separation of the minority from the majority, rather than assimilation to it.

In response to the deficiencies in both these approaches, a new type of so-called "intercultural" approach looks to diversity as a fact with positive potentialities to be managed for the benefit of better social cohesion and integration.

To this regard, the "intercultural cities programme" launched as a joint action by the Council of Europe and the European Commission provides a good example on how to manage diversity as a socio-cultural asset that affects both citizenship and education in a double way.

The *education through citizenship*, enhancing the socio-educational value of citizenship as daily practice of living together in community.

The *citizenship through education*, enhancing the socio-educational value of the intercultural dialogue at the base of an inclusive, more active and participatory, dimension of citizenry.

In this sense, the general and rather generic idea of global citizenship takes up the most feasible spirit and function of a means of coexistence through different cultures, in the form of the so-called "intercultural citizenship."

Along this path of reasoning, focused on the mutual relationship between citizenship and education, in view of societies getting more and more complex and potentially conflictual, because of their plurality and diversity, we will try to argue that the idea of global citizenship thus based on intercultural education, instead of being expression of abstract universal principles, has its roots in local territories and communities, within the framework of shared values, across boundaries of any nature physical or mental ones that hinder the very es-

sence of education as one of the most fundamental human rights: that one to learn to be human.

6. *The challenge of cultural diversity and the evolving concept of citizenship: an overview*

Interdependence on a global scale is and will increasingly be the most widespread human condition on the planet.

In the contemporary world, cultures are no longer isolated. They interact and influence each other. One of the main reasons is, of course, the process of globalisation that has pushed the cross-country flows of ideas, knowledge, goods, capital and people.

Behind an apparent trend to homogenization of world cultures, that brings out new macro identities, such as the one of global consumers, counter-dynamics are set in motion that lead, not without tension, to the emergence of new dynamics regarding cultural and ethical values, social norms and lifestyles that affect individual and group identities.

Increased mobility coupled in particular with migration flows have brought others very close to us. These “others” no longer live in some distant place, but right in our own town or neighborhood. Such proximity, along with the mixing up of individuals and groups, has brought about a greater articulation and extension of diversity, no longer in terms only of movements of people reflecting more ethnicities, languages and countries of origin, but as regards a multiplication of significant variables that affect where, how and with whom people live, sometimes called "super-diversity".[2]

[2] When coining this term S. Vertovec (“The emergence of super-diversity in Britain”, Research on immigration and integration in the metropolis, vol. No. 06-14, Working Paper Series, Vancouver Centre of Excellence; “Super-diversity and its implications”, in Ethnic and Racial Studies, 2007, 30(6), pp. 1024ff.) used “super-diversity” to intend that “diversification not only applies to the range of migrant-sending and migrant-receiving countries, but also to the socio-economic, cultural,

These phenomena pose the need for the overcoming, especially in the field of social sciences, of the Europe/West-centric paradigm, in its turn linked to ideologised and territorialised methodological nationalism.

With regard in particular to the European region, we are experiencing an ever-growing complexity in the context of societies at local and national level that become more and more pluralistic: multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multi-linguistic, multi-cultural.

At this junction between global trends and the resulting diversification of social contexts at territorial (local) levels, it raises the question and the challenge of cultural diversity.

Generally understood as the outcome of complex and dynamic processes through which individuals and groups continuously categorise themselves and are categorised by others, with reference not only to ethno-linguistic but also to religion and other characteristics for the identification of groups in a population, cultural diversity presents both risks and benefits. The risks of discrimination, intolerance, racism, violence and conflict that threaten social cohesion are confronted with the idea of *diversity as a value* with beneficial opportunities to be developed out of the plurality of cultural backgrounds as source of exchange, innovation and creativity.

We may agree with the great French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss prediction that a "*world civilization could, in fact, represent no more than a worldwide coalition of cultures, each of which would preserve its own originality*." But keeping in mind the basic ambivalence of the risks/benefits potentially arising out of the cultural diversity, the problem still remains: how could we then cope with this challenge?

religious, and linguistic profiles of the migrants as well as to their civil status, their educational or training background, and their migration trajectories, networks and diasporic links": K. Arnaut & M. Spotti, "Super-diversity discourse", Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies, Paper 90, January 2014, p. 2.

Luigi Moccia

The 2001 Unesco "Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity" stresses the positive potential of the plurality of cultures, stating that "*cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature*" (Art. 1). Further, in the Preamble to the 2005 Unesco "Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions" is affirmed that cultural diversity is "*a defining characteristic of humanity… a common heritage to be cherished and preserved for the benefit of all*."

