

"Multiculturalism vs Interculturalism: New Paradigm? (Sociologic and Juridical Aspects of the Debate between the two Paradigms)"?

Shkelzen Hasanaj PhD

PhD student

Department of Social Sciences

University of Pisa

Italy

Abstract

This paper retraces the debate between the main scholars of the multicultural approach and those of the intercultural approach, recently developed in the United Kingdom. After emphasizing the peculiarities and the criticism of multiculturalism, concerning the recognition of diversities and the inclusion of foreigners, the comparison of such model with the actual challenges faced by the United Kingdom, marked by the dynamicity and differentiation of the ethnic minorities, leads to consider some of the intercultural theses as a better approach for representing and reacting to the ethnic and religious diversities. Finally, the applicability of interculturalism was tested on the case study of Quebec, through a revision of the theories of Gerard Bouchard and Charles Taylor.

Keywords: Minorities, Diversity, Identity, Multiculturalism, Interculturalism

Introduction

Today's society is becoming increasingly diverse, to the point that cultural homogeneity and national belonging are losing their importance. The question we ask today is not so much how to live with diversity, but how to live in diversity (Antonsich, 2012). It is a conceptual change in which the term diversity no longer refers to the arrival of migrants in the host communities, which often provoke shock and turmoil, but the ongoing demographic change in these communities that gradually changes the very meaning of identity and group membership, including that of traditional nationalities. This diversification, including the concept of tolerance plays a central role, as regards to what should be tolerated (Brown, 2009) and what has to be controlled and limited (Hage, 2000).

When asked about how to govern the complex phenomenon of diversity within the society, two main theoretical approaches were proposed: a "multiculturalists" one and the other "interculturalist". The supporters of multiculturalism claim to have formulated an efficient proposal that covers both from a theoretical democratic point of view and with practical policies of intervention. On the contrary, interculturalists believe that the failure of multiculturalism has been that of building an essentialist and static image of territorial and socio-cultural areas, which is inadequate to explain the fragmentary nature and mutability of today's sense of identity. In Ted Cantle's (2015) opinion, the interculturalist is confronted with different types and levels of complexity, going beyond the multiculturalists approach (as well as the "communitarian" one). On the other hand, multiculturalists find the model proposed by supporters of interculturalism, to be simply a variant of multiculturalism and not a new approach to integration (Modood, Meer, 2012).

If we consider this dispute from an historical point of view, we can see that the increase in migratory flows to Europe, since the early fifties and their progressive allocation in the eighties, have produced an increasingly visible growth in ethnic minorities in the European society. Their settlement and the growth in their diversity, a peripheral and transient phenomena, have become a central theme in public agendas. Even with significant resistance, European societies have redefined the policy of intervention in the light of the concepts of diversity and "super diversity" (Vertovec, 2007), only to take a number of models to address the phenomena related to the recognition and inclusion. In general, 50 years after those early challenges of social integration, multiculturalism has prevailed (Cantle, 2012).

However, for a long time it was not possible to distinguish between a multicultural society and multicultural policies and, therefore, it has been difficult to be able to reply to the dynamics of diversity and that of individual and collective identity.

1. Multiculturalism vs Interculturalism

Multiculturalism is presented as a set of political doctrines, national and local intervention policies, initiatives by people from civil society, and a complex of public opinions put in the forefront in recent years in the European debate (Modood, 2016).

