

# **Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship**

Translating Values into Actions

A Common Project for Europeans  
and Their Partners

*edited by* Léonce Bekemans, Maria Karasinska-Fendler,  
Marco Mascia, Antonio Papisca, Constantine A. Stephanou,  
Peter G. Xuereb

Marsilio

*On the cover*  
Sketch by Laurens Bekemans

*Editing and layout*  
in.pagina srl, Mestre-Venice

© 2007 by Marsilio Editori® s.p.a. in Venice

First edition: February 2007

ISBN 88-317-9270

[www.marsilioeditori.it](http://www.marsilioeditori.it)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 11 Editorial Notes
- 13 Content Premises
- 17 Notes on the Contributors
- 31 General Introduction
  
- A. INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE AND DEMOCRACY  
Lodz Team
- 47 Introduction  
*Maria Karasinska-Fendler*
- 51 Identity, Culture and Democracy  
*Kazimierz Sobotka*
- 67 European Citizenship for Inclusive Europe  
*Stanislaw Konopacki*
- 85 How Intercultural Dialogue Can Improve European Democracy -  
Deliberative Democracy Approach  
*Maria Karasinska-Fendler*
- 101 The Art of Intercultural Dialogue  
*Enrique Banús*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 113 Urban Environment of Intercultural Dialogue in Europe:  
Why Cities Matter in Building a Democratic «Urban Civitas»  
*Léonce Bekemans*
- 135 Existing and Potential Fora for Intercultural Dialogue in the EU  
*Anna Jedrzejewska*
- 159 Islam, Democratic Values and the Experience of Al-Andalus  
*Jobannes Thomas*
- 177 Conclusions
- B. GOVERNING A MULTICULTURAL EUROPE:  
A NEW REPUBLICAN APPROACH  
Athens Team**
- 183 Introduction  
*Constantine A. Stephanou*
- 185 Governing a Multicultural Europe:  
Policy Challenges and Responses  
*Constantine A. Stephanou, Iro G. Nicolacopoulou*
- 207 A Republic of Europeans: Civic Unity in Polycultural Diversity  
*Kostas A. Lavdas, Dimitris N. Chrysochoou*
- C. INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE  
AND EU-MEDITERRANEAN PARTNERSHIP  
Malta Team**
- 231 Intercultural Dialogue in Europe and the Mediterranean  
in the Context of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership  
*Peter G. Xuereb*
- 245 The Nurturing and Development of Intercultural Dialogue  
through Youth Action in the Euro-Mediterranean Region:  
«Urban and Rural Institutes» for the Young;  
A Policy Suggestion for the EMP Youth Programme  
*Deniz Ilgaz*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 263 Les coopératives d’alphabétisation et d’éducation au Maroc:  
éléments d’évaluation  
*Aomar Ibourek*
- 277 Placer les sociétés civiles au coeur du Partenariat  
renouvelé des défis et des pistes pour l’avenir  
*Neila Akrimi*
- 297 Civil Society, Intercultural Dialogue and Political Activism:  
Rethinking EMP Policies  
*Gerald M. Steinberg*
- 313 Normative Power, Legitimacy Deficit  
and Intercultural Dialogue in the EU-Israeli Context  
*Guy Harpaz*
- 329 Le Partenariat Euro-Maghrebin, droits humains et dialogue  
*Fatiba Sabli*
- 345 Minorities in the Euro-Mediterranean Area:  
The Prerequisites for Launching a Fruitful  
Intercultural Dialogue  
*Erwan Lannon, Anneleen Van Bossuyt, Peter Van Elsuwege*
- 403 L’apport du Partenariat euroméditerranéen  
à la société civile dans le sud de la Méditerranée.  
Étude de cas: la Ligue tunisienne des droits de l’homme  
*Jinan Limam*
- 423 Intercultural Dialogue and Democratisation in the Mediterranean:  
Turkey as a Facilitator  
*Çiğdem Nas*
- 439 Est-ce la guerre des civilisations?  
*Slim Laghmani*
- D. INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE AND HUMAN RIGHTS,  
CIVIL SOCIETY AND WORLD ORDER ISSUES  
Padua Team
- 447 Introduction  
*Marco Mascia*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 457 Citizenship and Citizenships *Ad Omnes Includendos*:  
A Human Rights Approach  
*Antonio Papisca*
- 481 The European Union «Dialogues» Strategy as an Effective Way  
towards a World Order Based on Human Rights  
*Marco Mascia*
- 515 The Intercultural Dialogue  
between the European Union and Latin America  
*Rosa Maria Piñon Antillon, Carlos Ballesteros*
- 529 The Mainstreaming of Intercultural Dialogue  
in the Council of Europe, OSCE and UNESCO  
*Stefano Valenti*
- 545 Do We (Again) Make the Bill without the People?  
Human Security for the Inclusive City  
and the Political Dimension of Intercultural Dialogue  
*Klaus Starl*
- 555 Policy Dialogue among Cultures and Religions in the City  
*Enzo Pace*
- 569 Why Multiculturalism Affects Gender Matters.  
The Need of a Women Rights-Based Approach  
*Paola Degani*
- 587 Inclusion, Human Rights and Intercultural Dialogue  
*Giampiero Griffio*
- 601 Democracy, Nationalism and Citizenship in the Enlarged EU.  
The Effects of Globalisation and Democratisation  
*Kumiko Haba*
- 621 Comparative Law and Administrative Citizenship in the Balkan Area  
*Roberto Scarciglia*
- 641 Violence in Religions?  
*Giuseppe Grampa*
- 651 General Conclusion  
*Léonce Bekemans*

INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE  
AND CITIZENSHIP





## EDITORIAL NOTES

The transnational research project on «The Role of Intercultural Dialogue for the Development of a New (Plural, Democratic) Citizenship» has been promoted by a network of Jean Monnet Chairs, National ECSA Associations and Jean Monnet Centres of Excellence. More precisely, the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence of the University of Padua, in particular the Interdepartmental Centre on Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples, has coordinated the project, in close partnership with the European Institute in Lodz, the ECSA Greece-Panteion University of Athens and the Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence of the University of Malta.

The project has been co-financed by the European Commission, the DG Education and Culture, Unit A2 and by the Region of Veneto.

The transnational research project was coordinated by Professor Antonio Papisca and articulated in four international and interdisciplinary research teams of 35 researchers:

– European Institute and University of Lodz: *Intercultural Dialogue and Democracy*: Maria Karasinska-Fendler (coordinator), Enrique Banús, Léonce Bekemans, Anna Jedrzejewska, Stanislaw Konopacki, Johannes Thomas and Kazimierz Sobotka.

– ECSA Greece-Panteion University, Athens: *Governing a Multicultural Europe: A New Republican Approach*: Constantine A. Stephanou (coordinator), Dimitris N. Chrysoschoou, Kostas A. Lavdas and Iro G. Nicolacopoulou.

– University of Malta: *Intercultural Dialogue and EU-Mediterranean Partnership*: Peter G. Xuereb (coordinator), Guy Harpaz, Deniz Ilgaz, Aomar Ibourk, Slim Laghmani, Erwan Lannon, Çiğdem Nas, Fatiha Sahli,

Gerald M. Steinberg, Anneleen Van Bossuyt and Peter Van Elsuwege.

– University of Padua: *Intercultural Dialogue and Human Rights, Civil Society and World Order Issues*: Marco Mascia (coordinator), Carlos Ballesteros, Paola Degani, Giuseppe Grampa, Giampiero Griffo, Kumiko Haba, Enzo Pace, Antonio Papisca, Rosa Maria Piñon Antillon, Roberto Scarciglia, Klaus Starl and Stefano Valenti.