The Council of Europe (a pan-European human rights and democracy watchdog), states clearly that diversity is a resource necessary for the advancement of societies, and that the expression of one's cultural identity is a fundamental right. It has enshrined these principles in various international conventions and other legal instruments. European societies need to embrace and harness diversity in order to foster a pluralistic identity at the basis of a European model of open and inclusive society, if it is to avoid increasing conflicts, violence and exclusion which will tarnish its own core values.

However, besides general principles, critical views on diversity look to it as factor that can hinder social empathy. Diversity can have negative effects due to difficult interactions (communication barriers) between different cultures, incompatible behaviours, lack of shared values and norms. Diversity may generate fear of losing national identity at the root of the classic notion of citizenship and thus provoke reactions against "foreigners", such as reciprocal distaste and conflicting attitudes. Social conflicts may arise when immigrants are seen as competitors for housing, jobs and social benefits.

But, on the other side, the same picture shows that in today's societies, becoming more and more *multiple*, i.e. culturally diverse, the concept of citizenship understood as belonging to the state no longer implies a single people. In the globalised world the correspondence of citizenship with national identity, fenced within the territorial as well as cultural borders of the nation-state, is evolving from the more traditional exclusionary model, based on the dichotomy

between “we” (citizens) and the “others” (foreigners), towards a new logic of higher standards of inclusiveness and social cohesion in the name of principles and values such as solidarity, non-discrimination and peaceful coexistence.

7. *Differing national policies and the need for a change of logic: intercultural encounters on the road to cosmopolitanism*

In order to cope with such issues European countries, individually taken, have developed over time various and different policies of diversity management. As above anticipated, two main approaches may be distinguished.

The assimilationist approach aims to discourage diversity and to absorb it into the cultural majority of the host country.

At the opposite, the multiculturalist approach advocates the recognition of minority groups on par with the host majority.

Our purpose here is not to evaluate these policies, but to see if there is, and what is, a new, emerging and possibly prevailing European view on the matter, and more precisely what are the implications with regard to the relationship between citizenship and education in a multicultural environment.

Before coming to this later on, it is here required to pause, briefly enough, to observe that, in spite of their outward differences, multiculturalism and assimilationism share a same conception of society, in terms of contrast between majority and minority, differing only in endorsing separation of the minority from the majority, rather than assimilation to it.

To take further the point, it is interesting to note the dichotomous nature of such conception, which reveals an underlying logic that, for the sake of simplicity, I would refer to as the Aristotelian principle of non-contradiction. This logic implies a point of view according to which any kind of identity, be it of an abstract concept, or an object existing in nature, arises from itself and is valid in it

itself, in contrast with any other identity equally understood as such, on its turn.

Contrary to such more traditional approaches looking at diversity as a problem to be solved, a third-way, beyond assimilation and multiculturality, is the intercultural one, which looks to diversity as a fact to be engaged with, in order to make it an asset for better answering the problem on how to build a more cohesive society, based on mutual exchange between the plurality of its cultural components.

In the light of the principle mentioned earlier on the equivalence of cultural diversity with biodiversity, this new approach carries out the idea of encouraging public policies able to address positively the challenge of diversity as a fact with potential benefits, that opens the way to the possibility of developing the intercultural society's vision, in terms of mutual exchange between the plurality of its cultural components.

This new approach seems to carry a strong similarity and proximity to a culture-specific characteristic, not typically European (Western), within the terms of the Aristotelian tradition, but of external origin, amenable to an Eastern and especially Chinese traditional way of thinking, expressed by the so-called "principle of contradiction" or "complementary nature of opposites." A concept also referred to as the "logic of correlative duality."

This change of logic, I do not dare to call it philosophy, for present purposes, makes interculturality a less ideologised and territorialised policy approach than the assimilationist and multiculturalist one, respectively, on the basis of the principled assumption of complementarity of (different) cultures.

In both methodological and conceptual terms, this way of thinking means:

- to carry out a dual logic, calibrated on the opportunity (if not the necessity) to get rid of the oppositional logic (*aut-aut*) and rely on a conciliatory one (*and-and*), that is to say the *inclusive distinction*;

- to support a harmonious or mimetic form of reasoning which tends to imitate, and not to dominate, the reality (nature) of things in its many manifestations, often contradictory;

- to accept reality of things, without however being resigned to the idea of an amalgam of unresolved contradictions, but as a possibility of a mixed blend of cultural identities characterizing a condition of multiple affiliations, that one of the *global citizen*.

Cosmopolitanism, therefore, as a characteristic trend of the contemporary world expresses and reflects such an inclusive logic of complementarity of opposites, rather than dichotomous logic of mutual exclusion.

