



## INTERCULTURAL CITIES

### Bridging the equality, diversity and inclusion agendas

#### Executive Summary

Europe is at crossroads in relation to diversity and migrant inclusion policies. An economic downturn and a string of terrorist attacks have fuelled authoritarian populism. Many European states are adopting an “internal security” perspective to handling the arrival of migrants and refugees, sometimes undermining the human rights standards that they have committed to. Hate speech against migrants and minorities, particularly Muslims, are rife on political podiums and social media. Political rhetoric designed to mobilise voters for the defence of a fixed national identity defined by ethnicity and culture, is drowning more inclusive discourses that recognise diversity as a fact in today’s globalised societies and that call for valuing cultural pluralism as a factor of societal development and innovation.

This bleak picture is somewhat softened when considering the local level. Many cities across Europe have shown remarkable solidarity towards migrants and refugees. The 120 cities engaged in the Intercultural cities programme of the Council of Europe, but also many others, are putting in place diversity and integration policies which promote welcoming, equality and inclusion. A range of studies have demonstrated that cities which adopt inclusive integration policies gave better outcomes in terms of residents’ perceptions of cohesion, trust in the administration, safety, quality of services, welfare, good governance and economic growth. How can national-level policies also benefit from a shift in a more inclusive direction, in co-operation and with cities?

In order to encourage such a shift, it is important to coin a “unifying theory” of equality, diversity and inclusion as policy goals, which can help address the full range of diversity challenges, and maximise the impact of policy and grassroots action in the field of equality. Such a “theory” should be based on the three guiding principles of Equality, Diversity Advantage and Intercultural Interaction. These principles help design a comprehensive approach to diversity and inclusion, and identify the specific role of national and local authorities. These principles are at the core of the Intercultural integration approach advocated by the Council of Europe, and could also be successfully applied to other diversity-related policy areas with which interculturalism already intersect, such as human rights implementation, anti-discrimination, gender equality, and equality with regard to sexual orientation.

This paper will examine the way in which Intercultural integration as a policy approach can help address a range of societal challenges related to equality, inclusion and cohesion. It takes as a starting point the normative framework and the 10-year experience of the Intercultural cities working with guidance and support by the Council of Europe to translate Intercultural integration into practice. In the past decade, Intercultural integration has underlined the centrality of the City as both the container and driver of social change. However, the paper takes a new step in more closely defining the role of the City within a web of relationships with other polities at local, national and supra-national levels. It proposes an aspiration to expand the understanding and practical application of the concept of ‘urban citizenship’ over the coming years.

# 1. Introduction

## a. What is “Intercultural integration?”

Intercultural integration is a policy framework for achieving cohesion, equality and development in culturally diverse societies. The underlying principles of intercultural integration are equal respect and dignity for all as individuals entitled to rights, freedom and responsibilities, and the understanding that building inclusive societies requires openness to change from both the majority and minorities<sup>1</sup>.

Intercultural integration policies are based on individual rights and include actions to ensure effective anti-discrimination. Such policies can work optimally only if the society as a whole is prepared to embrace the equal dignity of cultures and the change driven by daily intercultural interaction. The key operational elements of Intercultural integration are: power sharing (including people of different cultural backgrounds in different roles in institutions and governing structures); fostering cultural mixing and interaction in public institutions and the public space; and making institutions culturally competent and receptive to innovation through diverse inputs, as well as resilient to cultural conflict, prejudice and discrimination.

Intercultural integration underscores the delicate balance between the three foundational European values – Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law. Human rights are those fundamental civil, political, economic and social rights and freedom that are inherent to every person and that should be enjoyed without discrimination. By ratifying the European Convention on Human Rights, European States accept to give it precedence over national legislation and practice, and to apply it to every person present on their territory. Democracy is immutably necessary for the exercise of Human rights, because it is the mechanism through which a deliberation is carried out, and a collective decision is made about the nature and extent of rights, beyond any secular or sacred power’s will. The rule of law, and particularly constitutionalism, lays down the rules and boundaries for public powers in the exercise of both Human Rights and Democracy.