At the centre of the multiculturalists theories there is citizenship, considered not only as a set of rights and duties which give a legal entitlement to have access to a passport, to vote, but also in a broader sense. The multiculturalists emphasize the importance of relations between the groups in an ethical context characterized by the respect for freedom and equality. Differently from the liberal theories, citizenship is conceived as a relationship "in general", not only as a specific relationship between individuals and the powers of the government. In addition, liberal theories lean towards the assimilation of minorities to the dominant culture in the public sphere, acquiring an abstract idea of individuals, while tolerating differences in the private sphere better, only to be dependent on the acceptance by the good will of people involved in these relationships. Vice versa the proponents of the multicultural approach find in the concept of equality speculated aspects of discrimination based on ethnicity, gender, physical and mental conditions. For multiculturalists, the liberal theories prove to be incapable of recognizing the rights of equality because they create two particular cases: on the one hand, they favor formal citizenship, but on the other, they are not interested in the realization of those rights by citizens, leaving them to free rein in the relations between the main-stream of the ruling classes and minority subcultures. Multiculturalism proposes overcoming this vision by starting from the reformulation of the concept of equality as the equal treatment of diversity. Equality and diversity complement one another. The right to receive recognition of their differences must be supported both in the private sphere as it is in the public, so that no community or minority feels mutilated. Any opinion or behavior that does not respect diversity is not equality – explained by Meer and Modood (2012a). Minorities must be able to present demands for recognition and the sharing of public spaces in the same way as the cultural majority. Ultimately, if in the liberal approach equality is measured the same as the cultural majority, multiculturalism supports the recognition in the private and public spheres and it tries to propose some guidelines on the concept of equality, specifically in relating to this multifaceted concept that guarantees for minorities, but that does not replace the legal rights and protection from racism, including cultural racism and Islam phobia.

Another derivation of the concept of equality which is criticized, is that connected to "assimilation." For multiculturalists integration must be a spontaneous process, dependent on personal choices. No group or community must cancel the essential elements of its identity. Still, it is very important the theme of the cultural claims of a group within the institutions, for example, the Pasti Halal in the public institutions, schools and hospitals, the right to wear certain types of clothing in these public domains. All minority groups should be given the right to maintain their own identity, but in conjunction with the national one, in the name of a multicultural citizenship.

Meer and Modood, Zappata-Barrero (2016) argue that the multicultural citizenship, if understood in this way, does not dissolve or deny national citizenship, indeed, it can be considered a momentum towards its enhancement. European history has left us various experiences related to racism and colonialism, where the status quo has played a role of exclusion rather than integration. From these examples, a project with a new approach for the reconstruction of national identity reconstruction must be welcomed and encouraged by the majority. This must be done with the intention of being able to maximize the sense of belonging, reducing alienation and fragmentation.

2. Multicultural policies in the Great Britain

Critics of multiculturalism argue that it appeared in Britain for the first time between the sixties and seventies (Cantle, 2012), while others believe that the era of multiculturalism began, only in the eighties (Goodhart, 2013). In our view, the history of multicultural policies in the UK began in 1965 with the implementation of the first laws against racial discrimination (Race Relations Act), a concept that can be interpreted as being part of liberal equality. The second law of 1976, The Relations Act, focused on the principle of equality in the face of differences (Meer, Modood, 2012a).

Up until the sixties, the majority of politicians and the general opinion used the expression "racial equality" in reference to the relationship between the native population, dominant whites, and the newcomers, who were blacks and other discriminated ethnic groups (Modood, 1998).

Such a conception has proved implausible since 1982, when "ethnic pluralism" was introduced, which included religious elements in addition to ethnic ones. In the first half of the eighties some members of the Asian community put forward demands for recognition to the British institutions and therefore, other questions were discussed in the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE). In 1982, the House of Lords judged inadequate the restrictive conception of equality only in terms of racial equality. The Asian affirmation has enabled the transition from a notion of racial equality to that of ethnic equality (Modood, 1994).

An event that emphasized the issue of religion in the context of British multiculturalism was that of the "Satanic Verses" by Salman Rushdie Affair. According to Tariq Modood, the case of Rushdie was essential in understanding the problem that had been created within the British society, in reference to religious tolerance. Muslims, compared with other religious groups, did not have the same rights and the same protection guaranteed by the racial equality legislation for the Sikhs and Jews. This affair has served to understand how important it is to protect Muslims from discrimination and the incitement of religious hatred, and how important it is to recognize and begin pro- multicultural integration processes (Modood, 2013). In addition, we were put in front of the importance of recognizing religion as an essential element of public life, in the same way as we consider ethnic and sexual orientation of one's identity. Any form of condemnation, absolutist approach, limiting the freedom of speech, will increase further more the overall hatred and anger of the Muslims (Parekh, 1989). The multiculturalists rather believe that we should broaden the concept of integration through the extension of multiculturalism in terms of racial dualism, and ethnic and religious pluralism (Modood, 1993).

