

Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship on the International Policy Agenda*

Antonio Papisca**

1. «Alliance of Civilisations», an Antidote to a «Clash of Civilisations»

It was starting with the first Gulf War (1991) that the theorisation-preconisation of the «Clash of Civilisations» saw cynical rulers ready to translate it into a re-edition of wars as a physiologic instrument of international relations. In this scenario of «easy war»¹, debate began to review the fundamental principles onto which the construction of world order started earlier with the United Nations Charter and with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in particular: proscription of war, prohibition of the use of force, peaceful settlement of international disputes, respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms and international cooperation and solidarity. Foregone, once and for all, is the extensive interpretation of Article 51 of the United Nations Charter whose goal would be to legitimise the attempt of some states – *in primis*, the United States – to recover the right to wage war (*ius ad bellum*) that the United Nations Charter and the current international law have denied by principle². Elevated values as human rights, cultural identity, democracy and religion have been exploited to justify the use of force, unilaterally, with forms of multilateralism *à la carte*.

«The anxiety and confusion caused by the “clash of civilisations” theory regrettably has distorted the terms of the discourse on the real nature of the predicament the world is facing». This statement is found in the High-level Group Report that has operated within the «Alliance of Civilisations» framework initiative, published on 13 November 2006³.

After recalling that «the history of relations between cultures has witnessed not only wars and clashes, but also constructive exchanges, reciprocal fertilisation and peaceful coexistence»,

* English version of: Dialogo interculturale e cittadinanza nell'agenda politica internazionale, in «La Comunità Internazionale», LXII, 2, 2007, pp. 259-273.
** Professor of International Relations, Chairholder, UNESCO Chair in Human Rights, Democracy and Peace, University of Padua.

¹ A. Papisca, Article 51 of the United Nations Charter: Exception or General Rule? The Nightmare of the 'Easy War', in «Pace diritti umani/Peace human rights», II, 1, 2005.

² The extensive arbitrary interpretation is contained in the United Nations' Secretary General Report In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All, A/59/2005, 21 March 2005, p. 33.

³ The initiative was launched on 25 August 2005 by the United Nations Secretary General as proposed by the Prime Ministers of Spain and Turkey. Members of the High-level Group were appointed by the UN Secretary General. See *Alliance of Civilisations. Report of the High-level Group*, 13 November 2006, New York, United Nations, 2006.

the Report underpins «the need to build bridges between societies and to forge collective political will to address the world's imbalances», finally to fight, with an alliance of great «civilisations», the stereotypes and misunderstandings that induce hostility and reciprocal suspicion.

2. UNESCO: Universalist Inspiration and Particularist Claims

Following the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, intercultural dialogue became, as never before, an undisputed priority on the international political agenda.

Yet it has always been included on the agenda of major international organisations, but the follow up was not consistent: an appropriate metaphor, at least until the above mentioned tragic events occurred, is that of *vox clamantis in deserto*.

From its onset, UNESCO has been a particularly significant example of the most «universalist» of UN's specialised agencies: I would not hesitate to call it the «beautiful bride» of the United Nations system. It is committed to foster intercultural dialogue between cultures and civilisations to achieve a world peace whose defences, as proclaimed in the UNESCO Constitution Preamble, must be built in the minds of people for it is there that wars originate. As one of its early most significant initiatives we should mention the *Major Project on the Importance of Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values*, enacted in the years 1957-1967. The Project was steered by an International Advisory Committee which produced a Joint Declaration that identified the main reasons for the undertaking as: psychological and political obstacles to mutual understanding; movements for emancipation and democratisation of the «broadening of the groups with which men acknowledge bonds of solidarity» growing demand on the part of all nations to be treated equally on the world stage; and «an ever-stronger feeling of advancing towards a type of education which does, or will eventually, give every individual the possibility of full access to culture».