The project as a whole and this publication also benefited greatly from the work of the Steering Committee, which acted also as its editorial board. It consisted of Professors Maria Karasinska-Fendler, Marco Mascia, Peter G. Xuereb, Léonce Bekemans and Antonio Papisca, and it gave scientific guidance to the policy-oriented approach of the research project.

The project was launched on 24-25 March 2006 at the University of Padua with a starting conference on «Intercultural Dialogue and Human Rights: Inclusive Cities in Inclusive Europe». Throughout the course of the project various working group meetings took place in different locations to guarantee the interdisciplinary and integral approach of the action-oriented results. The research results were presented in a final public conference at the University of Padua on 1-4 March 2007.

We would like to thank the administrative staff of the Interdepartmental Centre on Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples of the University of Padua for their continuous support and assistance during the full course of the project. A special thanks goes to the Editor for its swift and efficient collaboration without which the present volume would not have seen the light on time.

This publication of scientific essays provides timing, wide-ranging and diversified survey of the role of intercultural dialogue for the development of a new citizenship in Europe. Its many contributions analyse various aspects of both the internal and external political and institutional dimensions of the intercultural dialogue, conceived as a fundamental component of social cohesion and human security.

In many respects the analyses that are contained in this volume provide a blueprint of which the EU can move to be a leading promoter of «dialogue» involving governments and civil society, ensuring that human rights are accorded a central place in the building of a new inclusive European polity. Finally, the action-oriented research outcome, which contains general and specific policy recommendations and good practices, are meant to be a valuable input to the content of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue in 2008.

## CONTENT PREMISES

### CONTEXTUAL CONTENT

The subject of intercultural dialogue is multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary by nature and affects many themes and issues in our European societies. The current decade has witnessed a growing enlargement of the European Union and an increasing diversity in an era of opportunities and challenges. The EU represents more than ever an immense richness of cultural, social and linguistic diversity. In such a context, the shared values that hold together our societies, such as freedom, fairness, democracy, human rights, rule of law, tolerance and solidarity, become crucial for Europe's future.

The redefinition of citizenship as a plural (pluralist) concept is an essential part of the intercultural discourse, in view of opening new horizons and ways for the practice of participatory and deliberative democracy at local, national, European and international level, from the city up to the European Union and to other international institutions. This is a road that provides opportunities to all to exercise the same citizenship rights in the «inclusive city». In this context new roles are offered to civil society organisations and movements and to local government institutions.

Within the multi- and inter-disciplinary perspective of the research project, the human rights paradigm is assumed as a powerful trans-cultural facilitator to move from a conflicting stage of multi-culturality to a dialogic stage of inter-culturality. This implies:

- the need to complement traditional rights with new subjects

## CONTENT PREMISES

such as new citizenship inclusion, local and international democracy, shared responsibility for common goods, etc.;

- the need for public policies to pursue the strategic goal of the inclusion of individuals and groups in the city;

- a necessary reference to the various ECSA world conferences (2002-2004) as valid input to active thinking on intercultural dialogue;

- an invitation to the EU to commit an ambitious and ongoing policy in favour of intercultural dialogue, certainly in view of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue in 2008;

- an engagement of the academic world to an action-oriented and innovative research approach in the relation between intercultural dialogue and citizenship.

## CONCEPTUAL CONTEXT

At the beginning of this publication we think it is worthwhile to remind the various key concepts and basic premises which are used, developed and applied in the various papers:

- intercultural dialogue is assumed as a prerequisite for social cohesion and peace at internal and international level;

- intercultural dialogue may provide real opportunities for all those living in the city, not only to better know each other, but also to do together in the same political community;

- institutions have the task to create a suitable ground for doing together, i.e. providing the same citizenship rights to all. This is linked to the international recognition of human rights and the concept of (active) citizenship;

- the concept of (active) citizenship is strictly linked to democracy and to the different dimensions of the practice of democracy from the local level up to the international institutions;

- for a fertile dialogue of cultures, EU is faced with the challenge to make the European space a real space of interculturality;

- the natural environment for intercultural dialogue is the city and an inclusive city should provide the ground for its achievement;

- part of the action-oriented research is to outline the identikit of the inclusive city and of inclusive Europe and to find out significant indicators of the variable inclusion;

- it should be clear that the prior goal of intercultural dialogue is

## CONTENT PREMISES

to motivate individuals and groups of different cultures to share universal values by doing together in the city and in the EU;

- political participation is a fundamental feature of both inclusive city and inclusive Europe;

- action-oriented education is therefore necessary to achieve civil and political awareness on the road to peace.



## NOTES ON THE CONTRIBUTORS

**Neila Akrimi** is Researcher in the Centre d'Études et de Recherches Internationales et Communautaires (CERIC) at the Faculty of Law and Political Science of Aix-en-Provence and Academic Assistant at the Centre d'Études et de Recherches sur le Partenariat Euroméditerranéen (ERPÉM) at Paul Cezanne University, Aix-Marseille III. She contributed in the preparation of the study on culture and communication at the Anna Lindh Euro-Mediterranean Foundation for the Dialogue between Cultures for the preparation of the Euromed Ministerial Conference on «Equality of Opportunities» of November 2006. Her publications include: *La politique européenne de voisinage: regards croisés sur la Méditerranée*, in «Revue Tunisienne des Études Internationales» (2005); and *The Euro-Mediterranean Partnership: Space of Homogeneous Development in Global Perspective?*, in P.G. Xuereb (ed.), *The Mediterranean's European Challenge*, vol. V (2004).

**Carlos Ballesteros** is Member of ECSA Mexico's Directive Board, and Professor-Researcher, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, UNAM. Expert in Bilateral Relations between Europe and Latin America.

**Enrique Banús**, M.A./Ph.D. (Comparative Literature, Romance and German Philology), is the Director of the Centre for European Studies at the University of Navarra, Professor of European Literature at the University of Navarra, and the Head of the Organising Committee of the Conference of European Culture (since

1990). He is also a Member of the Experts Team «Intercultural Dialogue» of the European Commission (DG Education and Culture). His main and recent publications include: *Cultural Policy in the EU and the European Identity*, in M. Farrell, S. Fella and M. Newman (eds.), *European Integration in the 21st Century*, London, Sage, 2002, pp. 158-183; *Algunas tesis simples para un tema complejo*, in «Cultura europea»; *The European Union: A Space for Intercultural Dialogue*, in European Commission/ Commission européenne, *Intercultural Dialogue/Dialogue interculturel*, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2003, pp. 188-201; *The Role of the European Union: A Critical Perspective*, in European Commission/ Commission européenne, *Intercultural Dialogue/Dialogue interculturel*, Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2003, pp. 37-38; *Desde o hacia el multiculturalismo? Un concepto y su plasmación en la Unión Europea y el Consejo de Europa*, in E. Banús and A. Llano (eds.), *Razón práctica y multiculturalismo*, Pamplona, Newbook ediciones, 1999, pp. 259-277.

**Léonce Bekemans**, Professor Doctor (B.A. in Philosophy, M.A. in International Studies and Ph.D. in International Economics), is Jean Monnet Professor of European Interdisciplinary Studies at the Polonia University in Czestochowa and Responsible for R&D in Sum Research, an interdisciplinary study group in Brussels. He is currently also President of a European and international information and formation centre near Bruges (B) and Vice-President of the Forum Europe of Cultures. He has been an expert to the Council of Europe and the European Union in relation to European education and intercultural dialogue. His publications include many articles concerning the relation between culture and society in Europe.