This made way for the arrival of the New Labour government, which in the first term (1997-2001) was called the most multicultural of UK history. It is not essential to list the specific policies adopted by the Labor government, instead it is more important to use them to underline some policies proposed by the British multiculturalists: the abolition of the rule of the "primary purpose" immigration; the funding of religious schools, especially Islamic ones; the recognition, at a national level, of the Muslim council within government institutions using the same criteria as the other groups; the creation of a committee of inquiry and discussion on institutional racism with the prospect of proposing an appropriate program of intervention by central institutions; promoting and strengthening equality within local authorities; the recognition of Bengali communities, Afro-Caribbean and Pakistani special rights in education and employment fields; the introduction of religious affiliation in the census; the establishment of the day of remembrance.

Some of these policies were enacted after the introduction of religious hate crimes in 2003 and 2006, and those on racial equality and sexual equality in 2010. This has been defined by multiculturalists as "the era of British multiculturalism". At this point the question of national identity comes to be of great interest. For British multiculturalist its elaboration, especially British, has been in the lime light since the late seventies, when it became central and consistent in public speeches at an institutional level. Margaret Thatcher considered the essential maintenance of British identity, as did John Major who, was aware of the strong growth of social diversity, and hoped it was possible to maintain it. On the contrary, Tony Blair described the UK as a young country, in rapid evolution, both by population but also culturally, full of youthful creativity as a mosaic of cultures and colors, which placed ethnic and cultural diversity at the centre of everything. As recalled by Modood, there were several members of the British Government that used an inclusive language, such as the former Interior Minister Jack Straw (1997-2001) stressing that being British, meant being inclusive? Another important member of the Labour government, Robin Cook, uttered in a public speech that his favourite national dish was the "chicken tikka". Furthermore in 2010, the Commission on the future of multi-ethnic Britain (CMEB) published the national report, owing merit to the New Labor Government for the growing acceptance of multi-ethnicity at a national level and active verbs like "build", "develop" and "create" were central in the work of the CMEB (Uberoi, Modood, 2013).

3. Criticism on multiculturalism and the new intercultural model

The multiculturalist policies in Europe, and particularly in the United Kingdom, however, failed to produce their desired re-sults, only to lose public confidence and political and administrative institutions. Some European political leaders, such as former French president Sarkozy (2010), former British Prime Minister David Cameron (2012) and the current German Chancellor Angela Merkel (2014), ended up accusing the multicultural model responsible for not promoting integration.

Critics of multiculturalism moved from the observation that some of its assumptions have never evolved from the first phase elaboration and that, for this reason, the approach has always been less adequate to understand the evolution of social relations and, specifically in the redefinition of identity of individual and group membership.

Multiculturalism has revealed its limitations in the enhancement of individual differences, as well as in that of specific communities (blacks, whites, Muslims, Sikhs and other smaller communities), by considering it as the homogenization between individuals and communities. In fact, at least from a certain perspective and in the construction of the narration on diversity, there is no shortage of cases in which the men of individual communities have produced a distorted image of women, and others in which internal abuses were committed within the community itself by producing relational and social disconnection at the level of communication and participation in community and society, as well as creating cases of lack of interpersonal relationships between members of the same community. Such phenomena have produced situations of residential segregation, culminating in crucial episodes such as the racially motivated riots that broke out in 2001 in Bedford (London). Consequently, within the community the realization of the need to overcome the multicultural paradigm became evident. The transformation of minorities reached such a complex level that the national identity proved to be insufficient in the face of strict separation between the majority and the minority.