The UNESCO strategic objective was, and still remains, to encourage the development of a world culture moulded on a

sort of «common fund» of values and principles that can emerge from the depths of various cultures.

The idea that values can be shared universally is embodied in a coherent and comprehensive system of acknowledgments and guarantees concerning the «world heritage» of humanity that is constituted by selected «universals» expressed in the form of art, monuments and landscape worldwide (so far, the World Heritage List includes 851 «properties» in 141 countries). A «new humanism» of universalist inspiration has been ingrained in the «Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Cooperation», adopted by the UNESCO General Conference, on 4 November 1966. What has emerged, once again, is that reciprocal understanding and knowledge of cultures is the key to peace. In the Seventies, the approach that affirmed itself was: «*la culture au service du développement*», intended as a *self-reliant* and diversified development of every country⁴. In this perspective, the idea that intercultural dialogue must take into account and occur in conditions of respect of cultural endogeneity, a value that unfortunately – it should be underlined – is often hypostatized with marked ideological implications. The UNESCO Plan's mid-term objectives for 1977-1982 included promoting «recognition and respect of cultural identity of people, groups, nations and regions; cultural identity as a factor of independence and solidarity; cultural identity within a global development strategy; respecting the cultural identity of peoples and groups, especially those who must face the phenomenon of exclusion in a developed or developing society». In this context, the right for each culture to exist and be respected is linked to the self-determination of peoples, recognised – as worth reminding – as a «fundamental right» by the same Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly of 1966 and in force in 1976. We are in the midst of a debate on New International Economic Order (NIEO) and a New World Order of Information and Communication (NOMIC), a debate that formally started with the first UNCTAD in 1964 and, in 1974, with the United Nation's Declaration on the Creation of a New International Economic Order, the attached Action Program and the Charter on Economic Rights and

⁴ UNESCO Director General Reports of 1975-1976 and 1977-1978.

Duties of States⁵. Awareness is raised regarding what the phenomenon of global interdependence would imply in terms of economic, social and political imbalance. As generally known, the predominant theory was that of *dependence-dependency* in the relations between the «centre» and «periphery» of the world. Relating to development processes and policies, emphasis was on «self-reliance», individual and collective, with priority given to South-South relations: the reaction is towards the economic model of «modernisation and development» whose parameters also include the secularisation of culture. In such context, reference to cultural endogeneity mitigates and even puts the universalist inspiration inscribed in UNESCO's DNA as secondary, exploiting and instrumentalising the endogeneity principle for political and ideological purposes.

⁵ For reference on the debate see: AA.VV, *Aspetti e problemi del Nuovo ordine economico internazionale*, Padova, CEDAM, 1987.

⁶ This Report is a sort of UNESCO swan song relating to a matter that the United States strongly hindered. The USA was also against the project of a New World Order of Information and Communication, this was one of the main reasons why they left UNESCO, together with the United Kingdom. Always related to the rights of peoples, worth noting is that UNESCO had, even previously, promoted a series of conferences in various regions around the world, producing extremely interesting material, owing to the substantial contribution of intellectuals and politicians of different cultures. In order to collect the above-mentioned material in a comprehensive and useful way the Centre on Human Rights and the Rights of Peoples of the University of Padua was commissioned, formally by a UNESCO convention, a publication of what was so far elaborated, including the Report of the Expert Work Group Meeting in 1989. The book was edited by G.B. Kutukdjian and A. Papisca and published with the title: *Droits des Peoples, Rights of Peoples*, Padova, CEDAM, 1991, pp. 219.

⁷ UNESCO Plan 1990-1995, p. 83.

On 8 December 1986, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the «World Decade for Cultural Development» with the intent to bring together the specificity and universality of cultural values, thus the interests of political and economic decolonisation on the one hand, and the need to develop a global humanistic culture, on the other. The difficult age-old debate to «elucidate ideas and principles on the rights of peoples» was concluded in November 1989 by the Ad Hoc Group of Experts. An important Report was produced at the end of this last meeting, its main characteristic was the reference to the human rights paradigm and the consequent relaunching of the universalist⁶ appeal.