It is in the interplay between these three values that the unique European model of managing diversity – both historic and recent – was born and all three are needed in order to ensure its sustainability. Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law thus represent universal principles underpinning policies of inclusion of migrants and their descendants in European societies by establishing the moral equality of human beings and abolishing any hierarchy of cultures.

The intercultural integration approach offers guidelines to translate these values into policy adapted to diverse societies, at the local, but also eventually at the national level.

The Intercultural integration approach is based on the simultaneous application of three principles, formulated for the first time as an intercultural triptych by Carlos Gimenez<sup>2</sup>:

- *Equality*: public authorities that adopt the Intercultural integration approach, commit to ensuring equality and non-discrimination in all their actions – towards their own workforce, in their relations with partners and suppliers, including civil society organisations and enterprises. Focusing on equality only can, however, exacerbate identity politics and undermine solidarity and cohesion. Efforts to extend the equality message not only to minorities but also to the “majority”, and to direct policies and resources to everyone, based on need and merit, combat the negative effects of identity politics.
- *Diversity*: it is essential to undertake positive action to preserve diversity as an intrinsic feature of human communities, and a source of resilience, vitality and innovation. Interculturalism

---

<sup>1</sup> Wood, Phil (Ed.) (2009). *Intercultural Cities: Towards a model for Intercultural Integration*, Council of Europe Publishing, France

<sup>2</sup> Gimenez, C. (2003). *Pluralismo, Multiculturalismo E Interculturalidad, Propuesta de clarificación y apuntes educativo*, en Publicado en la Revista Educación y Futuro: Revista de Investigación Aplicada y Experiencias Educativas no8 (págs. 9-26). Editorial CES Don Bosco-EDEBE

understands that explicitly recognising diversity of individuals and groups is a pre-condition to normalising it. However, focusing on diversity only can, as in multiculturalism, undermine the sense of shared values and inhibit building bridges between diverse groups in society.

- *Interaction*: this is the cornerstone of the urban pedagogy of Intercultural integration. Supported by the contact theory<sup>3</sup>, interaction is about creating conditions for positive and constructive everyday encounters across cultural as well as gender, sexual identity, age, socio-economic status etc. differences. However, creating mixed neighbourhoods, schools, public spaces, and organisations, can be counterproductive without measures to ensure equality, and to embrace and protect diversity which can be fragile.

The intercultural “art of mixing” is about finding the right dosage of these three key ingredients in each specific policy field and situation, by applying knowledge, good will and common sense, and particularly deep humility and respect for fellow citizens.

Besides, Interculturalism opposes cultural determinism: it postulates that people have multiple identities relating to origin, gender, age, family situation, profession, social status, place of residence etc., and recognises that multiple identities contributes to shaping the diversity advantage by empowering harmonious individuals and communities. Intercultural policies help (re)balance identities by offering genuine opportunities for people to develop multiple identities and for organisations to benefit from the creative potential of diversity.

## 2. How the key principles of intercultural integration bridge the diversity, equality and inclusion agendas

### a. Equality in the Intercultural integration context

In 2008 the Council of Europe White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue<sup>4</sup> defined the objective of intercultural dialogue as learning to live together peacefully and constructively in a multicultural world and to develop a sense of community and belonging. The White Paper aspired to a condition of ‘broad-mindedness’ founded on the twin principles of freedom and non-discrimination. This called for a citizenry capable of reflecting upon life from both their own, and from others’ perspectives, and a particular form of democratic sphere, defined by:

- egalitarian individualism (where humankind is regarded as belonging to a single moral realm),
- reciprocal recognition (in which this status of equal worth is recognised by all), and
- impartial treatment (where all claims arising are subject to rules that all can share).

This demarcated the Intercultural approach from preceding models for managing cultural diversity. Unlike assimilation, it recognises that public authorities must be impartial, rather than accepting a majority ethos only, if communalist tensions are to be avoided. Unlike multiculturalism, however, it vindicates a shared and common core of values which leaves no room for moral relativism.