From Cantle's point of view, identities are becoming more and more mixed, and nowadays they continue to be implicated in fear and contempt, as if around them there is a hovering taboo. In fact, in the UK, the mixed communities, locally, are growing rapidly and the country has lost the distinction of the number of homogeneous communities (IPSOS MORI, 2013)

Therefore, it becomes of utmost importance the investment in a new model capable of identifying the identity according to the principles of exclusivity and importance. In the new model of intercultural education, the citizens should have the chance to come to terms with the changing world. Ted Cantle presented the case of a young girl of Pakistani origin who lives in Glasgow. She spent some of her teen years in Pakistan, and she now attends a Catholic school of confession, she is a Glasgow Rangers supporter and spends her free time hanging out with her friends. This is an example of a person who expresses different traits of his composite identity compared to that of the social context in which she lives. According to the multicultural approach, this young girl who had her primary school education in her homeland should stand only for what is her Muslim identity, giving up other behaviors related to everyday life in the Scottish city. On the contrary, this case is exemplary to understand the concept of plurality, which is now a central element in the identity of the new generations, and the limits of multiculturalism in addressing the differences that are created within the communities themselves.

On the contrary, the promotion and protection of particular identities has been entrusted, for far too long, to the representatives of the communities, through agreements that often proved not to be fully accepted within the group they belong to, and not always respectful of the internal differences. Some examples of these incompatibilities were eg. Combined weddings and the rejection of homosexuality. This has produced a form of "tick-box" (control and monitoring) that has annihilated the identities under one aspect and led to the creation of confined identities, which over time have originated and strengthened forms of segregation. One exemplary case is that of segregated communities. For a long time, the English supporters of the multicultural approach, have tried to spread the idea that the construction of such communities should not be linked to ethnic and cultural factors, but to economic and residential factors (Meer, Modood, 2012).

Conversely, interculturalists describe segregation as a "parallel life", in which individuals have no contact with others, contributing to the increase of fear and intolerance. The main point is to find ways of how to break down barriers to facilitate contacts between people and provide distinctive items. The task of interculturalism must be that of creating new shared spaces to reduce prejudices and fear in some of the important areas of social life, like in the workplace, in the context of interpersonal exchanges, locally and in the institutional framework. In this respect, public schools play a primary and essential role, and each must guarantee religious literacy in helping to understand the diversity from a religious perspective, laic and atheist, and provide the tools for the knowledge of different confessions. Moreover, the implementation of programs that promote interaction, contact and exchange between teachers, students, parents and other components belonging to these communities (Cantle, 2012) is in line with the programs and directives of the European Council for intercultural cities provided by the White Paper on intercultural dialogue, 2008.

4. *The multiculturalists Response to Interculturalist Criticism*

The multiculturalists recognize the merit of interculturalists of being able to better understand, from a theoretical standpoint, the factors of interaction between members of the communities, the importance of the theory of contact and cohesion between groups and, how the cooperation and the coming together in local areas foster communication.

However, these considerations had already emerged in the conclusions of the investigation carried out by the Commission for Social Cohesion (Community Cohesion, 2001), which verified that in relations of cooperation at a local level, contacts between the groups are essential for the achievement of social cohesion. Some limits of multiculturalists (which will be covered in the last paragraph) were not able to value the role of national citizenship, for example through citizenship ceremonies and education (Crick, 2003), not having regarded the importance of the normative claims of the native majority, and finally failing to recognize the role of multiple identities (Hall, 1998; Vertovec, 2007). The multiculturalists argue, however, that the criticisms of interculturalists have contributed to the improvement their approach.