8. *The mutual relationship between citizenship and education*

Bearing in mind that citizenship and education as complementary terms, at least in theory, can work together in a double way, as education through citizenship and as citizenship through education, I propose here to talk about two scenarios and related objectives, each exemplifying the one and the other way, respectively, in which the mutual relationship between citizenship and education becomes relevant in face of the diversity challenge set above.

The first example is a factual example, although limited here to a description of its main features, regarding the so-called "intercultural cities programme," launched in 2008 as a joint action of the Council of Europe and the European Commission.

The second example is about the conceptual framework of this programme, here again limited to a description of its main features, regarding the *intercultural model* and, by implication, the idea of global citizenship, essentially seen as an educational achievement based on intercultural dialogue.

Luigi Moccia

8.1. *Education through Citizenship: the "Intercultural City"*

From a policy perspective, the challenge is to design and implement strategies for the management of diversity that can help tapping the potential benefits of diversity while minimising its risks.

The need for new policy approaches, that respect and value the positive potential of differences while allowing people to build relations over and above and through differences, is at the basis of the most recent intercultural model, according to which minorities' rights to their differences are recognised by law and institutions, but in addition to and with the support of policies and practices, on the side especially of local communities and civil society by and large, intended to favouring (formal and informal) encounters and mobilising citizens on issues of common interests that cut across ethnic and social boundaries, while setting out conditions to create common ground for mutual understanding and shared aspirations.

In other words, and basically speaking, minorities are not only recognized, but also supported with public policies, intended to favouring inclusion at local level on issues of common interests, that cut across ethnic and social boundaries, while setting out conditions to create common ground for mutual understanding and shared aspirations.

To this regard, the Council of Europe and European Commission joint programme on intercultural cities provides a good indication of a new policy approach.

First launched, in 2008, as 2-year pilot project, with 11 cities from several European countries, including EU member states and non-members, after the end of the pilot phase, a further group of cities up to 21 joined the network, further extending associate membership to cities in North America and East Asia.[3]

[3] As reported by the Council of Europe ("The Outcomes and Impact of the Intercultural Cities Programme 2008-2013," at *http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/ICCOutcomes_en.pdf*), the programme: «was launched in Liverpool in May 2008 with a 2-year pilot project. The original member cities were Berlin Neukölln (Germany), Izhevsk

The programme is officially presented in such terms:

The Intercultural City does not simply "cope" with diversity but uses it as a source of dynamism, innovation, creativity and growth. It accepts diversity as a norm and helps people from all groups – minority as well as the majority – benefit from it. The intercultural city shapes its educational, social, housing, employment, cultural and related policies, and its public spaces, in ways which enable people from different cultural backgrounds to mix, exchange and interact for mutual benefit. (…) The intercultural city does not avoid cultural conflict but accepts it and develops ways of dealing with it.

The intercultural cities approach thus proposes a new model that, at the level of cities, seeks to overcome the limitations and weaknesses of both assimilationist and multiculturalist approaches, respectively.

To this regard, it should be also reminded that both the assimilationist approach, with its emphasis on unilateralism aimed to resist and oppose diversity, while channelling it into the majority culture of the host community, and the multiculturalist approach, with its counter-emphasis on multilateralism aimed to foster diversity, but leaving it separated and even segregated to the detriment of common values, are at odds with the mutuality principle established as the first of the "Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy" in the EU (2004), which states that: "*Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States*."

(Russia), Lublin (Poland), Lyon (France), Melitopol (Ukraine), Neuchâtel (Switzerland), Patras (Greece), Reggio Emilia (Italy) and Subotica (Serbia). They were subsequently joined by Oslo (Norway) and Tilburg (Netherlands). At the end of the Pilot phase in 2010 a further group of cities joined the network, comprising Botkyrka (Sweden), Copenhagen (Denmark), Dublin (Ireland), Geneva (Switzerland), Limassol (Cyprus), Lisbon (Portugal), London Lewisham (UK), Pécs (Hungary), and San Sebastian (Spain). It has subsequently extended associate membership to cities in North America and East Asia.»

In turn, this vision brings about the possibility to look afresh to concepts like citizenship and education, through intercultural lens, for a re-conceptualization of such socio-cultural constructs to better adapt them to the challenge of diversity, while exploiting, also through intra-cultural exchanges, the potential diversity benefits for a more structured peaceful coexistence.

To proceed further, here is a shortlist of main objectives of the programme:

- it promotes the active involvement of public institutions, business organisations, local NGOs and community associations in (intercultural) policy formation;
- it provides for the active empowerment of cities' diverse communities and help migrant to integrate in and contribute to the economic and social life of the city;
- it aims at promoting open spaces of interaction, which will help sustaining trust and social cohesion and facilitating the circulation of ideas and creativity;
- it acts across a variety of domains (education, public administration and governance, public service provision, housing, urban planning, security, sanitary services, health, education, business and labour market, conflict mediation, citizens' involvement, media relations, cultural and civil life).