Moreover, Intercultural integration embraces the principle of cultural reciprocity and symmetry against cultural supremacy. And this principle remains distinct from what might be variously characterised as ‘civic integrationism’ or ‘welfare chauvinism’. In these cases, equality has been portrayed as a finite quality, limited to those who, by accident of birth, may find themselves in a privileged group.

So what kind of equality can legitimately be sought? ‘*Equality of opportunity*’ has been criticised as fostering only individual social mobility rather than overall social justice. It has done little to help those

---

<sup>3</sup> Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge/Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley

<sup>4</sup> See [http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/policy\\_EN.asp](http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/intercultural/policy_EN.asp)

confined to the ghettos of despair. In this respect, instruments like the Revised European Social Charter, based on principles such as dignity, autonomy, equality and solidarity, are particularly relevant to reattach the concept of social justice to the context of diverse communities.

Moreover, the European social model, proposed by the *New Strategy for Social Cohesion*<sup>5</sup>, seeks to secure a more profound equality of life chances by recognising that legal protection of rights has to be accompanied by determined social policy measures to ensure that everyone in practice has access to their rights<sup>6</sup>. Formal equality is not always sufficient because it can result in indirect discrimination when states, without an objective and reasonable justification, fail to treat differently persons whose situations are significantly different. Over and above the principle of non-discrimination, states are thus also encouraged to take positive-action measures to redress the inequalities experienced by members of minority communities, a vital step in a diverse society. In order to avoid a policy of forced assimilation, it may be necessary to take, within certain limits, practical measures to accommodate for diversity take into account the fact that diversity of situations requires a variety of approaches and norms.

In terms of governance of anti-discrimination, actors of Intercultural integration such as Intercultural cities are advised to set up generalist anti-discrimination structures which are able to understand and deal with discrimination on any ground included in Protocol 12 of the European Convention of Human Rights, support victims, and detect, substantiate and suggest remedies to systemic discrimination. They are also required to foster the diversity competence of public and elected officials – covering all types of diversity, including what may be specific to a particular city (eg traditional minorities and languages). Finally, cities should dispense an urban pedagogy of human rights, intercultural dialogue & multiple identities, and prevention of multiple discrimination, via official public discourse, non-formal education, partnerships with NGOs, social media and anti-rumour strategies. They are also invited to design intersectional activities, involving organisations with different anti-discrimination foci, to help raise awareness of multiple and compounded discrimination, and design effective strategies which create synergies between various advocacy organisations.<sup>7</sup>

## b. Diversity in the Intercultural integration context

In its [Thematic commentary no. 4 on the scope of application of CoE Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities \(FCNM\)](#), the Advisory Committee recalls that the promotion of tolerance and openness towards diversity in society is essential for the development and implementation of successful integration strategies, and that openness and tolerance in society can only be genuine if they are not limited to certain predefined groups but embrace everyone, because full equality cannot be effectively achieved when diversity as such is perceived negatively.

The intercultural integration approach is founded on the idea that whilst humans need stability and predictability to survive, they need change and difference to thrive, adapt to change and show resilience to crises. It is easy to understand that individuals and groups can adopt a mind-set which sees change and difference as a challenge, or even a threat, to an established lifestyle or state of affairs. But history also

---

<sup>5</sup> *New Strategy and Council of Europe Action Plan for Social Cohesion*, approved by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 7 July 2010.

<sup>6</sup> For instance, the Revised European Social Charter and the European Convention on the Legal Status of Migrant Workers stress that migrant workers and their families should be entitled to treatment no less favourable than signatory-state nationals in a range of social and economic contexts.

<sup>7</sup> It should also be recognised that in the decade since ICC was founded, material inequality has continued to follow a long-term increasing trend. In most countries, the gap between rich and poor is at its highest level in at least 30 years. Today, in OECD countries, the richest 10% of the population earn 9.6 times the income of the poorest 10%. In the 1980s, this ratio stood at 7:1 rising to 8:1 in the 1990s and 9:1 in the 2000s. . But beyond this it should also be acknowledged that inequality is not only a threat to economic and social rights, but it threatens the realisation of all forms of human rights everywhere. See: Radhika Balakrishnan & James Heintz (2015) *How inequality threatens all human rights*.