The multiculturalists have long put the emphasis on multiple identities while balancing their interest for some particular identities (Modood, 1998). There are black people who hold different social and professional roles for which it is more the sense of belonging rather than the status conferred by the socio-economic position that interests them. Similarly, many women say they feel more important belonging to the female gender rather than a particular social position and Muslims mainly feel part of their own confessional community rather than other memberships (Modood, 2013). Citizens of the Islamic religion, as well as for many other minorities accused of being refractory to integration or to contain in itself the seeds of terrorism, "Englishness" is only a general representation of their being. In this case, membership of a religious community does not end in a multiple identity framework, as interculturalists believe (Cantle, 2012). To overcome the cases of stigma and marginalization, multiculturalists aim at the public recognition of ethnic and religious differences. For them, the fact that some ethnic minorities have had multiple identities sewn on to them and that they have to show them off, is interpreted as a sort of postmodern assimilation (Modood, 2016). In conclusion, although many have sanctioned the failure of multiculturalist theories, this approach has had some positive theoretical recognition. This has helped multicultural theories to grow and evolve, so much so that the proposals of the European and Quebec interculturalists are now conceived as a sensitive part, sometimes critical, but never alternative to the multicultural approach (Meer and Modood, 2015).

5. *The comparison between the two models: the Quebec case*

The socio-political context in which the two models of integration, multiculturalists and interculturalist, are developed and applied is crucial and therefore the two need to be compared. The case chosen is that of Quebec because it has been the subject of debate in recent years over the issue of recognition of collective identities and the application of pluralist policies.

The intercultural project in Quebec began in the seventies, when Canada decided to adopt the multicultural model of integration to represent all ethnic communities in the area. The questioning of the status of the two main cultures in Canada, Anglophone and Francophone, turned out to be against the latter and led to the implementation of the intercultural model, in contrast to that of the rest of the federation.

The definition of the new project was based on the idea of a cultural pluralism which could guarantee a mediated integration of newcomers and at the same time was able to provide some elements "ad hoc precedence" in defence of the cultural majority of Quebec (Bouchard, 2011). The existence of an established identity is one of the reasons that contributed to the development of a new model distinct from the rest of Canada. It also added that Canadian multiculturalism has been interpreted by the Quebec nationalist groups as a form of submission and non-recognition of the special status of Quebec citizenship as one of the two cultures that founded the federation and which make up the majority of the Canadian society (Taylor, 2012).

Raffaele Iacovino defines this duality of interest as a form of subtle balance capable of reconciling certain rules of cultural diversity on the one hand, with the constant need for national affirmation on the other, as a new intercultural model (2015). Comparing it with the model proposed by Ted Cantle, he explains how the project of Quebec embraces a sociological conception of citizenship, in terms of that the nation rather than the culture. In his opinion, what makes it special is the use of interculturalism to obtain the notion of a nation in which cultural identities have an established role.

Iacovino explains that in the absence of a clear national identity, and national response to internal demands, multiculturalism fills a void raising culture in public spaces and rejecting all cultures as central elements for collective self-determination. It may be added that the intercultural path in Quebec aimed to provide a differentiated notion of citizenship, as the majority felt like a minority within this province. An essential contribution on the subject is presented by Gerard Bouchard, who explains why the case of Quebec is far from the international conception of interculturalism.

The intercultural project in the province of Quebec was based on the defense of traditions and cultural values of the French-speaking majority from the possibility of engagement of cultural pluralism, following the increase and the geographic and cultural diversity of migration flows. In this regard, it should be noted the secession referendum in 1980, proposed by the PLQ Party, which called for its independence from Canada (Labelle, 2008). In the nineties, the government developed a regulatory framework for integration based on equality, so the cultural majority was invited to enter into a sort of "moral contract" with newcomers, based on mutual respect. They were trying to create foundations for a future cultural fusion, for coexistence both in public and private life. The participation of minorities in the public and cultural life of the country was guaranteed, as long as they learnt French, and contemporarily, the cultural majority was required to provide all necessary resources to achieve their full integration. The Quebec intercultural model relies thus on two fundamental pillars that distinguish it from other models: the first defines the integration guidelines and can be called macro-social while the second is, on the other hand, micro-social and refers to the relationships that are created locally in the newspaper, in the community and in public institutions such as schools, hospitals, workplaces.