**Dimitris N. Chrysochoou** is Associate Professor of International Organisation at the University of Crete. His publications include: *Essay on International Theory: New Forms of Sovereignty and Synarchy* (in Greek, Papazisis, 2006); *European Integration and Political Theory: The Challenge of Republicanism* (in Greek, edited with K.A. Lavdas, I. Sideris, 2004); *Theorizing European Integration* (Sage, 2001); and *Democracy in the European Union* (I.B. Tauris, 1998).



**Paola Degani** is Lecturer of Human Rights and Vulnerable Groups and of Globalisation, Human Rights and Promotion of Women at the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Padua. She is also Researcher at the Interdepartmental Centre on Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples. Her publications focus on gender issues and human rights. Specifically, she has been working for many years on violence against women, trafficking in women for the purpose of sexual exploitation and on human-gender security concept. She has also published some essays on the international system of promotion and protection of women's rights. Nowadays she is coordinating an EC Daphne Project on trafficking and human rights.

**Giuseppe Grampa** graduated in Theology at the Theological Faculty of Milan, in Philosophy at the Catholic University of Milan, Ph.D. in Philosophy in Paris under the supervision of Paul Ricoeur. Professor of Philosophy of Religions at the University of Padua, at the Catholic University of Milan and at the Philosophy-Theology Institute in Scutari (Albania). Publications include: *Dialettica e struttura. Dibattito sull'antropologia nel marxismo francese contemporaneo* (1974); *Ideologia e poetica* (1979); *La schiena di Dio* (2006).

**Giampiero Griffo** is Director at the National Library of Naples, Head of the Diversity Section. Since 1972, he has been actively advocating at a local, national and international level, the human rights of persons with disabilities. Former Chair of Disabled Peoples' International (DPI/Europe); Member of DPI World Council; Member of the Board of the Italian National Council of Disabilities in the European Disabilities Forum; Member of the National Board of Italian Federation of Overcoming Handicap (FISH); Member of the Scientific Board of the post-graduate course on Human Rights and Disabilities at the University of Padua. Advisor of the Italian delegation for the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. He edited books and articles on human rights and disabilities.

**Kumiko Haba** (Ph.D.) is Professor of International Politics and EU Enlargement Policy at Hosei University, Director of European Institute, Jean Monnet Chair of the EU. The Directorate Member of ISA (International Studies Association) of the USA, Visiting

Researcher of University of London, and Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of History. Directorate Member of JAIR (Japan Association of International Relations), EUSAJ (European Union Studies Association in Japan), JSEES (Japanese School of East European Studies), and General Secretary of JAREES (Japanese Association of Russia and East European Studies). Publications, more than 10, include: *Eastern Enlargement of Europe* (Iwanami, 2006); *Challenge of the Enlarging Europe - Does It Become a Multilateral Power besides the USA?* (Chuokoron Shinsya, 2004); *Globalization and the European Enlargement* (Ochanomizu Shobo, 2002); *Enlargement of the EU toward Central Europe and the Role of Japanese Economy* (Aula, 2002); *Invitation for International Society in the 21st Century* (Yuhikaku, 2001); and *Enlarging Europe and Central European Grouping* (Iwanami, 1998).

**Guy Harpaz** is a Jean Monnet Lecturer of EU Law and International Law at the Faculty of Law and Department of International Relations, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He is also serving as the Vice-President of the Israeli Association for the Study of European Integration. His publications include recent contributions in the «Common Market Law Review», «European Law Review», «Journal of World Trade», and the «Cambridge Yearbook on European Legal Studies».

**Aomar Ibourk:** Centre de Recherche en Economie Quantitative, Faculté de Droit et d'Economie, Marrakech, Morocco.

**Deniz Ilgaz**, an Assistant Professor at the School of Foreign Languages at Bogazici University in Istanbul, Turkey, has a Ph.D. Degree in Political Science and International Relations and teaches courses on European Political Integration and the Future of the European Union. She presented a paper on *Women's Rights in the Euro-Mediterranean* in the Civil Society Project Conference in September 2006, «Family Values in the European Union and Malta», and has chaired a workshop on «Women and Family in the Mediterranean Region». Her publications include *Reevaluation de la Citoyennete en Turquie a la Lumiere de la Citoyennete Europeenne*, in E. Lannon and J. Lebullenger (eds.), *Les défis d'une Adhésion de la Turquie à l'Union Européenne*, Brussels, Bruylant, 2006.

**Anna Jedrzejewska**, M.A. in Polish Studies (1991), M.A. in English Studies (1994), post-graduate Diploma in European Studies, British Foreign and Commonwealth Office Chevening Scholarship, Institutions and Decision-Making Studies, University of Sussex. Researcher at the European Institute, Lodz, Poland. Current research areas: EU institutions and decision-making, European governance, participatory democracy, history of European integration. Main and most recent publications: *Perspectives and Problems of Thinking in Regions*, in *The Role of High Education and Training in Preparing the Visegrad Countries for EU Accession*, Budapest 2002; *Assessment of the Convention and the Prospects for IGC*, Budapest 2003; *Report: Adaptation, Learning and Europeanisation among Cohesion Countries - Comparative Study* (Multinational Research Project ADAPT).

**Maria Karasinska-Fendler** is a Research Director at the European Institute in Lodz, Poland, since 2000 she is a part-time Professor at the European Studies Institute of the Free University of Brussels (teaching Widening and Deepening of the European Union) and since 2006, Professor at the College of Europe, Bruges (teaching EU Neighborhood Policy). She co-chairs the International Network of Excellence EU-CONSENT, in the thematic area: democratic life in the process of EU widening and deepening. She graduated from the International Economics Department of the University of Lodz (1979) and from the Centre for European Studies of the University of Nancy II in European Economics and received the DEA in European Law (1980-1981). Her Ph.D. thesis in European Studies was defended at the University of Lodz (1986). Since 1989 she chaired the Centre for European Studies of the University of Lodz, and in the years 1993-1999 and 2000-2001 she was the Co-Founder and Director General of the European Institute. In the years 1999-2001 she served as the Undersecretary of State for European Integration of the Polish Government. Her main recent publications are: *Dilemma of European Integration* (European Institute, 2005); *Committees and Commitology* (European Institute, 2005); *Convention on EU Reform and Enlargement* (European Institute, 2003).

**Stanislaw Konopacki** is Associate Professor at the Department of Central and Eastern Europe, Faculty of International Studies and

Political Science, University of Lodz, Poland. His current research includes: European citizenship, enlargement, European identity, theories of political integration. He is the author of the following books: *European Citizenship in the Context of Polish Accession to the European Union* (2005); *European Integration and Postmodernism* (1998); co-author of *Changing Europe* (2002); and *National and Ethnic Identity in the European Context* (2001). He also published around fifty articles on European issues in Polish academic journals and press.