Two international symposia were held in the same period dedicated respectively to: *Philosophy and the French Revolution. The Universal Ideal and Its Limits* and to *The Three Declarations of Human Rights: 1776, 1789, 1948*. Both, in the name of universal values and of the repudiation of uniformity, tackled the tendency of leaderships of the South to view human rights as an expression of homologating and imperialistic occidentism. Once again it is worth highlighting that UNESCO's 1990-1995 medium-term Plan pinpoints that growing interdependence of cultures and economies (...) enhances the feeling of belonging to a universal culture and the development of pluricultural societies makes the affirmation of cultural identities more complex, enriching them⁷.

3. Diversity of Cultural Expressions in a Globalised World

With the goal of harmonising specific «loyalties», rooted in different cultures, with universal obligations that descend from a common sense of belonging to the «human family», the notion of «international civism», whose pedagogical articulation appeared in the robust and still valid UNESCO Recommendation of 19 November 1974 «on education for international understanding, cooperation and peace, and education relating to human rights and fundamental freedoms»⁸, returns. It brings with it a tendency to build a new concept of citizenship based on greater awareness and responsibility of individuals, where «civic dimensions are developed together with purely political aspects». The importance of minority rights within states is underscored and to guarantee their security, multiculturalism is proposed as an alternative to assimilation and integration. In tune with the United Nations, which proclaimed the year 1995 as the International Year of Tolerance, UNESCO elaborates ideas on «active tolerance» and of «our creative diversity». In the 1996-2001 medium-term Strategy the focus is on the conflicts that arise from «the fertile grounds of multiethnic, multicultural or multiconfessional societies» which would make «politiques publiques permettant de renforcer la cohésion sociale au sein des sociétés multi-ethniques ou multiculturelles»⁹ necessary. UNESCO insists that to tackle the challenges of universalism solutions need to be found in the connection of culture and development, culture and democracy, culture and peace, and recently of culture and security.

In seeking unity within diversity, UNESCO's latest undertaking involves the International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultures, adopted on 20 October 2005, and soon to be effective, following the deposit of ratification instruments on the part of the European Community and eleven of its member states¹⁰.

In the Preamble, the Convention recalls the motives and the recurrent connections of the UNESCO's path that as summed up above involve: diversity, specificity, development, democracy, minority and peace. The objectives listed in Article

⁸ Endorsed by the UNESCO's General Conference, 19 November 1974. See text (Italian translation) in «Pace, diritti dell'uomo, diritti dei popoli», 2, 1988, pp. 141-148.

⁹ UNESCO 1996-2001 Strategy, p. 49.

¹⁰ This fact has contributed to reach and quickly overcome the minimum threshold of thirty ratifications requested by the Convention for its coming into force.

I include the following undertakings: to protect and promote cultural diversity; to create the conditions for cultures to flourish and interact freely for their mutual benefit; to encourage dialogue among cultures; to ensure ample and balanced cultural exchanges which enhance intercultural respect and a culture of peace; to facilitate interculturality to expand cultural interaction to bridge the gaps that separate peoples; to recognise the distinctive nature of activities, of goods and cultural services as vehicles of identity, values and of sense. Article 2 sets the principles. Notably, the first regards the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms: «Cultural diversity can be protected and promoted only if human rights and fundamental freedoms, such as freedom of expression, information and communication, as well as the ability of individuals to choose cultural expressions, are guaranteed. No one may invoke the provisions of this Convention in order to infringe human rights and fundamental freedoms as enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or guaranteed by international law, or to limit the scope thereof»¹¹. Other principles are those of sovereignty, of equal dignity and respect of all cultures, solidarity and international cooperation, complementarity of the aspects of economic and cultural development, sustainable development, and fair, open and balanced access. Article 11 proclaims that the fundamental role of civil society is vital and Parties must encourage an active participation¹².