6. The intercultural paradigm also has some distinctive features.

The first is diversity: diversity awareness is strong in the French speaking part of Quebec, but also in other situations such as in the United States, Sweden, Australia and India. The premise that accompanies us in the analysis must be the awareness of nations which are composed of a collection of individuals, ethnic and cultural groups, where they are on an equal treatment plan, and receive the same protection by the laws of each state. The peculiarity is that the recognition does not occur on cultural bases. The paradigm of diversity guarantees all citizens to express themselves freely without restriction, except when required by law.

The second distinctive element is homogeneity and is based on the recognition of dignity and the protection. Recognition is guaranteed both ethnically and culturally in a public domain and in some cases even in a private one. This approach is present in states like France, Italy, Japan and Russia.

The third distinctive element is multi-polarity. Particular reference is made to those societies in which there are multiple groups on the same national territory. Official recognition can be protected, as in the case of multi-national states like Bolivia, Malaysia, Belgium, Switzerland and Northern Ireland.

The fourth element of the intercultural paradigm is that of duality. Diversity and recognition are conceived in a dual relation between minority and majority cultures. Every culture is designed and identified by its historical elements of each community. Some of the features of the collective recognition of a culture are language, traditions, memories and institutions. In these societies, minorities can acquire a priority status compared to that of the majority, as what happened with the indigenous majority in Quebec. Bouchard believes that the most important cultures are those that belong to the majority culture and minority cultures can help to change them and in some cases completely erase diversity.

The paradigm of duality appears as a dichotomous form between majority and minority, and characterises most western countries in the persistent coexistence of them and us. This has produced anxiety in the cultural majority, who feel threatened by the growing demands of recognition from minorities. The situation of "culture shock" (Consorti, 2013) is also due to migration flows and in particular to growth in the last decade of Islamic fundamentalism in many developed countries. In the province of Quebec, the state of shock and the resulting anxieties is linked to the fact that the French-speaking majority constitute a minority in the North American region (less than 2% of the total population), but you can say that the ethnic minority is the majority within the society. The local majority accuse the minority of not wanting to integrate, while the latter are having to live in a state of uncertainty as to their integration. In Bouchard's opinion, the majority is faced with a real threat because of its diversity and proves unable to face the fears and the real problems that are related primarily to globalization, while the Central government has not been able to manage these situations of diversity.

The growing presence of immigrants in the Montreal area, has caused disturbing attitudes, some of which are justified by the weakness of the French-speaking majority which fears losing the values of its identity. Bouchard defines these attitudes rather intolerant and associated to a regime of inequality, which one would call artificial, between citizens. On the contrary, they could be mere theoretical or imaginary constructions, xenophobia, social exclusion and discrimination, all recurring in the history of Western societies. Bouchard is convinced that the public debate must not remain connected only to a perspective of duality, which seems to be a dead end, worsened by trends that consider the two components fixed and unchanging, rather than layered and multi-faceted.

Interculturalism guarantees all citizens equal recognition and responsibility in building intercultural relations to overcome conflicts and incompatibilities in institutional and domestic spheres to the community resorting to the courts as a final solution. Every citizen is asked to play a part in the evolution of relations between members of society. Bouchard identifies four possible interventions by the main participants (the state, the justice system, civic organizations and associations, individuals and groups) in the workplace and in private life. In all cases, it assumes the existence of a culture ready for dialogue, negotiation and exchange. In particular, the Bouchard-Taylor commission noticed the presence of a culture that is open and ready to cooperate in the Province of Quebec in the health system, education and in the metropolitan areas, where hundreds of people are meant to contribute and accelerate social and economic integration. Another important contribution was that of the municipal councils, which adopted appropriate policies to facilitate communication and the mutual recognition between the members of society.