**Slim Laghmani** est professeur à la Faculté des Sciences Juridiques, Politiques et Sociales de Tunis.

**Erwan Lannon** is Professor at the University of Ghent and at the College of Europe (Natolin) and has been Consultant to the United Nations. Being specialised in European Law and more especially in the EU's External Relations (Mediterranean, Middle East, Neighbourhood Policy) he is currently a member of the Euromesco Network (a confidence building measure of the Euromed Partnership) and is very active in a number of Euromed academic and civil society networks. Among recent publications: E. Lannon and J. Lebullenger, *Les défis d'une adhésion de la Turquie à l'Union européenne*, Brussels, Bruylant, May 2006; E. Lannon, *Egypt and the European Neighbourhood Policy - The «Democracy, Rule of Law, Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Dimensions»*, in *European Neighbourhood Policy: Human Rights in EU-Egypt Relations*, Copenhagen, Euro-Mediterranean Human Rights Network, March 2006, pp. 29-40; E. Lannon, *Les principes de co-appropriation et de co-développement*, in *Le droit de l'Union européenne en principes - Liber amicorum en l'honneur de Jean Raux*, Rennes, Apogée, mars 2006, pp. 727-766.

**Kostas A. Lavdas** is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Crete and Director of the Centre for Documentation and Political Research. His publications include, *Interests and Politics: Interest Organisation and Models of Governance* (in Greek, Athens, Papazisis, 2004); *European Integration and Political Theory: The Challenge of Republicanism* (in Greek, edited with D.N. Chrysochoou, Athens, I. Sideris, 2004); *Politics, Subsidies and Competition* (with M. Mendrinou, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar,

1999); and *Europeanization of Greece: Interest Politics and the Crises of Integration* (London, Macmillan, 1997).

**Jinan Limam** est membre du Laboratoire de Recherche en Droit Communautaire et des Relations Maghreb-Europe, Faculte des Sciences Juridiques Politiques et Sociales de Tunis.

**Marco Mascia** is Associate Professor of International Relations at the Faculty of Political Science of the University of Padua, has a Ph.D. in International Relations and he is Chairholder of the Jean Monnet Chair in «Political System of the European Union», and Coordinator of the Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence at the University of Padua. In the same University he is President of the Degree Council in «Institutions and Politics of the Human Rights and of the Peace», and Deputy Director of the Interdepartmental Centre on Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples. His publications include: *Il sistema dell'Unione Europea. Appunti su teorie attori processi nella prospettiva di una Costituzione per l'Europa* (The System of the European Union. Theories, Actors and Politics in the Perspective of a European Constitution) (2005); *La società civile nell'Unione Europea. Nuovo orizzonte democratico* (Civil Society in the European Union. New Democratic Horizon) (2004); *La strategia dell'Unione Europea nel solco della human security, premessa per passare dalla potenza all'atto*, published in the review «Pace diritti umani/Peace Human Rights» (1/2006); and *Il paradigma dei diritti umani per le missioni di sicurezza umana dell'UE. Il contributo del Rapporto di Barcellona*, published in the same review (2/2006).

**Çiğdem Nas** is Assistant Professor in European Studies at the European Community Institute of the Marmara University in Istanbul. She teaches on the European integration process, and politics of the EU. Her research interests include European politics, Turkey-EU relations, democracy, minorities, and identity. Her recent publications include: *Legitimacy and Democracy in the EU and the Recent Constitutional Crisis*, published in «The Journal of the Yeditepe University Faculty of Law»; *Democratization in Turkey: A Regional Model or a Unique Case in the Mediterranean?*, published as a Euromesco paper (2005); *Turkey's International Role as a Democratic Model in the Middle East*, published in «Turkish

Review of Middle East Studies» (2005); and *Intercultural Dialogue Between Civilizations: Turkey as a Bridge*, published in N. Neuwahl and H. Kabaalioglu (eds.), *EU and Turkey: Reflections on the Prospects for Membership* (2006).

**Iro G. Nicolacopoulou** is Professor of European Social Law & Policy (Panteion University of Athens) and holder of a Jean Monnet Chair since 1998. She is also President of the Greek Council for Refugees and Member of the Governing Board of the European Council for Refugees and Exiles (ECRE). Her publications include: *Employment Policies in the European Union* (Athens, Papazisis, 1997); *Policies on Pharmaceuticals in the European Union* (Athens, Papazisis, 2002); and *Social Europe: Deficits and Prospects* (Athens, I. Sideris, 2002, 2nd ed. 2006).

**Enzo Pace** is Professor of Sociology, Sociology of Religion and Sociology of Human Rights at the University of Padua. He chairs the module on Dialogue with Islam in the European Master on Human Rights and Democratisation and Three Religion and Human Rights course. Visiting Professor at EHESS (Ecole des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris) in 1996 and 2000, he is President of the International Society for the Sociology of Religion (ISSR). He's Member of the HumanitarianNet (coordinated by the University of Deusto) for the European Doctoral Programme on Migration, Identity and Diversity. His publications include: *Sociologia dell'Islam* (2004, translated in Portuguese, Petropolis, Vozes, 2005); *Islam in Europa: modelli di integrazione a confronto* (2004); and *La questione dei diritti umani nell'Islam* (2005).

**Antonio Papisca** is Professor of International Relations and International Protection of Human Rights; Director of the Interdepartmental Centre on Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples of the University of Padua; Jean Monnet Chair *ad honorem*; Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Human Rights, Democracy and Peace at the University of Padua; former Member of the European University Council for the Action Jean Monnet; past President of the European Community Studies Association, ECSA-World, Brussels. Publications include: *Democrazia internazionale, via di pace. Per un nuovo ordine internazionale democratico*, Milano, Franco Angeli, 1986 (5th edition, 1995); *Le relazioni internazionali*

*nell'era dell'interdipendenza e dei diritti umani* (with M. Mascia), Padova, CEDAM, 2004.

**Rosa Maria Piñon Antillon** is President of ECSA Mexico, Full Time Professor and Researcher, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences (UNAM), and National Researcher of the National Council for Science and Technology. Her recent publications are: *Global Challenges in a Troubled World, the Role of the European Union and the United States of America*, ECSA Mexico, Jean Monnet Project, European Commission, National University of Mexico, February 2007; *The European Union vs. FTAA in the Mercosur's Juncture*, ECSA Mexico, Jean Monnet Project, European Commission, Friedrich Ebert Foundation, National University of Mexico, 2006.

**Fatiha Sahli** est professeur de Droit international économique à la Faculté des Sciences Juridiques Économiques et Sociales, Université Cadi Ayyad Marrakech, Maroc (depuis 1987). Il est professeur invité à l'Université des Sciences Sociales Toulouse 1 depuis 1989, et à l'Université Paris 7 Diderot en 2001-2002. Elle a contribué aux «Corso seminariale multidisciplinare, III, IV, VII, VIII giornate sui Diritti musulmano et dei paesi arabi», La scuola di Sant'Anna, Pise. Elle assure actuellement la responsable de l'UFR de Droit économique international et européen (DESA & Doctorat), du Mastère «Femmes, civilisations et systèmes juridiques» (DESS). Elle est responsable du Centre de Recherches sur la Coopération Internationale pour le Développement (CRCID) et coordinateur (côté marocain) du Projet TEMPUS (30011-2002), *Afrique, Europe et Droits Humains*. Elle a contribué à l'élaboration de plusieurs travaux.

**Roberto Scarciglia** is Professor of Comparative Constitutional Law at the School of Political Sciences, Trieste University. Ph.D. in Administrative Law at Barcelona University (UB) and Ph.D. in Public Law at Bologna University. Visiting Professor at University of Jaén (Spain), Law School (2001-2006); University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain), Law School (2000); University of Tarragona (Spain), Law School (2004); London University, Law School (2005). Member of AIC (Associazione Italiana dei Costituzionalisti), of ADPCE (Associazione Diritto Comparato ed Europeo) and of AIDC (Associazione Italiana Diritto Comparato). Member of the

Scientific Board of «Diritto Comparato Pubblico ed Europeo». Publications include: *Introduzione al diritto pubblico comparato* (2006); *Spagna* (2005); *Il divieto di mandato imperativo. Contributo a uno studio di diritto comparato* (2005).