UNESCO's activity in the field of «intercultural dialogue» and «inter-religious dialogue», carried out by its Division of Cultural Policies and Intercultural Dialogue, at present boasts a rich array of initiatives. Amid the various initiatives, one of noteworthy importance is the *Intercultural Routes Project*, articulated in: Silk Roads, Faith Roads, Iron Roads, and Slave Routes. The program relating to cultural mediation in the Balkans is also significant for its *data-base* contains more than 700 examples of «best practices in urban harmony» built on a «Cities for Peace» network, and the project *Culture in the Neighbourhood*.

¹¹ The «human rights clause» that is recurrent in EU treaties with third countries is implicitly adopted here.

¹² Another interesting aspect regards the accuracy of Article 4 in defining concepts and principles: for instance, «interculturality» must be understood as «the equal existence and interaction of different cultures as well as the possibility to generate shared cultural expressions by means of dialogue and mutual respect».

4. The Council of Europe's Expanding Role

An objective, that the Council of Europe – the European common house of human rights – has been pursuing from its onset, is to aid citizens of its member states to study the languages, history and civilisation of the other members, as well as study the civilisation common to them all. The European Cultural Convention, adopted in Paris, on 19 December 1954, in force on 5 May 1955, is the juridical tool that is meant to develop a mutual knowledge of the many different «histories» that characterise the European continent so that light can be shed on the common heritage of values and cultures. Article 4 speaks expressly of the «common cultural heritage of Europe», unquestionably in line and in evident assonance with UNESCO's «world heritage» regime. As of 2002, with the special project on intercultural dialogue and prevention of conflicts, the Council's activities on intercultural dialogue became more specific. In May 2005, at the Third Summit of Heads of States in Warsaw, the leading theme of priority was to build a more humane and inclusive Europe. That same year, in October, the 50th anniversary of the European Cultural Convention was celebrated. The Ministers of Culture met in Faro, Portugal, and launched the «European Council's Strategy to Promote Intercultural Dialogue», the so-called «Faro Strategy», a political coherent document containing detailed operational provisions. At the end of 2005, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe appointed a Coordinator on Intercultural Dialogue¹³. In 2006, the Council was committed to prepare a «White Book» on the very intercultural dialogue and to support the efforts undertaken by the Congress of local and regional powers in pursuit of what emerged from the November 2006 Conference (Montchanin, France) on *Local Authorities and Religions, Strategies to Consolidate Inter-Religious Dialogue*.

The Council of Europe has also been increasingly involved in attaining synergetic relations with UNESCO, OSCE, the European Union, and of late, the UN initiative «Alliance of Civilisations».

¹³ Within the section of «Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport».

5. The Active Entry of the European Union and the Role of Universities

The strong signal demonstrating the European Union's interest in intercultural dialogue is the launching, in March 2002, of an international Conference entitled *Intercultural Dialogue*¹⁴. In fact, three hundred academics and experts from all over the world participated in the event. The specific themes addressed included: the images of Europe worldwide, inter-religious dialogue, democracy and human rights, globalisation and solidarity.

From this Conference onwards, the EU's core focus *in re* went to the human rights paradigm and its practical implications, to the position of inter-religious dialogue in the dynamics of the intercultural dialogue, and to choices that imply adopting an interdisciplinary «policy - and action-oriented» approach. It is unanimously assumed that human rights, which are internationally recognised by the 1948 Universal Declaration and by ensuing international and regional conventions, provide the code of communicative symbols, therefore they offer a «transcultural» instrument to help the transition from the potentially conflictual phase of «multi-culturality», to the dialogic (potentially cooperative) stage of «inter-culturality». Starting from such assumption, debate follows to assure that dialogue is not merely limited to a reciprocal exchange of knowledge on the different histories, cultures and identities, but that mutual knowledge implies to detect what «can be done together», to share projects, actions and responsibility in the city in which people live.