These objectives have to be seen as functions of a series of basic assumptions that may be resumed, although schematically for the sake of brevity and simplicity, in the following 10 main points, related and consequent to one another.

1. Intercultural approach does not accept and freeze cultural diversity as an absolute, static value. Rather, it considers it as the means of cultural enrichment, as a driver for human development and human security, for social and territorial cohesion (the so-called "diversity advantage"). Beyond apologetic discourses on diversity, intercultural approach purports to embrace and harness the challenge of diversity in its complexity.

2. Intercultural approach emphasises the strategic role played by cities, local communities and generally by civil society actors (such as educators, media, employers, trade unions, churches and religious groups), in order to bring about the necessary changes in public attitudes and create a public space more appropriate for including/integrating minority people.

3. Intercultural approach looks at the civic dimension as an inclusive space where to set out the conditions necessary for the concrete exercise of civic rights and duties by all those (autochthonous and immigrant) who live in it. This concept is exemplified by the "right to the city," such as stated in the opening article of the "European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the Cities":

> *The city is a collective space belonging to all who live in it. These have the right to conditions which allow their own political, social and ecological development but at the same time accepting a commitment to solidarity*.

4. Inclusion means no forced integration (assimilation) nor, to its opposite, segregation into separated different cultural identities. But it is the necessary prerequisite for a process of voluntary integration.

5. The inclusive city respects therefore the multiple identities of persons and fosters the acquisition of a transcending civic identity, understood as a greater civic awareness needed to develop interculturality and solidarity projects and practices for pursuing goals of common good. To say it otherwise, the respect of multiple identities should be based on the development of a civic awareness related to the need of pursuing common goals of active involvement in a civic welfare.

6. The intercultural city is a community committed to educate all its residents in human rights, dialogue, solidarity, artistic creativity,

respect of nature and the environment. It is a laboratory for a new humanism, whose universal values are put into practice in the daily life of its citizens, benefiting from the contribution of all its different cultures.

7. The intercultural city is envisioned as a place for encounter and dialogue, in which new and "shared" cultural expressions are nurtured. In other words, a place where the development of a universal culture is fostered, which holds as its central tenet the principle that "*recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world*" (as stated in Preamble of the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights").

8. Intercultural approach cannot function without a clear framework of values, and a rights-based approach to diversity management, including standards of democracy and respect for human rights. As stated by the Council of Europe, all actors engaged with the challenge of cultural diversity must have "*a strong understanding of the imperatives of a rights-based approach to diversity management, fight resolutely any form of discrimination are refuse cultural relativism*."

9. Intercultural city is genuinely a *territory* but not a *boundary*. It contributes to the re-definition of the category of territoriality as well as of citizenship in that it mitigates the monopolistic use made of such terms by the states; and promotes, instead, forms of cross-border cooperation for the purpose of strengthening social cohesion. Accordingly, the traditional (hard) concept of citizenship as a political (exclusionary) instrument should be adapted to a more flexible (inclusive) residence-based concept. Its basic meaning should change from that one of being a citizen *of* a nation-state to that one of being a citizen *for* the wellbeing of society, and of the community (*civitas*) where we live in, with greater emphasis therefore on the value of citizenship as a cultural (educative) instrument.

10. Intercultural city is secular by definition: it is a space open to the exercise of all human rights by all persons, including the right to freedom of religion and worship. In the words of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the right to freedom of religion "*represents one of the foundations of a democratic society*." The intercultural city, then, promotes positive secularism. Positive secularism does not call for the eradication and cancellation of cultural and religious symbols. There shall be no need to remove existing religious symbols, or other symbols of collective identity, from public places. According to the Council of Europe Recommendation of 2011 on "The religious dimension of intercultural dialogue": "*differences that exist between people of different convictions (…) as long as they are compatible with respect for human rights and the principles that underpin democracy, not only have every right to exist but also help determine the essence of our plural societies*."

One may worry, frankly speaking, about the difficulties in the implementation of such project and the effectiveness of its outcomes. Needless to add, this is a long-term project; it will take decades to get tangible results. But for our purposes, what matters here is the pivotal idea that comes out of the intercultural cities programme.

This idea consists not only in the *diversity advantage*, that is in cultural diversity as a positive value, but also and much more in the *citizenship advantage*, that is in citizenship as the fundamental condition through which to develop (an education to) the daily practice of living together in a pluralistic society.