Conclusions

The aim of the research done in this article is to analyze the debate between multiculturalism and interculturalism, about the challenges of growing diversity in the UK, comparing them with other realities of acceptance and integration adopted in different countries. We have identified that both models reflect a pluralistic framework, putting emphasis on public recognition of collective identities which are essential for the construction of modern citizenship. Both models reject a regulatory assimilations framework, considering it as being morally excessive and in which the culture of the majority has the task of structuring all of the political and social regulatory frameworks. The rejection of a culture bound to the private interests of a particular group, community or society is made by respecting the smaller groups and minorities that are found within a given society. The lines of consensus seem to prevail in the two models, and yet, here we also found some conceptual differences between the two models. In particular, we focused on the social and political context within which the models are developed and implemented. The situation of foreign communities that are located in the United Kingdom and the key concepts of the debates that have produced positions and oppositions between the two models was analyzed. Considering the heterogeneity of the foreign communities in British territory and their ethnic, cultural and religious diversity, the comparison with the intercultural model in Quebec was suggested, because of intercultural policies in this country. The social and political context in which the intercultural model of Quebec is processed, rather than presenting itself as the ideal model of integration and citizenship, could be defined as a national defense project of the Francophone culture against the fears and the anxieties of the minority of Quebec created by the implementation of the multicultural model in the Canadian federation. The national project for integration in Quebec, has had the goal to deal with the culture of the indigenous majority (Iacovino, 2015) rather than the defense of ethnic minorities. This is also demonstrated in the law of 1980, in which the model recognized the importance of the "Culture of divergence" (Government of Quebec, 1981), which were formulated as initiatives to accelerate the integration of ethnic minorities and cultural in a period of high tension after the secession referendum in 1980. Through the contributions of the major interculturalists scholars, we found confirmation that the intercultural model in Quebec is a different and very exceptional case, which cannot be taken as an example for other intercultural models. However, multiculturalism and interculturalism both recognize that our societies are facing globalization and consequently social diversification. Both approaches also highlight the urgent need to implement a regulatory framework able to recognize some forms of collective identities on a public and institutional level with the aim to achieve a collective citizenship. We can detect, therefore, a two-way rejection of models that are based on principles of belonging and cultural homogeneity. According to us, they seem more connected with certain principles of confidentiality and keeping the interests of the community stronger. Both models share the idea of recognition of identity within a liberal and pluralistic framework, the creation of a set of rules that target the recognition of forms of collective identities essential for citizenship without the majority community resulting to be predominant.

We may add that one of the fundamental elements of the debate between the two schools of thought is related to the analysis of pluralistic policies to be implemented to give importance to the collective identity. Cantle shows that equality and recognition, according to the notion of the multiculturalists, are no longer sufficient to meet the complexity of today's social context. He says that multiculturalism has long compared the recognition of identity with the traditional concepts of race, ethnicity and culture, without considering the differentiating factors of our societies, and failing to guarantee the need for representation of communities and creating non effective integration strategies.

According to Cantle, the supporters of multiculturalism would consider national identity an essential element of citizenship, but its implementation would require the recognition and understanding of different cultures, avoiding assimilations tendencies. In Modood's opinion, current societies are complex and he is convinced that any form of public recognition is illusory, and furthermore, it goes into a post-modern assimilations direction, if it does not go through this complex identity first. One might conclude that for Modood that Cantle's model, based on a liberal vision that supports a general recognition of the collective identity in the private area, focused on so-called "principles of social cohesion of cultures", cannot deal with specific cases of social exclusion and proves unconvincing.