**Kazimierz Sobotka** is Director General of the European Institute in Lodz, Poland (since 2001). He is Jean Monnet Professor for the European Permanent Course: European Culture - Sources and the Process of Integration, and Senior Lecturer at the Centre for European Studies of the University of Lodz, and the Head of the National Training Centre for European Social Fund, and a Member of the National Council for European Integration. He got Ph.D. in Sociology (1978) at the University of Lodz. His main research topics are: European cultural identity, history of European culture, European social policy, European citizenship and decision-making in the EU. The main and most recent publications are: *The Role of NGOs in Poland in the European Integration Process* (1998); *Unity Versus Diversity in the Light of Globalization and EU Policies* (University La Sapienza, 1998); *The Debate on the Future of Europe* (TEPSA, 2003); *Citizens and Enlargement* (European Institute, 1999).

**Klaus Starl** works as Executive Secretary at the European Training and Research Centre for Human Rights and Democracy (ETC) in Graz. He is working on human rights at local level, integration policies, migration and non-discrimination. Recently he published two UNESCO commissioned studies on *Measures of Cities to Combat Racism* and coedited the publication *Anti-Discrimination for the Judiciary - A Challenge to the Access to Justice in Austria, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia*. He coordinates the EC funded projects «Development and Implementation of an Anti-Discrimination Training for Judges and Prosecutors on the Basis of Human Rights Education» and «PROMISE-Promotion of Migrants in Science Education».

**Gerald M. Steinberg** is Professor of Political Studies and directs the Programme on Conflict Management at Bar Ilan University, Israel. He also heads the NGO Monitor project, is a Fellow at the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs, and has been a member of research groups under the auspices of the UN University, SIPRI, PRIO, and the NATO Mediterranean Partnership. His recent



publications include: *The Centrality of Confidence Building Measures: Lessons from the Middle East*; *The UN, the ICJ and the Separation Barrier: War by Other Means*, in «Israel Law Review», vol. 38, n. 1-2, 2005; and *Europe's Failed Middle East Policies*, in «Security Dialogue», vol. 35, n. 3, 2004.

**Constantine A. Stephanou** has studied Law and International Relations at the University of Geneva. Since 1992 he has been Jean Monnet Professor of European Organisation at the Department of International and European Studies of the Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, Athens, where he is also Director of the post-graduate program of the Department. He is currently the President of the Hellenic ECSA association and Vice-President of ECSA - Europe. He has served as Visiting Professor in France (Nice, Grenoble, Bordeaux and currently at Paris II), as well as at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Universities of Utah (USA), Madrid (Alcala de Henarès) and Tunis. He has acted as technical advisor to the Greek government during the IGCs for the revision of the EC/EU treaties and has written extensively on issues related to the governance and citizenship of the European Union, including the books *Réformes et mutations de l'Union européenne* (Brussels, Bruylant, 1997) and *Adjusting to EU Enlargement. Recurring Issues in a New Setting* (Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 2006).

**Johannes Thomas** is Emeritus Professor of Culture and Philosophy at the Institute of Romantic Literature of the University of Paderborn. He studied Roman Philology and Philosophy at the Universities of Köln, Bonn and Geneva (1961-1966). He accomplished his Ph.Ds in Philosophy and in Comparative Culture Studies at the Universities of Aachen and Köln (1967-1974). His habilitation thesis was defended at the University of Paderborn (1974). He chaired the Konrad Adenauer Institute in Rome (1985-1988). Since 1993 he chaired the journal «Documents». Since 1999 he was a Senate Chairman of the University of Erfurt. His current research interests are concentrated on: the role of intercultural dialogue in the society; Roman-Arab-Jewish cultural contacts; intercultural studies - French-Spanish literature. His main and recent publications are: *Intellectuals and the European Dialogue* (Madrid, 2005); *Europe as a Symbolic Space* (Madrid, 2005).

**Stefano Valenti** is a Council of Europe (CoE) Officer, currently on sabbatical leave, contributing to research and training activities of the Human Rights Centre of the University of Padua. He was appointed in 2005 Council of Europe Special Representative to Serbia and Montenegro. In his previous 8-year employment at the Council of Europe Strasbourg Headquarter he dealt with human rights training and contributed to the publication of CoE training manuals for judiciary and police. Before joining the CoE, he worked for 8 years as legal officer of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in Africa (Somalia and Guinea Bissau), Asia (Hong-Kong and Philippines) and Europe (Geneva and Bosnia-Herzegovina).

**Anneleen Van Bossuyt** studied Law at Ghent University (Belgium) and has a DEA in «Droit communautaire» from Rennes University (France). Currently, she works as an Academic Assistant at the European Institute within the Law Faculty of Ghent University. She is preparing a Ph.D. thesis on *The Legal Framework of Minority Protection in the EU's External Relations*. Given the subject of her Ph.D., she has participated to various international conferences (such as «The Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities: A Useful Pan-European Instrument?»). She also published texts on the subject including that with I. Govaere, *Le commerce à visage de plus en plus humain? Les droits de l'homme dans la politique commerciale commune*, in M. Candela Soriano (ed.), *Les droits de l'homme dans les politiques de l'Union européenne*, Brussels, Larcier, 2006, pp. 225-254.

**Peter Van Elsuwege** is Master in International Relations and Advanced Master in European Law (Ghent University). He is currently Academic Assistant and Ph.D. candidate at the European Institute of Ghent University. His Ph.D. thesis deals with the political and legal consequences of EU enlargement to the Baltic States. He also works on related topics such as the relations between the enlarged European Union and its new neighbours. His recent publications include: *Promoting Democracy in the EU's Neighbourhood: Lessons from the Pre-Accession Strategy*, in A. Kasekamp and H. Pääbo (eds.), *Promoting Democratic Values in The Enlarging Europe: The Changing Role of the Baltic States from Importers to Exporters* (2006); and *Minority Protection in the EU:*

*Challenges Ahead*, in A. Ott and K. Inglis (eds.), *The Constitution for Europe and an Enlarging Union: Unity in Diversity* (2005).

**Peter G. Xuereb** is Professor of European and Comparative Law at the University of Malta. He is also Chairman of the European Documentation and Research Centre, which is a Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence, in the University of Malta.



## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

Literature on intercultural dialogue has become boundless and endless. So far, it involved mainly anthropology, psychology, philosophy, sociology, pedagogy, history, theology, linguistics, arts, etc. In ongoing debates on future construction of European integration, the current status of intercultural dialogue has been treated as a rather isolated issue than a mainstreamed one. Since multicultural situations and processes have become a crucial *governance issue* at local, national, regional and international levels, the subject needs to be addressed in a more specific and articulated way than in the past by interrelating political science, economics, international law and international relations.

Under such multi- and inter-disciplinary perspective, the *human rights paradigm* can be assumed as a powerful *trans-cultural* facilitator to move from the (increasingly) conflicting stage of *multi-culturality* to the dialogic stage of *inter-culturality*. It should become the core of both research and the political agenda. This central assumption has inspired the work of the Padua Team; the Malta Team has stressed this idea. A number of papers contain concrete proposals for intercultural dialogue at the European and Euro-Mediterranean institutional level (Xuerab, Lannon *et al.*), the national level (Akrimi, Ilgaz), the transnational level (Lannon), and the international level (Mascia, Jedrzejewska, Papisca, Stephanou, Nicolacopoulou).