Combined with this, is the idea that the more global is the challenge, the more local should be the approach to it. Indeed, any discourse on global citizenship or global education has its root locally.

When considering the concept of education through experience, besides and beyond school curricula, the intercultural city appears to be an example of *education to citizenship through the practice of citizenship* itself. Not according to the monolithic vertical nation-state conception of citizenship, but according to a broader multidi-

mensional citizenship, such as transformed, reshaped and adapted to the changing context of our societies, characterised by outer globalisation, and by inner diversification of their multiethnic, multi-religious and multicultural population.

In today's world, the idea of citizenship is split transversely in a plurality of membership to overlapping communities, ranging from the local to regional, from national to trans-national, up to global one, while coping with a variety of dimensions, such as the personal (private) dimension, of being committed to one's own ethic or faith, the social (public) dimension, of living together as equals in a pluralistic society, and the spatial (cultural) dimension, of sharing common interests in a context of diversity of habits, attitudes and identities. At the same time, however, by virtue of the international legal recognition of human rights, the idea of citizenship has become more uniform on the base of the value of human dignity. This internationally-based recognition of the human rights of any person assigns pre-eminence to a common idea of citizenship, which in turn implies that traditional forms of citizenship must fully comply with such universal value.

In this double sense, the re-conceptualization of citizenship, as normative paradigm of an open, inclusive and pluralistic society, takes shape in the intercultural city as a laboratory for a citizenship – both territorial (residential) and spatial (global) – essentially based on a *culture of the diversity in its universality*.

The intercultural cities project as a process of active adaptation to the changes in our contemporary societies aims therefore to develop a new idea of citizenship, rooted in local communities (residential citizenship), but with the fundamental objective of its transformation from status of belonging to *coexistence function*, in the perspective and to the effect of building a more cohesive society, precisely through the practice of citizenship as a universal value (and virtue), in turn expressed in shared values within local and national communities.

8.2. *Citizenship through Education: the "Intercultural Dialogue"*

Let us talk now of the other side of the same coin: the citizenship through education.

Along the path of reasoning so far followed, we come across the question: what kind of education do we need to develop that spirit and function (essence) of global citizenship that gives sense and shape to quality of citizens committed to the attainment of better, more inclusive and cohesive, societies now and in the future?

If we answer such question through the intercultural lens, we have to start first with an overview of the conceptual framework within which to place it.

The 2005 Unesco Convention's definition on "interculturality" refers, in particular, to "*the possibility of generating shared cultural expressions through dialogue and mutual respect*."

Indeed, if interculturality – as applied to in the Intercultural cities programme – is a policy approach strictly related and intertwined with the intercultural dialogue, this in turn is its vital and strategic support.

To the extent that it points to "*generating shared cultural expressions through dialogue*," interculturalism then goes beyond existing cultural differences as such, towards the pluralist transformation of public space, institutions and civic culture. Intercultural cities need to develop policies which prioritise actions whereby different cultures intersect, meet and influence each other, without offending and abusing or destroying each other. City governments should promote cross-fertilisation across all boundaries, as a source for cultural, social, civic and economic innovation.

All in all, intercultural dialogue is *learning how to live together*.

Two documents can be here reminded about the fundamental role that education plays in the protection and promotion of cultural expressions and shared common values, at the base of a pluralistic civic community identity.

One is the path breaking 1996 Report to Unesco ("Learning: The Treasure Within") written by the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, chaired by Jacques Delors, who in his Introduction to the Report (the paragraph titled "Learning throughout life: the heartbeat of society") underlies the Commission's position to put greater emphasis, out of the four pillars there proposed as the foundations of education (*Learning to know - to do - to live together* - and *to be*), precisely on the "Learning to live together," in terms of the need to develop "*an understanding of others*," and in order to create "*a new spirit which would induce people to implement common projects*" in order "*to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way*," coming to the conclusion that, if this could sound as utopia, it is however "*a necessary Utopia*."

The other document, with an eye closer to a European pattern, is the 2008 Council of Europe "White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue", significantly titled, on the wave of that same utopia, "Living Together As Equals in Dignity".

What message can we get from it? To put it in the simplest way, three main propositions are relevant to building, in the context of a plurality of cultures, a civic awareness upon which to base an "*open society without discrimination (…) marked by the inclusion of all residents in full respect of their human rights*" (to use the opening words of that document).

First. The principle of equality in dignity finds its very meaning in the idea of a "*universal citizenship*" having at its centre the person, and embracing our common humanity and common destiny. In this respect, the important role that intercultural dialogue has to play is "*to prevent ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural divides*," and "*to deal with our different identities constructively and democratically on the basis of shared universal values*." In particular, interreligious dialogue should contribute to an increased understanding between different cultures.