<https://www.opendemocracy.net/openglobalrights/radhika-balakrishnan-james-heintz/how-inequality-threatens-all-human-rights>

throws up many examples of how stasis and insularity can be of equal threat to well-being: there is considerable scientific and empirical research to suggest that entities which retain an excess of homogeneity are more vulnerable to threats such as disease or economic downturn; whilst more heterogeneous groups of people are more likely to adapt and find unconventional solutions to the problems which beset them<sup>8</sup>. This has come to be known as the Diversity Advantage, and requires not only the presence of diversity/difference within the corps of the citizenry, but also specific policies and strategies that enable diverse contributions to shape the cultural, economic and social fabric, and manage inevitable conflicts which may threaten community cohesion.

### c. Interaction in the Intercultural integration context

This third principle of interaction within the city is what gives Intercultural integration its distinctive value.

There is overwhelming evidence to prove that the more contact (direct and indirect) that people of different backgrounds and lifestyles have with each other, the less likely they are to think and behave in prejudicial ways. With 713 independent samples from 515 studies, a meta-analysis test of intergroup contact theory found the evidence was compelling.<sup>9</sup> The evidence also vindicates Allport's<sup>10</sup> original claim that the conditions are important—notably equality between participants and recognition by each other of their particular cultural/identity backgrounds. These conditions need to be present also in policies for intercultural mixing and interaction.

The importance of interaction has been pointed out by the Advisory Committee of the Council of Europe's Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM) that recalled that Article 6 calls for "deliberate efforts to foster a climate of mutual respect, understanding and co-operation where persons belonging to national minorities are recognised as integral elements of society, who effectively enjoy equal access to rights and resources, while being provided with opportunities for social interaction and inclusion across difference"<sup>11</sup>. Whilst rights are conferred upon individuals by supranational and national entities - and generally enforced by them too - it is however in the daily enactment - or infringement - of these rights that lives and societies are formed. And much of this is determined through the quality of interactions and associations - between individuals, groups and institutions.

Active engagement across difference, rather than benign indifference is the necessary building block of a thriving society. Thus disputatious contact is preferable to no contact at all - on condition that there is underlying and long-term investment in the mediational competences and conditions which strive towards resolution. Such an explicit commitment over an extended period has created the conditions for policy innovation within intercultural cities, with perhaps the best example being the Anti-Rumours methodology devised in Barcelona and endorsed and promoted by the Council of Europe and Intercultural cities in Europe and beyond<sup>12</sup>.

---

<sup>8</sup> Kseniya Khovanova-Rubicondo & Dino Pinelli (2012) *Evidence of the Economic and Social Advantages of Intercultural Cities Approach: a Meta-analytic assessment*. Council of Europe.

Page, S. E. (2008). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton University Press.

<sup>9</sup> Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). *A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory*. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 90(5), 751.

<sup>10</sup> Gordon Allport was a psychologist and one of the founders of personality psychology.

<sup>11</sup> See : [Thematic commentary no. 4 on the scope of application of CoE Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities \(FCNM\)](#)

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.coe.int/en/web/interculturalcities/anti-rumours>

#### d. The role of Intercultural Cities as agents of Intercultural integration in the coming decade

In practice, in order to bridge the diversity, equality and inclusion agendas, Intercultural cities need to consolidate their diversity and equality strategies and offices, and enable all policy actors to learn about, and be able to address, cross-cutting and intersectional issues.