To this end traditional items of the research agenda as cultural rights (right to education, right to identity, religious freedom), minority rights, the right to self-determination, criminal law,

immigration, asylum, religious freedom need to be integrated with new subjects that include:

- how to build and develop «new citizenship» concepts and practice;
- «inclusion» as a prerequisite for social cohesion;
- what makes or enhances legitimacy, participation and laity of public institutions;
- how to improve local democracy;
- how to develop international democracy;
- how to promote awareness of shared responsibility for common good(s);
- the political relevance of the inter-religious dialogue.

«Public policies» are an absolutely must to pursue the strategic goal of «inclusion» of all individuals and groups living in the city (*inclusion dans la ville*), with special reference to economic, social and cultural rights. The subject of inclusion is also addressed with specific reference to the gender approach (Degani) and to the condition of persons with disability (Griffo) by the Padua Team. Democratic dialogue among citizens and between citizens and governments of various levels is a central idea of democracy. There needs to be a permanent and mutual interaction of the two-way communication between the two groups and this particular role must be played by governances to provide channels for such a bottom-up and top-bottom symmetric interaction. Hence connecting intercultural dialogue to governments is an imperative of, policy-making, and governance at different levels, in particular the papers of Karasinska-Fendler and Bekemans of the Lodz Team. Several of these issues are also addressed in the papers of the Malta Team: e.g. Xuereb calls for the application of the European model of dialogue as linked to decision-making, Ilgaz's calls for Urban and Rural Institutes in order to focus dialogue in the context of common action at the youth level, Sahli urges sincere and real dialogue on human rights with particular reference to immigration policy, and Lannon *et al.*'s emphasize minority rights. Mascia speaks of the European Union «dialogue» strategy as an effective way towards a world order based on human rights and suggests that the principle of subsidiarity could work as a guiding principle in «dialogue decision-making» and in the implementation of «dialogue policies».

To this end, a useful reference is the «Declaration» by the

Scientific Committee that supervised the first EU (Jean Monnet Project)-ECSA World Conference on «Intercultural Dialogue» (Brussels, Charlemagne Building, 20-21 March 2002). Significant excerpts read as follows:

– «After the dramatic events of 11 September, the European Union is called upon to take up its moral and political responsibility, in close cooperation with its partners of the Mediterranean area. The governance of peace in the region and the respect for human rights are set within a shared responsibility» (Xuereb, Limam, Akrimi, Harpaz and Sahli).

– «In a globalising world, a policy of intercultural dialogue guarantees the application and constant reflection on the respect of human rights, the functioning of democracy as well as the roots of violence and terrorism».

– «A policy of intercultural dialogue by the European Union needs to be inspired by a mobilising global vision, in constant search of coherence». The papers of Xuereb, Harpaz, Laghmani and Sahli call for coherence and avoidance of double standards or even the perception of double standards.

– «The European Union policy should also stimulate dialogue between intellectuals, academics, journalists, economic and political actors, and point out existing opportunities as well as suggest some further adjustments to EU programmes» (Jedrzejewska and Bekemans).

– «Aware of the shared responsibility that the Union and its partners have to take up, the academic community, meeting in Brussels for the conference on «Intercultural Dialogue», invites the Union to commit itself to an ambitious and ongoing policy in favour of intercultural dialogue. In this perspective, the world of academia and culture will contribute without hesitation to the promotion of common values in intercultural dialogue». The Padua Team emphasizes this commitment and to mainstream it also in the EU external relations.

A second EU Conference (Jean Monnet Project)-ECSA World Conference took place in Brussels on 24-25 March 2004, on «Dialogue between Peoples and Cultures. Actors in the Dialogue». (the Acts of both Conferences were published in two distinct books by the European Commission, Directorate-General for Education and Culture).

The present research project offers the unique opportunity to launch the commitment undertaken by the above-mentioned Scientific Committee, also in view of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue proposed by the European Commission for 2008.

The *ratio* of the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue has been officially announced in October 2005: «Intercultural dialogue is intimately linked to the fundamental ambition underlying the construction of Europe, namely to bring together the peoples of Europe. This vocation on the part of the Union requires dialogue to be voluntarily declared a priority, in order to call upon *European citizens, and all those living in the European Union*, to play a full part in managing our diversity, which is enriched by increasing variation and by the changes and additions brought about by globalisation» (emphasis added) (Commission of the European Communities, Proposal for a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008), COM (2005) 467 final). In this respect, the paper by Xuereb emphasizes the underpinning of dialogue with churches, confessions and religions by the proposed Constitutional Treaty, for an important part of the answer to the question «dialogue about what?» is that there must be real and deep dialogue about values, and religions play a major part in inspiring policy-making with values. Furthermore, Euro-Mediterranean institutions such as the Euro-Mediterranean Parliamentary Assembly are capable of advancing dialogue on all fronts but must be allowed to participate effectively in the shaping of Union policy, both «internal» and «external» in full coherence. These arguments are strongly supported by Sobotka and Konopacki's papers; both raise questions of equal citizenship as the prerequisite for good governance and dialogue in opposition to conflict or confrontation.

During the 2002 Brussels Conference, it was widely accepted that human rights be recognised in pertinent international legal instruments as the core of any suitable approach to intercultural dialogue. It was also emphasized that international law of human rights has extended its «constitutional space» from inside nation-states to the entire world. Papisca points out the strategic relevance of this innovating legal reality. A number of papers from the Malta Team confirm the importance and indeed, the need to fully adopt a



human rights paradigmatic approach in the Mediterranean context, and also in a wider neighbourhood context (especially Lannon *et al.*, Sahli, Akrimi and Nas).

If intercultural dialogue is assumed as a prerequisite for social cohesion and peace, at both internal and international level, once put in action it is a boomerang for institutions for it raises the fundamental question of the ontic «equality» and equal rights of the actors in dialogue. Some basic assumptions on the prerequisites of intercultural dialogue that contribute to the improvement of democracy were formulated in Karasinska-Fendler's paper. This entails that institutions that foster intercultural dialogue have to be available to adapt, review or radically change existing legislation and political strategies, and mobilise *ad hoc* human and material resources.

Policymaking for intercultural dialogue cannot be done without addressing the «theological» challenge: intercultural dialogue «for what»? (*le dialogue interculturel à quoi faire?*). We wonder whether the appropriate answer should be: to provide real opportunities for all those living in the city, not only know (and tolerate) each other better, but also «to do things together» (*faire ensemble*) in the same political community. To know each other better is the first step, and the result cannot automatically lead to mutual understanding and cooperation. To avoid that dialogue among cultures gets exhausted at the stage of a mere transmission of cognitive data or of reciprocal contemplation of different artistic heritages, the dialogue has to be translated in terms of concrete behaviour, projects, strategies and policies in accordance with an axio-practical approach. In other words, intercultural dialogue should be carried out jointly by pursuing common good(s) (Ilgaz, Akrimi, Sahli, Sobotka and Bekemans). The question of «intercultural dialogue for what» was raised at the 2002 ECSA Conference in Brussels on «Intercultural Dialogue». The policy- and action-oriented approach on this regard is used by several papers of the Padua Team (Pace, Starl, Degani, Griffo) as well as the Lodz Team (Banús, Bekemans and Jedrzejska).