Bibliographic Index

- ANTONSICH M. (2012), Interculturalism versus Multiculturalism - The Cantle-Modood debate, in «Ethnicities», 0, 0, pp. 1-24.
- (2014), Living together in diversity. A Journey from scholarly views to people's voices and back, in «Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana», XIII, 7, pp. 317-337.
- BROWN W. (2009), *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- BOUCHARD G. (2011), What is Interculturalism?, in «McGill Law Journal», LVI, 2, pp. 435-468.
- CAMERON D. (2011), PM's Speech at Munich Security Conference, 5 febbraio.
- CANTLE T. (2001), *The Cantle Report of the Independent Community Cohesion Review Team*, London, Home Office.
- (2008) *Community Cohesion. A New Framework for Race and Diversity*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- (2012), *Interculturalism: The new era of cohesion and diversity*, Basingstoke-New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- (2015), *Implementing Intercultural Policies*, in Zapata-Barrero R., a cura di, *Interculturalism in Cities*, Stockport, Elgar, pp. 76-94.
- COHEN-EMERIQUE M., ROTHBERG A., *Il metodo degli shock culturali. Manuale di formazione per il lavoro sociale e umanitario*, Milano, Francoangeli, 2016.
- CONSORTI P. (2013), «Hanno ragione tutti!». Profili di gestione dei conflitti interculturali ed interreligiosi, in Id., Valdambriani A., a cura di, *Gestire i conflitti interculturali ed interreligiosi. Approcci a confronto*, Pisa, Pisa University Press, pp. 9-30.
- CRICK B. (2003), *Advisory Group on Life in the UK, Interim Report*, London, HMSO.
- GOODHART D. (2013), *The British Dream*, London, Atlantic Books. HAGE G. (2000), *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multi-cultural Society*, London, Routledge.
- HALL S. (1988), *New ethnicities*, in Mercer K., a cura di, *Black Film, British Cinema*, London, Institute of Contemporary Arts/BFI/ICA Documents 7.
- IACOVINO R. (2015), Commentary: interculturalism vs multiculturalism - How can we live together in diversity, in «Ethnicities», 0, 0, pp. 20-24.
- MODOOD T. (1993), Muslim Views on Religious Identity and Racial Equality, in «New Community», XIX, 3, pp. 513-519.
- (1994), Establishment, Multiculturalism and British Citizenship, in «Political Quarterly», LXV, 1, pp. 53-73.
- (1998) Multiculturalism, Secularism and the State, in «Critical Review of International, Social and Political Philosophy», I, 3, pp. 79-97.
- (2005), *Multicultural Politics: Racism, Ethnicity and Muslims in Britain*, Minneapolis-Edimburgo, University of Minnesota Press-University of Edinburgh Press.

- (2007; 20132), *Multiculturalism: A civil Idea*, Cambridge, Polity Press. — (2016), On being a public intellectual, a Muslim and a mul-ticulturalist, interviewed by Simon Thompson, in «Renewal», XXIV, 2, pp. 90-95. —, MEER N., (2012), Assessing the Divergences on Our Reading of Inter- culturalism and Multiculturalism, in «Journal of Intercultural Studies»,XXXII, 2, pp. 233-244.
- MEER N., MODOOD T. (2012a), How does Interculturalism con-trast whith multiculturalism?, in «Journal of Intercultural Studies», XXXIII, 2, pp.175-196.
- , — (2012b), Interculturalism, multiculturalism or both?. in «Political Insight», III, 1, pp. 30-33.
- , — (2015), Religious pluralism in the United States and Britain: Its im- plications for Muslims and nationhood, in «Social Compass», LXII, 4, pp. 526-540.
- ,—, ZAPPATA-BARRERO R. (2016), *Interculturalism and Mul-ticultura- lism*, Edimburgh, Edimburgh University Press.
- LABELLE M. (2008), De la culture publique commune à la citoyen-neté : ancrages historiques et enjeux actuels, in Gervais S., Karmis D., La- moureux D., Laval, a cura di, *Du tricoté serré au métissé serré? La culture publique commune au Québec en débats*, Québec, Les Presss de l'Université Laval, pp. 19-43.
- PAREKH B. (1989), Between holy text and moral void, in «New Sta-tesman and Society», 24 marzo.
- TAYLOR Ch. (2012), Interculturalism or multiculturalism?, in «Phi-losophy and Social Criticism», XXXVIII, 4-5, pp. 413-423.
- UBEROI V., MODOOD T. (2013), Has Multiculturalism Retreated in Brit- ain?, in «Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture», pp. 129-142.
- VERTOVEC S. (2007), Super-diversity and its implications, in «Ethnic and Radical Studies», XXX, 6, pp. 1024-1054.