To follow-up the Conference, the former President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, had a Group of Scholars work on the theme of *Intercultural Dialogue in the European-Mediterranean Space* yielding a Report, published in 2004¹⁵.

On May of the same year, an initiative of the European Commission that worked in close collaboration with the large network of «Action Jean Monnet» and ECSA-World, organised another Conference, in Brussels, devoted to *Dialogue between Peoples and Cultures: Actors in Dialogue*. The program dealt with the following topics: Mediterranean «networks»; the contribution of women and civil society; citizenship and social

¹⁴ The Conference was organised by the European Commission (Directorate General of Education and Culture) in collaboration with the network of professors of the «Action Jean Monnet» and of the «European Community Studies Association», ECSA-World. The Conference program and the Final Declaration were elaborated by a Scientific Committee made up of seven professors from different European universities. Conference Proceedings are found in the Commission's publication *Intercultural Dialogue. Dialogue Interculturel*, Brussels, Directorate General of Education and Culture, 2003.

¹⁵ Commission Européenne (Groupe des Conseillers Politiques), *Le dialogue entre les peuples et les culture dans l'espace euro-méditerranéen. Rapport du groupe des Sages créé à l'initiative du président de la Commission européenne*, Brussels, 2004.

change in Europe; the role of the media in the dialogue; European-Mediterranean dialogue and international challenges. Here too, hundreds of participants from all corners of the world were present, including representatives of civil society organisations and transnational movements¹⁶.

The EU intercultural dialogue approach places emphasis on international variables like globalisation, immigration, conflicts, and «new» world order issues. In fact, a third Conference was always set in Brussels and was entitled: *The European Union and Emerging World Orders: Perceptions and Strategies* (30 November - 1 December 2004)¹⁷.

In October 2005, the European Commission put forward a proposal for a joint decision, of the European Parliament and Commission, to call 2008 the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue. The document underlines that «intercultural dialogue is intimately linked to the fundamental ambition underlying the construction of Europe, namely to bring together the peoples of Europe». It emphasizes that «this vocation on the part of the Union requires dialogue to be voluntarily declared a priority, in order to call upon Europeans citizens, and all those living in the European Union, to play a full part in managing our diversity, which is enshrined by increasing variation and by the changes and additions brought about by globalisation».

Currently, as I am writing, a number of initiatives intended to prepare, especially with regards to information and education, the European Year are under way. Among those carried out by the academic world in 2006 it should be mentioned the European Research Project on the theme: *Intercultural Dialogue for the Development of a New (Plural, Democratic) Citizenship*, which involved numerous universities from EU and other continents¹⁸.

6. Why Intercultural Dialogue? A Teleological Challenge

The commitment demonstrated by major international organisations prompts the world of culture, particularly that of academia, to overcome those traditional «disciplinary» gatekeepers in dealing with subjects of multiculturalism and interculturality, such as anthropology, history, philosophy,

¹⁶ Conference Proceedings are found in the publication by the European Commission (Directorate General Education and Culture), *Dialogue between peoples and cultures: actors in the dialogue. Dialogue des peuples et des cultures: les acteurs du dialogue*, Brussels, 2005.

¹⁷ The organisation of this Conference was intensely coveted, and was even more collectively oriented (if possible) than the previous ones, by the international network of Jean Monnet and ECSA-World professors. Speakers at the opening session included: Boutros-Boutros Ghali and Federico Mayor Saragoza. Its Proceedings have still not been published, but are found on the site: <http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/ajm/organisation/ecsa-world/index-en.html>.