Second. Social inclusion (or integration) must be understood as a two-sided process, consisting in the capacity of people to live together with full respect for one another, and to participate in social, cultural, economic and political life. In this sense, it is needed the practice of a democratic governance of cultural diversity.

Third. Such intercultural-based governance needs, in turn, to be guided and supported by a political culture valuing diversity. The cornerstones of this political culture are the common values of democracy, human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law. No dialogue can take place in the absence of respect for such universal values that are essential to ensure that will prevail the force of argument rather than the argument of force.

On the assumption that only dialogue may help to live in a complex society that aims to be characterised by unity in diversity, the question on what kind of education is better suited to afford the challenge of cultural diversity can be then reformulated in such terms: how to educate to intercultural dialogue?

9. *Learning intercultural competences*

We thus come to a final issue along the mutual relationship between citizenship and education in the context of the challenge posed by cultural diversity.

Briefly speaking, with an eye again to the 1996 Unesco Report mentioned above, a vision of the kind of education that would create and underlay the new spirit needed to cope with that challenge is implied in the emphasis there given, amongst various types of learning foundations, to the one about learning to live together.

To this regard, the basic proposition set forth by the Council of Europe is that:

> *The competences necessary for intercultural dialogue are not automatically acquired: they need to be learned, practised and*

> *maintained throughout life. Public authorities, education professionals, civil-society organisations, religious communities, the media and all other providers of education – working in all institutional contexts and at all levels – can play a crucial role here in the pursuit of the aims and core values… and in furthering intercultural dialogue*.

The key competences areas selected by the Council of Europe, such as civic education (mainly education to human rights and democracy), language (to facilitate intercultural conversations/ communications), and history (particularly addressed to develop respect for all kind of differences), are those most sensitive and conducive to attain basic knowledge and skills necessary to live in culturally diverse societies.

This short list of competences, all of them placed on the side of humanities, is not exhaustive, but it is open to be enlarged and adapted, according to local and/or specific contexts, with the addition of other areas of competences, ranging from scientific (such as in the field of health care and nutrition, without neglecting of course the issues relating to the earth's ecological systems) to artistic and creative ones, particularly useful to fight against stereotypes (such as in the field of media, communication and entertainment industry in general).

However, what should be here stressed is the common goal represented by the need to strengthen and implement dialogue between cultures, civilizations and religions, in order to expanding it, towards a more useful intellectual exchange, in the framework of shared values.

This has become more and more a fundamental issue in European societies; the one to embrace and harness diversity in order to foster a democratic governance of interculturality at the basis of a European model of open and inclusive society, if it is to avoid increasing conflicts, violence and exclusion which will tarnish its own core values.

The intercultural cities project, as an active adaption process to current world transformation, is a workshop, so to speak, for devel-

opment of an inclusive citizenship having its essential objective both in learning the real practice of citizenship as "civic service" (education through citizenship) and in teaching the educational value of citizenship as "civic virtue" in view and to the effect of building a society based on shared values (citizenship through education).

To this regard, next to and beyond the knowledge and competence, values and attitudes that make us feeling committed to use our skills positively for the well-being of our neighbours in our ever complex societies, are to be developed either through educational curricula and in a self-learning continuous process.

The kind of education that seems to be called in to play a crucial role for inclusive citizenship in the spirit and with the aim of supporting social coexistence across cultural borders, is education to such values and attitudes that embodies the spirit and function of "global citizenship" with more solid roots in local communities.

Indeed, the more universal are values, the more they need to be learnt, taught and respected in places close to us: our families, our schools, our cities. As said before, I repeat it here: any new idea of intercultural/global citizenship does not descend from above, that is from abstract general principles, but grows from below, having its roots in the community, in our way of living, in our sincere and positive attitudes towards the others, our neighbours.

10. *A metaphor to end*

It has been rightly questioned: "*How can we learn to live together in the global village if we cannot manage to live together in the communities to which we naturally belong – the nation, the region, the city, the village, the neighborhood?*" (J. Delors, "Introduction" to the 1996 Unesco Report).

Faced with this obviously provocative question, I wish to end my argument by going back to where it started; with a final remark that gets inspiration from the great metaphorical strength of that an-

cient anecdote quoted at the beginning of this paper: the one about the Greek philosopher Diogenes.

Millennia have elapsed since the time when happened that this man, who was once asked where he came from, replied, "*I am a citizen of the world*."

One may use this quote just to remind of the fact that since then humanity has started a long march, still to be accomplished towards global citizenship.