They need to strengthen their capacity to promote and protect Human Rights, to engage meaningfully with civil society groups across identity politics divides, and develop together with them an inclusive narrative. This narrative may be based on the concept of the Right to the City – which includes a pluralistic urban “we”-culture, equal access to rights and opportunities for political participation for all residents, regardless of legal status and length of stay. Intercultural cities should foster solidarity based on shared values and sense of belonging to the local community. These shared values should be explicitly referred to in public debate, and enshrined in charters or similar to make them accessible to all, including newcomers. Cities should help citizens acquire a sophisticated understanding of the interplay between universal human rights, and rights which stem from diversity of faiths and languages, and support bridge-builders (individuals, organisations and actions) which help increase interaction and trust across diversities.

### 3. Emerging issues for Intercultural integration to address

The last decade has been a period of intense and unsettling change, characterised particularly by its interconnectivity around the world. Globalisation is the shorthand used for this but it has many and various manifestations. On the positive side many people around the world have been lifted out of poverty and oppression by a combination of advances in health, education, technology and economics. But set against this, there have been multiple factors that are putting pressure on social cohesion and welfare, and namely:

- Climate change and biodiversity loss, combined with growing land and resource competition, which sometimes sparks conflict and involuntary migration;
- A rebalancing of the global economy, seeing the rise of some regions and the relative decline of others in terms of wealth and market share, combined with demographic shifts that is causing alarm and the disruption of familiar patterns, in the societies of the Global North;
- A period of neoliberal economics that has seen the diminishing or the dismantling of traditional welfare states, combined with the massive loss of regular industrial and service sectors jobs and their replacement with casual and low skill work;
- The financial crash, and the ensuing austerity and the roll-back from principles of free trade, that may have signalled the high water mark of neoliberalism, but it has exacerbated rather than reversed the trends in economic and spatial inequality across the Global North;
- The digital revolution that is changing the nature of work, entrepreneurship, employment as well as media and democracy by weakening traditional intermediaries and enabling a direct relationship between product/service/information/political leadership providers and the public

This has led to harsh and polarised debates about immigration in many countries whilst, at the level of the city street in a range of countries there has been a notable increase in the level of ethnically-motivated violence, hate-speech and discrimination.

It is important, in this context, to celebrate the leadership that many Mayors and city officials in intercultural cities play in offering a positive vision of their cities as open, inclusive and equitable, cities that



are prepared to take a responsibility for those in need of support in times of crisis, show solidarity, but also recognise and enjoy the benefits that diversity brings to the community in the long run. In this complex context, some intercultural cities are considering expanding the scope of their intercultural strategies to address some specific issues and challenges which gained prominence in the past decade.

## a. Human Rights

What is the issue?

The White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue was founded upon the universal principles of human rights (HR) because they were seen as providing the framework for a culture of tolerance. Recognition of the values and principles upheld by the Council of Europe is the necessary condition for intercultural dialogue. They guarantee the principle of non-domination and are thus essential for ensuring that dialogue is governed by the force of argument rather than the argument of force. The case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and the practice of monitoring bodies such as the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance or the Advisory Committee of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities provide examples of how such balance can be achieved in practice.

For instance, ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic traditions cannot be invoked to prevent individuals from exercising their basic rights or from participating in society. This is particularly important regarding the prohibition of gender-based, sexual orientation or other forms of discrimination, the rights and interests of children and young people, and the freedom to practise or not to practise a particular religion. Practices amounting to human rights abuses, such as forced marriages, so-called 'honour crimes' or genital mutilations, can never be justified. Equally, the rules of a—real or imagined— 'dominant culture' cannot be used to justify discrimination, hate speech or other manifestations of racism.

Among the most relevant provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights are the rights to freedom of thought and expression, to freedom of religion, to free assembly and association, as well as the rights to privacy and family life.

When it comes to intercultural dialogue, a focus inevitably falls on freedom of expression, which is clearly a *conditio sine qua non* of participation. Yet, freedom of expression is not absolute; its exercise comes with duties and responsibilities. For instance, 'Hate speech' has been an increasing concern for the European Court of Human Rights in recent years, and in its jurisprudence the Court has sought to draw the boundary, case by case, beyond which rights to freedom of expression are forfeited. At the same time, the European Court of Human Rights has set a high bar against restrictions on free expression, indicating that it is not enough to justify curbs that such expression should 'offend, shock or disturb'. This means, for example, a certain licence to criticise another's religion (as a system of ideas which they can choose to embrace).