¹⁸ Research work, coordinated by the Human Rights Centre of the University of Padua and the European Centre of Excellence «Jean Monnet» at the same University, began in March 2006, in Padua, with an international Conference on the theme *Intercultural Dialogue and Human Rights: Inclusive Cities in Inclusive Europe*, and it closed with a Conference, in March 2007, again in Padua, on *Intercultural Dialogue for the Development of a New (Plural, Democratic) Citizenship*. During the Conference, the book containing the work of the various participants was also presented: see L. Bekemans, M. Karasinska-Fendler, M. Mascia, A. Papisca, C. Stephanou, P.G. Xuereb (eds.), *Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship. Translating Values into Actions. A Common Project for Europeans and Their Partners*, Venice, Marsilio Editori, 2007, pp. 665.

psychology, and more recently sociology¹⁹. Since institutions at both national and international level, are increasingly demanded to take decisions and implement «policies» that take into account the fact that «tensions across cultures have spread beyond the political level into the hearts and minds of populations»²⁰, the challenge is today also – but I would say: primarily – for the disciplines of law and politics.

It should be underlined that the traditional way of approaching the issue often bears tautological conditioning: dialogue is a value in itself and therefore dialogue is needed for dialogue. The object of dialogue, it is said, is constituted by packages of cognitive data on the culture and identity of the individuals and groups who are «the other» in relation to «others». The goal is to transmit reciprocal knowledge. Yet such approach today is proving to be inadequate since its results may simply yield articulate comparisons of specific histories and identities without ever moving any further from «where each person stays or is», therefore without positive outcomes when trying to overcome the stereotypes and myths that nurture the potential conflictual rationale of relationships between different groups. It lacks any reference to what is, or has to be shared, from top to bottom: that is, a shared paradigm of values and common action plans.

In most recent analyses, it is underlined that the object of knowledge, regarded as the preliminary object, must be a paradigm of values that, for the fact that are formally acknowledged as «universal» by the «new» international law rooted in the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, they are, at least in principle, much less arbitrary than others.

Thus, and as previously stated, the International Code of Human Rights has a pivotal role as the *trans-cultural* facilitator in the transition from the phase of *multi-culturality* to that of *inter-culturality*.

To use this paradigm correctly and effectively dealing with interactive processes between cultures, it is necessary to refer to the concept of human rights as those needs of the human person that, for the fact of being «vital needs», the legislator – and today, even the international one – «recognises» (calls) «the rights and fundamental freedoms» so as to oblige himself and everybody to «satisfy» (guarantee, protect) them. Recalling the

¹⁹ Literature on the subject is extremely vast. To know the latest updates see the book mentioned in the previous note.

²⁰ See the Report *Alliance of Civilisations...*, cit., p. 25. To know more about an evaluation of the actions *in re* of major international organisations, see S. Valenti, *The Mainstreaming of Intercultural Dialogue in the Council of Europe, OSCE and UNESCO*, in L. Bekemans et al. (eds.), *Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship...*, cit., pp. 529-544.

axio-practical approach that guided those who drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we are before «practical truths» (*verités pratiques*), whose meaning can be understood universally: the right to life is the vital need to live, the right to work is the vital need to work, the right to health is the vital need to physical and psychic wellbeing, etc. From a perspective of fundamental rights as practical truths, it is easier to arrive at their acceptance as universally shared values.

Assuming therefore that equal dignity of all the members of the human family is the founding principle of whatever legal system, the intercultural dialogue marked by human rights and by the tension of the *telos*, of «what-to do-together-where», the question that needs to be reopened regards the traditional concept of citizenship in the sense of making it plural and extending the space it is exercised in. The traditional statute of citizenship, and its related approaches, is closely linked to the form of the sovereign-state-nation and is moulded on the logic of exclusion: *ad alios excludendos*. Even with the attainment of the first «national» juridical instruments relating to human rights, this discriminatory logic still remains: humans rights are a privilege or a luxury for those who belong to a particular «enlightened» state. Notable in this respect is the title of the 1789 paradigmatic French Declaration: «Déclaration des droits de l'homme *et du citoyen*» (italics added). With the international juridical recognition of human rights and fundamental freedoms, the distinction between «man» (*personne*) and «citizen» has been overcome: fundamental rights are explicitly taken as «inherent» to the human being, regardless of the person's registered citizenship²¹. Currently the international law that is in force refers to «human rights» *tout court*, to *droits de la personne*. The logic behind the «new» international law, coherently with the assumption of «inherence» of fundamental rights to the human being as such is therefore, regardless of the citizenship (state-national) connotations that one is registered under, one of inclusion: *ad omnes includendos*.