However, another and even more significant anecdote on the same philosopher recounts that he lit up a lamp in broad daylight going around, and when he was asked why he did so, he candidly replied, "*I am looking for a human!*"

Indeed, we have here a perfect metaphor of any discourse on education for global citizenship.

True as it is that both anecdotes of those ancient times had targeted utopian goals, it is also true that in order to have a possibility, if any, of coming closer to such goals in our times, we must face with the diversity challenge taking into account a further goal also of a rather utopian character; the one that points to a fruitful mutual relationship between citizenship and education, in the context of increasingly pluralistic societies within an ever more connected, complex and conflictual world.

To the extent that we need to have a prospective viewpoint of the variety of issues implicated by the idea of post-national citizenship, supported and nurtured by a real and effective intercultural spirit of promoting peace and peaceful integration within our societies, we also need not to stop "*looking for the human*."

We live in the era of the technological utopia. When Diogenes went out looking for a human, he had at his disposal only a lamp. Today we have smart phones easily available to millions of people all around the globe, and any sort of hi-tech devices (ICT).

Yet, connecting people in this way it is not enough! What is still needed is to get people *living together*.

Notwithstanding such sophisticated devices that in few seconds make people reachable everywhere, we need above all a humanised common set of values and habits of mind upon which to base dialogue, peaceful interaction and prosperous coexistence in the world at global and local level, especially in the urban areas where it concentrates the majority of the world population.

As regards to morals, religious faiths, feelings and beliefs, cultural attitudes, people will be otherwise left alone in the darkness of ignorance, indifference and prejudice, without a lamp to light even in broad daylight, the lamp of education – the only one that puts us in a position to recognise our fellow human beings.

Nowadays that ancient message resonates like a motivational warning not to forget the very educational basis of any citizenship, essentially understood as a fundamental human attitude to sociality.

In this search, education and intercultural education particularly, with its emphasis on core values, empathic feelings, respect for diversity, mutual understanding, is the necessary utopia ahead of us.

With the words of the former Secretary General Ban ki-moon, when he urged in his appeal to world's leaders to "*put Education first*," we must acknowledge that "*education is a fundamental right, essential for shaping the future we want*."

But it should be also added that, as one of the most fundamental human rights, education carries with it the right to integrate, participate and get involved in a multifaceted society where people are equals in dignity, and they respect each other on the basis of a true attitude to learn to be human, in order to become conscious members of local and national communities as global citizens aimed to preserve their own individual and group identity of any sort, by sharing values and enriching it with knowledge and skills that make them capable, precisely, to live together.

References

Arendt, Hannah (1949), "The rights of man: what are they?", in *Modern Review*.

Arendt, Hannah (1970), "Karl Jaspers: Citizen of the World?", in *Men in Dark Times*, Harcourt Brace & Company, San Diego, New York, London.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1971), "Race, history and culture", in *UNESCO Courier*, *The Roots of Racism*, 1996.

Learning the Treasure Within (1996), Report to Unesco of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century: http://www.unesco. org/ education/pdf/15_62.pdf.

Hassner, Pierre (1998), "Refugees: a special case for cosmopolitan citizens?", in D. Archibugi, D. Held and M. Köhler (eds.), Reimagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Andrzejewski, Julie and Alessio, John (1999), "Education for Global Citizenship and Social Responsibility", in *Progressive Perspectives*, No. 2: http://www.uvm.edu/~dewey/mono graphs/glo mono.html.

Grossman, David (2000), "The Global and the Local in Partnership: Innovative Approaches to Citizenship Education", Paper presented at the 6th UNESCO-ACEID International Conference, Bangkok: http://www2.unescobkk.org/elib/publications/aceidconf6/themethree.pdf.

The European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City (2000): http://www.idhc.org/cat/documents/Carta_ingles. pdf.

EU Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy (2004): http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/en/EU_actions_integration.cfm.

Unesco Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (2005): http://portal.unesco. org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=31038&URLDO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201. html.

Planning and Engaging with Intercultural Communities. Building the knowledge and skills base (2006), document issued by Comedia and ASC (Academy for Sustainable Communities): http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/planningandengaging.pdf.

Coles, Mauric and Vincent, Robert (2006), "The Intercultural City Making the Most of Diversity: The Role of Schools in Intercultural Education: Building a Cohesive Society": http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/Publication/EducationColes_Vincent.pdf.

Bekemans, Léonce, Karasinska-Fendler, Maria, Mascia, Marco, Papisca, Antonio, Stephanou, Constantine A., Xuereb, Peter G., eds. (2007), *Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship Translating Values into Actions. A Common Project for Europeans and Their Partners*, Marsilio, Venice

Abdi, Ali A. and Shultz, Lynette (2008), *Educating for Hunan Rights and Global Citizenship. An Introduction*, State University of New York Press, Albany: https://www.sunypress.edu/pdf/61591.pdf.