Moreover, the rights portfolio in the Council of Europe framework also includes, for example, the socio-economic rights arising from the European Social Charter, which addresses many of the issues which bear particularly heavily on members of minorities (access to employment, education, social protection, health and housing), and the cultural rights identified in various Charters and Conventions. These rights, which also take in the right of everyone to participate in cultural life affirmed in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), may not provide a detailed blueprint for intercultural dialogue but do offer a common legal basis.

What is the Intercultural integration perspective on the issue?

There is sometimes assumed to be a disjuncture between an adherence to UHR and the 'cultural recognition' that underpins interculturalism. This is mistaken but understandable. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was drafted in 1948, in the shadow of World War II and the Holocaust: the

Declaration preferred to highlight “the inherent dignity” and the “equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family”, regardless of their cultural belonging.

Charles Taylor argues that one of the main reasons individuals are denied human rights is because they are discriminated against due to their cultural specificities, or because the state refuses to recognise them, thus the two are intimately linked.<sup>13</sup> People also have a right to be different. It can be said that the United Nations’ 1993 *Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National, Ethnic, Religious or Linguistic Minorities*; and the Council of Europe’s *Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, and its *Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* (both ratified in 1998), came out of this mode of thinking.

But these conventions intentionally use the language not of ‘community’ rights but of the *individual* rights attaching to ‘persons belonging to’ minority communities. So the distinction is not individual v group rights; it is between those rights attaching to *individuals in abstracto* and those rights attaching to individuals affiliated to particular communities. So long as clarity is maintained about this normative foundation of ICC, ‘accommodation’ is not a problem. As the White Paper stated, where cultural ‘traditions’ are advanced which are in conflict with universal norms (for example Female Genital Mutilation) universal norms must prevail. However, this prevalence is not automatic: interactive processes, based on respectful dialogue, should always accompany an “understanding and adhesion process” to such norms.

What is the added value of the Intercultural integration approach?

In a 1958 speech at the United Nations, Eleanor Roosevelt took stock of the progress that UHR had made since the proclamation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ten years before. Ms Roosevelt had chaired the UN committee that drafted the Universal Declaration. When asked to define how the progress of human rights should be measured, she answered:

*Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any maps of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighbourhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, farm, or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world.*

If UHR can be said to have fallen short of its original aspirations in any area, it is sure this. Only the law and legal institutions can confer rights and enforce obligations. On the other hand, neither rights nor laws alone can motivate people to care for, and seek reciprocal relationships, with others in their daily lives. Something more is needed.

Following a recent and very extensive research study of public attitudes, conducted in numerous countries, into ‘Human Rights, Global Ethics and the Ordinary Virtues’<sup>14</sup>, the author concurs with Mrs Roosevelt. He argues that the language of UHR, whilst of enduring necessity at the international level, is – when applied to the local realities of the majority of the world’s population – not only of little meaning, but may even be contributing to the very opposite of what it seeks to achieve.

Taking the case of accommodating refugees, he says that whilst ordinary people may hold individual and communal values of hospitality, if they feel they are being obliged to show hospitality by the imposition of UHR values by an over-weening external authority, they are more likely to turn inwards and reject both the values and the stranger. As evidence he cites the ease with which Canada has managed to welcome

---

<sup>13</sup> Charles Taylor (1997). *The politics of recognition*. New contexts of Canadian criticism, 98.

<sup>14</sup> Ignatieff, Michael (forthcoming) *The Ordinary Virtues: Moral Order in a Divided World*. Harvard University Press



refugees by making it a human transaction between families and communities<sup>15</sup>, compared with the backlash Europe has brought upon itself, through imposing UHR and quotas from above.

In this context, it seems that one Intercultural integration's most important features has been its ability to take high-level abstract ideals and pragmatically translate them into actions that make sense at the quotidian level to ordinary people. At this time, when refugee "crises" and populist backlashes threaten to roll back seven decades of progress on human rights, there may be a special mediating role to be played by Intercultural cities' extensive and experienced network.