²¹ Article 1 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights in fact proclaimed: «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».

7. *Plenitudo iuris, plenitudo civitatis*

When a system reaches the stage of the legal recognition of human rights, it enters the advanced phase of its humanisation

that can be defined as *plenitudo iuris*. To this humanocentric completeness must correspond, at least in principle, the completeness of citizenship, *plenitudo civitatis*, which implies equal citizenship rights for all «human beings» living in a given political community, regardless of sex, race, nationality, or religion, etc.

There is a citizenship that is common to all originary subjects of fundamental rights, a universal or world citizenship that is inherent to the status of the human person formally recognised by the international law of human rights. When, in documents of international organisations and other institutions, centrality of the human being²² is evoked, reference is indeed to the «person's statute» in international law. To this regard, the United Nations Declaration «on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognised Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms»²³ is explicit, for it proclaims, in Article 1, that «everyone has the right, individually and in association with others, to promote and to strive for the protection and realisation of human rights and fundamental freedoms at the national and international levels». This statement legitimises single individuals, groups and civil society organisations to exercise active citizenship rights, within and outside the space contained by domestic jurisdictions of states, therefore within the «constitutional» world space that is covered by the international human rights law. The only legitimacy requirement, affirmed several times in the Declaration, is that citizenship rights must be exercised within their extended space as long as it is done «peacefully». Traditional «national» citizenship, it must be underlined, is formally a citizenship that is *octroyée* by the state: though in presence of *ius soli* or of *ius sanguinis*, it always needs a citizenship registration. With the advent of universal law, *ius humanitatis* complements, *rectius* conditions the other two *iura* and citizenship becomes plural. Today, not only for pedagogic purposes only, the metaphor of a tree can be used to conceptualise the issue with: the trunk being the juridical status of the «person»; the roots are human rights; the trunk and roots make up the person's internationally recognised juridical status; the branches the citizenship registrations: national citizenship, European Union citizenship (for those

²² See, for instance, the United Nations Declaration on the Right to Development, 1986.

²³ Res.A/53/144 adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, 8 March 1999.

who are member state citizens), town citizenship and similar. But as it stands nowadays, the physiology of the tree is not right since its branches are not implanted into the trunk: citizenship registrations, chronologically and *de iure condito*, precede the advent of universal citizenship. Rulers today face the great challenge of composing the physiology of the tree, to harmonise particular (*ad excludendum*) citizenship registrations with the inclusive logic of universal citizenship.

The real challenge of intercultural dialogue does not only involve top notch intellectuals and rulers but sweeps across to touch the everyday life of people, and where they are living. The goal is to guarantee that everyone exercises their citizenship rights so that they all have equal opportunities to participate in the construction of an inclusive city.

The issue is being focused on increasingly and research is being conducted namely in search of the indicators of «inclusion»²⁴, also referring to the empirical evidence that has been collected from pilot experiences in Canada, Austria, Catalonia highlighting the connections of human rights and intercultural dialogue in the city, in the street, *dans la rue, en la calle*. The theme of inclusion involves firstly, a re-consideration of the «visions» that, until now, have been forwarded by international organisations. Firstly, recognition of the fact that the approach aimed at combining multiculturalism and integration is sterile.

The approach is not effective since it does not take the intermediate phases of interculturality, transculturality and inclusion into due consideration. Inclusion, in fact, does not mean integration, that is absorbing the characteristics of the dominant culture in a particular social and political context. An inclusive community is instead, and as mentioned previously, one that offers its residents equal opportunities to participate politically and exercise equal fundamental rights.