Then, institutions should endeavour to create the suitable ground for «doing things together», that is providing the same citizenship rights to all. The revolution triggered by the international recognition of human rights in the name of the inherent dignity of «all members of the human family», deeply affects the concept, the

law and practice of citizenship we have so far known and exercised in our individual (and separate) countries. The text of Konopacki stresses the deficiencies of the current EU reality of citizenship based mainly on economic rights. That is why a new European citizenship – combining the post-national and multicultural form – appears as a model for democratic community in which all citizens are treated equally, implying that they have universal rights as well as rights that are relevant to their group differences. The papers, especially those by Xuereb, Akrimi, Sahli illustrate this perspective.

The «universal citizenship» is granted by the «new» international law rooted in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. In virtue of this *ius novum universale*, all human beings are endowed with the same legal statute in the world constitutional space (needles to point out that, from a historical point of view and as «positive law», the «universal citizenship» comes after the national or bureaucratic or anagraphic citizenships, separately *octroyées* by the individual states).

While the *rationale* of national citizenship, traditionally based on *ius sanguinis* or on *ius soli*, is «to exclude the others» – *ad alios excludendos* – the *rationale* of universal citizenship is «to include all» – *ad omnes includendos*. Traditional national citizenship is fundamentally discriminatory. An example is provided by the paradigmatic French «Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen» of 1789. Human rights are a luxury for the citizens of the individual state, separately from one another. International legal instruments on human rights make no distinction between «human being» and «citizen»; they only say «human rights». Since universal citizenship is based on human rights, the reason of *ius humanitatis* would complement, even overcome the old parameters of *ius soli* and of *ius sanguinis*. In this perspective, citizenship can no longer be an object of haggling in the inter-state system. The traditional diplomatic principle of reciprocity does not fit in with the updated universalist *rationale* of citizenship. The European Union is required to quickly harmonise the present «EU citizenship» *rationale* with the correct citizenship *rationale* that stems from the EU Charter of fundamental rights. The «Maastricht citizenship» is clearly *ad alios excludendos*. Papisca provides arguments on this new inclusive vision.

As a prior follow-up to the *ius novum universale*, citizenship ought to be re-constructed as «plural citizenship». A tree could

serve as an appropriate metaphor with: the trunk being the legal status of «human being» (*personne*) internationally recognised, the branches being national or «registry» citizenships, including EU citizenship. In order to establish a dialogue with «the Other», representing different cultures and values, we must first recognise the Other within our own culture and society. In other words, in order to recognise the distant Other, we must first notice the Other within us – a close Other (more on this issues in the paper of Konopacki). Since, from the historical point of view, the branches pre-exist the trunk, the present challenge is to restore the physiology of the tree, which is to link and harmonise the branches with the trunk. This operation is the core of any credible policing for intercultural dialogue. The sense of the operation is that all residents in a given territory, as human beings with the same internationally recognised legal status, should be put in the condition to enjoy the same fundamental rights and liberties: political, civil, economic, social, cultural, including of course, democratic rights (Papisca, Starl).

In this perspective, citizenship, as active citizenship, is strictly linked to democracy. To this regard it would be useful to resume the old question «why democracy», especially if we inquire on how to counter the strategy of violent export of democracy. Once again, the answer comes from referring to the human rights paradigm: sovereignty belongs *in toto* to *the* people because each of its members is sovereign *pro quota*, and he/she is sovereign because he/she has «inherent» rights. Democracy based on human rights cannot but be all democracy: political, economic, and social; representative, participatory, deliberative and direct; local, national and international. Citizens and general and strong publics have different functions, are coexistent and interdependent. Together, through vocal criticism of the system in place and delineating reform proposals, they can contribute to the democratisation of the EU. They point to an emerging democratic order in Europe and also help to underpin the thesis that popular sovereignty can only be realised in a procedural manner – by allowing broad participation in opinion forming fora combined with well-informed deliberative and decision-making processes in institutionalised representative and accountable bodies. All papers of the Malta Team support this vision that runs across the Mediterranean, from Tunisia to Turkey and Israel. The call, however, is for serious and honest engagement,

avoidance of «double standards», and the building of trust around a tighter multilateral framework, as well as through effective implementation at a bilateral level. As pointed out by the Padua Team, effective and democratic supranational institutions, primarily the EU, are necessary to address situations revealing «immaturity of democracy», where nationalisms and populisms are emerging also through formal electoral processes and hinder the intercultural dialogue. In those cases the participatory articulation of democracy should be strongly enhanced giving voice to all civil society organisations and minority groups (Haba).

A big challenge to present politics is to coherently combine all dimensions of democracy at the local level and, at the same time, to extend the practice of democracy up to international institutions: strengthening and democratising the United Nations should hopefully become a fundamental common goal for the actors in dialogue. Needless to underline, among other, that immigrants are very sensitive to the impact of international variables on daily life: the Athens Team addresses this topic arguing that the principle of non-discrimination should cover economic, social and cultural rights as well as political rights, those very rights that are enshrined in the international legal instruments. In this context of hopefully improved social policymaking, priority should be given to the education of children of immigrants, as relevant also to move from multicultural approaches to intercultural approaches (Stephanou, Nicolacopoulou). In other words, addressing issues of world order such as those concerning the UN Charter validity, multilateralism, human development, human security, social justice and world economy, etc. together, at a local level, is crucial and is assumed to facilitate «doing things together» at local level. In this cooperative light and for further EU institutional and political developments, the Athens Team highlights the necessity to find out more sophisticated forms of governance based on the neo-republican principle of non-discrimination. Since the traditional approaches regarding the dynamics of polity formation are revealing no longer sustainable, it is argued that neo-republicanism is the suitable way to accommodate and embrace a multiculturalism that permits the coexistence of multiple allegiances while sharing core political values (Chrysochoou, Lavdas).

Europe «invented» both law and a coherent philosophy of human rights. Nowadays the internationalisation of human rights

retroacts to Europe as a boomerang. Nobody would question the positive outcome of a long fertilisation process, that among other things proves that the immanent universality of human rights is being «encultured» worldwide: real universalisation is actually going on. Now Europe is obliged to question itself whether it is performing adequately to all the responsibilities that stem from its being the «inventor» of such human-centric revolution. This point is made in several of the Malta Team papers. The European Union is preparing its response to the challenge. In this perspective, the Padua Team suggests greater coordination with other European institutions engaged in this field, in particular with the Council of Europe and the OECD (Valenti). A positive way to favour the efficiency of the human rights in the world is to place more focus and continuity on partnerships with other regions in the world, in particular Latin-America, and to strengthen the support of the UN (Piñon Antillon, Ballesteros, Mascia).

For a fertile dialogue of cultures, the European Union is asked to give examples of how to examine its conscience with regard to the human rights paradigm – first of all within its territorial and institutional space. The appropriate metaphor could be that of the purification of cultures at the regenerative source of the «universal» (human dignity and inherent rights) to better respond to the appeal of shared responsibilities in the globalised world. The challenge is to make the European space marked by a process of increasing multiculturalisation, a real yard for interculturality. Xuereb argues that we in the Union need to re-examine our practices across the board in dialogue with our neighbours. We need to make renewed contact with our essential values and explain them better, while also adhering to them more, if we are to be viewed as credible partners. Lip-service to key values, both on the Union's side and on the part of our neighbours, must be replaced by a firm commitment to those values, so that they become truly «shared-in-action». This means boundless dialogue to get to the heart of capitalism, family values, human rights, democracy, pluralism and so on until we can truly say that we share common values as made concrete in specific policies and actions decided jointly and implemented jointly. Sobotka's paper supports this thesis and enroots it in a larger context of identity formation. Grampa assumes that, to avoid the temptation of religious fanaticism, religions should accept the challenge of purification through a confrontation with universal human values.