Living together as equals in dignity (2008), White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue, Council of Europe: http://www.coe. int/t/dg4/intercultural/source/white%20paper_final_revise d_en.pdf.

Wood, Phil and Landry, Charles (2008), *The Intercultural City: Planning For Diversity Advantage*, London, Earthscan.

The Intercultural City: what it is and how to make it work (2008), Introductory document for cities participating in the Pilot Phase of the Intercultural Cities Programme, Joint action of

the Council of Europe and the European Commission, DGIV/Cult/IC(2008)01: http://www.coe.int/ t/dg4/culturehe ritage/culture/cities/concept_en.pdf.

Intercultural cities (2009), Resolution 261(2009) of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, Council of Europe: https:// wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?Index=no&comman d=com.instranet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=1462474&Se cMode=1&DocId=1263028&Usage=2.

Intercultural cities (2009), Resolution 280(2009) of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities, Council of Europe: https: //wcd.coe.int/com.instranet.InstraServlet?command=com.in starnet.CmdBlobGet&InstranetImage=1666141&SecMode=1 &DocId=1640374&Usage=2.

Wood, Phil ed. (2009), *Intercultural Cities. Towards a model for intercultural integration* (Council of Europe publication): http:// www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/ ICCMod elPubl_en.pdf.

Stromquist, Nelly P. (2009), "Theorizing Global Citizenship: Discourses, Challenges, and Implications for Education", in *Revista Interamericana de Educación para la Democracia - Interamerican Journal of Education to Democracy* (RIED – IJED), vol. 2, n. 1: www.ried-ijed.org.

Charter on Education for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education (2010), Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 11 May 2010 at the 120th Session, Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)7 of the Committee of Ministers to member states, Council of Europe: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/ education/edc/charter/charter_EN.asp.

Educating for Global Citizenship (2010), An EFTO Curriculum Development Inquiry Initiative: http://etfo.net/globaled/ Educating4GlobalCitizenship.pdf.

Karlberg, Michael (2010), "Education for Interdependence: The University and the Global Citizen", in *The Global Studies Journal*, Vol. 3, N. 1: http://myweb.wwu.edu/karlberg/articles/GC-Interdependence.pdf.

Euromed Intercultural Trends (2010), The Anna Lindh Report: http://www.euromedalex.org/sites/default/files/AnnaLindhReport2010.pdf.

Living together. Combining diversity and freedom in 21st-century Europe (2011), Report of the Group of Eminent Persons of the Council of Europe, Council of Europe: http://www.theewc.org/uploads/content/Living%20Together%20(The%20Group).pdf.

Migration Integration (2011), Aggregate Report, May 2011, Qualitative Eurobarometer: http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/quali/ql_5969_ migrant _en. pdf.

Faour, Muhammad and Muasher, Marwan (2011), *Education for Citizenship in the Arab World. Key to the Future*, The Carnegie Papers:http://Carnegieendowment.org/files/citizenship_education.pdf.

The religious dimension of intercultural dialogue (2011), Recommendation 1962(2011)1, Parliamentary Assembly, Council of Europe: http://assembly. coe.int/Mainf.asp?link=/Docum ents/AdoptedText/ta11/EREC1962.htm.

United Nations Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training (2011), Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 19 December 2011: http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/ UNDOC/GEN/N11/467/04/PDF/N1146704.pdf?Open Element.

Miller, David (2011), "The idea of global citizenship", in *Nuffield's Working Papers Series in Politics* (published 16 Feb. 2011)

Education to Global Citizenship (2012), Doha, Qatar: http://www.ineesite.org/uploads/files/resources/EAA_Education_for_Global_Citizenship.pdf.

The Outcomes and Impact of the Intercultural Cities Programme 2008-2013 (2013), Council of Europe Report: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/ICCOutcomes_en.pdf.

The intercultural city step by step. Practical guide for applying the urban model of intercultural integration (2013), Council of Europe Publishing: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/ICCstepbystepAugust2012.pdf.

Paehlke, Robert (2014), "Global Citizenship: Plausible Fears and Necessary Dreams", in *Great Transition Initiative. Towards a Transformative Vision and Praxis*.

Arnaut, Karel and Spotti, Massimiliano (2014), Super-diversity discourse, in *Tilburg Papers in Culture Studies*, Paper 90.

Final Report Evaluation of the Intercultural Cities Programme. Final Report (2015), Council of Europe, January 2015.

Grimley, Naomi (2016), "Identity 2016: Global citizenship rising, poll suggests", BBC News, 28 April: http://www.bbc.com/news/world-36139904.