Ongoing research on human rights naturally also considers the complex problem of identity, of sense of belonging, and of identifying with particular symbols. For the scientific analysis and for policy-making, an interdisciplinary approach imposes itself as the only fruitful course. In this context, identity too is considered a plural category, made by the ontic, unchanging nature of the human being as well as by other identities that are said to be acquired, and as such, are variable. In the evolutionary reality of globalisation and cultural diversities,

²⁴ Indicators and concrete examples of best practices are found in K. Starl, *Do We (Again) Make the Bill Without the People? Human Security for the Inclusive City and the Political Dimension of Intercultural Dialogue*, in L. Bekemans et al. (eds.), *Intercultural Dialogue and Citizenship...*, cit., pp. 545-553.

that prompts the distribution of *governance* at several levels by using intercultural dialogue to achieve inclusion, the construction of a new superior identity is urgently demanded. I mean a «transcend civic identity» as acquisition and exercise of a greater level of awareness of civil and political identification, an authentically secular identity since it is universalist, transcultural, as well as trans- and meta-territorial. It is the *plenitudo iuris* that has been internalised by individuals who are open to sharing responsibilities in the inclusive city. The significant role that information and education play in giving rise to this new civic and political culture must be stressed. It has been hypothesized that tension towards the new plural citizenship, in tandem with the processes of democratic inclusion, can revitalise the public sphere²⁵ in the perspective of an efficient *multi-level* and *supra-national governance*. This political-institutional architecture is perfectly congruous with the need to guarantee the rights of universal citizenship in the world-space. Indeed it is the phenomenon of citizenship «in the plural» transcend, of dialogue and inclusion that oblige institutions to redefine themselves in the perspective of the *telos* and, therefore, to open and develop multiple channels of democratic representation and participation.

8. «Plural Citizenship» and the European Union: Leading by Example

The European Union is heading towards plural citizenship and «*transcend civic identity*» formally from the time it introduced the «European Union citizenship» (Maastricht Treaty). In compliance with what was expressly set out by the Treaty establishing the European Community (consolidated version), Part Two (Union Citizenship, Articles 17 to 22) and by (the project of) «Constitutional Treaty», Part One, Title II (Fundamental Rights and Union Citizenship, Articles 1 to 10), having the citizenship of a member state is the essential prerequisite to be a EU citizen. Therefore «registered nationality» still prevails over «universality» of the human being status. By breaking up «EU citizenship» from the natural context of fundamental human rights, a clearly *ad alios excludendos* logic is (re)proposed at the European level which

²⁵ With reference to this orientation, great inspiration is provided by H. Arendt, *Men in the Dark Times*, New York, 1968; id., *Between Past and Future*, New York, 1968.

contradicts the principle of interdependence and indivisibility of all human rights.

Since the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, proclaimed in Nice, in 2000, centres on the «human being», it is more visible the discrimination that the present European law operates between the «citizen» of a member state and the «person», gratifying the former with a set of privileges. After Nice, the challenge of inclusion, also for the European Union, must pass through intercultural dialogue aimed at attaining equal citizenship rights for all those who live regularly within the «European space» regardless of the citizenship (nationally) registered.

Unquestionably, with «EU citizenship», as discriminatory as it may be, the Union contributes to give institutional way to plural citizenship. This process implies that the Union and its member states must implant the respective branches onto the tree trunk of universal citizenship properly. With this perspective, the Union is prompted to «transcend» the negative contents of Western historical identity, therefore the power of hegemony, of «conquest», colonialism, world wars, Nazism, Gulags, and must re-define itself using the positive contents of that identity, that is humanism, the «discovery» of fundamental human rights, the flourishing of free organisations and movements of civil society, the sowing of artistic and scientific «universals» for the benefit of the entire world.