Since «common good» is «the full realisation of the human personality and the sense of its dignity» (as proclaimed by the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 13), the «inclusive city» should provide the ground for the achievement of this paramount goal for all those living in its territory. In this sense, the papers by Banús, Ibourk and Ilgaz place the emphasis on education and training, and intercultural education. In brief, cities may, based on some conditions, provide a favourable, attractive and creative environment for citizens' participation in (formal and informal) democratic processes of active citizenship. Paths to dialogue interconnect cities by providing chances and areas of interchange and encounters. Interconnecting cities can, as history has proven, create the environment for intercultural practice between people (Bekemans). The subject of the inclusive city, with specific reference to the dialogue between cultures and religions in the largest space of the EU is addressed in the paper by Pace. With the use of a bottom-up methodology he assumes the city as an open-air social laboratory. Policy issues for the inclusive cities are specifically dealt with by Starl.

As the natural womb for intercultural dialogue, the city is fully eligible to demand a world order that does not counter or disrupt its sound institutional mission of «inclusion». Thus, the promotion of universal citizenship strengthens the eligibility of local government institutions to have a more visible place in the architecture and functioning of the world political system. Papisca argues these evolutionary dynamics.

An exciting research task is to outline the identikit of the «inclusive city» and of the «inclusive Europe» (EU is assuming that both should share the same philosophy of «plural citizenship» and the same model of world order). The human rights discourse to be legitimate and acceptable at both local and EU level cannot but entail continuing reference to international law and human rights instruments, that is a precise model of the world's political system marked by multilateralism, UN centrality, UN supranational authority as regards the use of force, prohibition of war, interdependence and indivisibility of all human rights, social justice, revising the International Monetary Fund strategies, etc., based on the international law of human rights and the United Nations Charter. The research task is to find the significant indicators of the variable «inclusion»; these include:

- the adoption by the City Council of the «European Charter of Human Rights in the City»;
- the inclusion in the Statute of the town of a norm dealing with human rights, peace, development cooperation, and referring to the international law of human rights, the EU Charter of fundamental rights, etc.;
- the establishment of a specialising «human rights infrastructure» (ombudsperson, etc.);
- strategies to pursue «human security» objectives;
- policies and organised «services» for economic and social rights (housing, occupation, health, school, etc.);
- educational projects with school, universities, NGOs;
- «round-tables» for intercultural and inter-religious dialogues;
- the right to vote to immigrants, infrastructures for participatory democracy;
- formal recognition and support for immigrants associations;
- permanent intercultural tables to promote and guarantee laicality in (of) the city;
- *ad hoc* structures on gender issues;
- incentives for civil society projects;
- incentives for entrepreneurial initiatives by immigrants;
- participation in international organisations and transnational networks;
- artistic festivals (music, theatre, cinema, etc.);
- etc.

Comparative analysis should take into consideration significant experiences carried out in different cities. The papers by Starl, Pace and Scarciglia offer interesting elements both from a methodological and a substantive perspective.

The same exercise should be made for the EU, to answer the question: what are the indicators of an «inclusive Europe» as opposed to the «EU fortress»?

These include:

- revision of the «EU citizenship» in accordance with the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights;
- human security (and human rights) approach for the «chapter» Justice and Home Affairs;
- legislation on asylum and immigration in accordance with the international law of human rights;

- welfare policies for economic and social rights;
- real and consistent commitment to contribute to build up a world order based on the UN Charter and the international law of human rights;
- larger and more substantive space for the role of civil society organisations and local authorities (subsidiarity is a key principle in this context, that should work in a more direct relationship local level-EU level). The system stimulating multiple forms of dialogue and communication to ensure that all kinds of people have their say needs to be encouraged.

A noteworthy question regards the EU policy for «political dialogues», «discussions», «cooperation», and the «human rights clause» in treaties with third countries. We should wonder whether a real, sincere spirit of intercultural dialogue is to be found in this complex diplomatic machinery, which is *per se* necessary and stimulating (Limam, Sahli, Xuereb, Lannon *et al.*). The «European Union Guidelines on Human Rights Dialogues» (13 December 2001) indicate the following objectives: «a) discussing question of mutual interest and enhancing cooperation on human rights *inter alia*, in multilateral fora such as the United Nations, b) registering the concern felt by the EU at the human rights situation in the country concerned, information gathering and endeavouring to improve the human rights situation in that country». The purpose of «sharing» a precise world order model is missing in this approach. We should wonder whether the EU would be more credible, convincing and effective by endeavouring to discuss and share with its interlocutors a clear and coherent vision of world order as the platform on which to develop dialogues and discussions. Mascia argues that the dialogues provide a clear framework for EU policy-making and would increase the democratic legitimacy that is needed to gain the vital support of the European civil society and public opinion. He underlines that intercultural dialogue has (still) not formally entered in the EU dialogues agenda. Unquestionably, intercultural dialogue can and must be included in human rights dialogue and in the amplest political dialogue as «emergent issue».

Needless to stress that since democratic principles and the rule of law are part of the EU package for «dialogues», «discussions» and «partnerships» (Mascia), EU credibility depends on its being consistent, for instance by openly countering the ongoing flagrant



violations of international law principles and norms by its principal allied (preventive war, marginalising the UN and multilateral organisations, boycotting international criminal law and the ICC, etc.).

The EU with regard to new members, especially (but not exclusively) with reference to Turkey, should take greater consideration of the requirements and objectives of the intercultural dialogue. The issue of the coexistence of democracy and Islam is raised more specifically by Thomas' paper. The suggestion in Çiğdem Nas' paper that Turkey's experience ought to be studied further, so as to shed some light on the challenges and solutions that are imperative to principles of democracy and human rights to be truly internalised and put into practice by our neighbours is interesting. Haba addresses the question of enlargement from various perspectives, in particular from the perspective of the experience of democracy and of the risks of nationalism and discriminations.

Final consideration. It should be clear that the prior goal of intercultural dialogue should not be integration or assimilation of individuals and groups of different cultures, but motivating them to «share» universal values in «doing things together» in the city and in the EU. Then, «political participation» and «laicality» are fundamental features of both inclusive city and inclusive EU. The strategic goal is to devise a *new civic identity* that could be called «transcendent identity». Reference to the European-constitutional motto «united in diversity» would then be appropriate in this regard. «Transcendent» does not mean denying previous original identities, but combining (harmonising) them into a superior trans-territorial (even meta-territorial) awareness. As explained before, each human being is *de iure* a tree of citizenships. The strategy of inclusion contributes to endow the tree with a «transcend» attribute. Civic transcendent identity is perfectly consistent with the inner *ratio* of the city, which is «territory», but not «border» (*hortus conclusus*), then vital venue within the larger space of human rights internationally recognised. Education action-oriented, as conceived by UNESCO, is absolutely necessary to achieve this new step of civil and political awareness on the road to peace. This is very much the sense and the conclusion of most of the papers by the different research teams, i.e. that the Union model, developed as it can be in the future also (Lavdas, Chrysochoou), to form the model

framework for unity in diversity within and outside the Union, in particular with its neighbours, so that a common «sense of citizenship» based on shared responsibility for the achievement of the common good can be elaborated through joint decision-making and joint implementation of shared policies.