When the national policies do not offer effective tools to address civic inclusion of foreign citizens, cities can innovate and test practices that – when successful - may even provoke changes in legislation including at state level. The local level is already testing new practices in the field of participatory democracy that enable foreign residents to participate in the political debate and, to some extent, even in political decision making.

For instance, some cities have opened up to the possibility of granting their own form of citizenship sometimes even to undocumented migrants. This "urban citizenship" derives directly from the residence as a fact, and from the relation with the territory.

Cities are also on the frontline for dealing with the situation of rejected asylum seekers or economic migrants who do not comply (or not anymore) with the legal and administrative conditions of entry and/or stay in the host country. Undocumented migrants are human beings that are in principles entitled to the protection of the European Convention of Human Rights, but that are in actual facts invisible at State level, without any legal recognition, despite being physically present on the territory.

Again, intercultural and inclusive cities have scope and room for manoeuvre to innovate and respond to pressing needs, and they are doing so by guaranteeing universal access to municipal public services – particularly health care - and by promoting access to the other services. Moreover, cities can provide assistance and encourage the regularisation of people living in the municipality in irregular situation, and stimulate dialogue and debate to promote amendments to (national) legislation to achieve a kind of recognition for the situation of undocumented migrants.

## b. Anti-discrimination

What is the issue?

Discrimination occurs either when people are treated less favourably than other people that are in a comparable situation only because they belong, or are perceived to belong to a certain group or category of people; or because people in different situations are subject to standardised norms that do not take into account their specific situation.

People may be discriminated against because of their age, disability, ethnicity, origin, political belief, race, religion, sex or gender, sexual orientation, language, culture and on many other grounds. Discrimination, which is often the result of prejudices people hold, makes people powerless, impedes them from becoming active citizens, prevents them from developing their skills and, in many situations, from accessing work, health services, education or accommodation.

On the face of it, 'anti-discrimination' might be seen to be a clear and unambiguous concept which refers to the law on the right of people to be treated equally. However there are different forms of anti-discrimination that can express themselves rather differently because of the national legal traditions from which they derive.

---

<sup>15</sup> Hyndman J, Payne W & Jimenez S. (2017). *Private refugee sponsorship in Canada*. *Forced Migration Review*, (54), 56.

There is a 'category-based' approach as expressed in the UK, USA and, in widely varying forms, in Sweden, the Netherlands and Belgium who have all enacted special anti-discrimination legislation and established independent public equality bodies whose mandate is defined by law. In its most pragmatic expression, embodied by the UK, this model is predominantly procedural, based on a management approach to social relations, with few substantive values to guide it. It is thus subject to frequent revisions based on policy needs of the day. The U.S. approach acknowledges diversity as inherent to society rather than caused by external developments such as immigration. The focus has been on how society can achieve the fair treatment of different groups, not on how newcomers blend into society. This means that Anglo-American race equality frameworks have been designed to address the rights of distinct groups and their mode of interaction, not merely the rights of individuals. The challenge of negotiating difference and equality has been recognised as integral to the policy goal of cohesion in a pluralist society. It raised the expectation of equal treatment derived from the actual process of managing diversity rather than a substantive assumption of sameness.

In contrast, a 'value-based' approach to equality can be found both in the traditions usually associated with France and Germany. Both rely on constitutional guarantees to secure citizens' rights. The French approach in particular is based on a strict separation between public and private spheres, combined with the propagation of a national civic faith shaping the public identity of individual citizens, disregarding their collective racial, ethnic or religious backgrounds. This imposition of pre-existing public values onto the seemingly blank canvas presented by isolated individuals runs counter to a pluralist understanding of a democracy constructed in processes of social interaction.

The emergence of a third approach can be identified, led by the opening to signature of [Protocol 12 to the Convention of the protection of human rights and fundamental freedom](#) (Rome, 2000)<sup>16</sup>, introducing a general prohibition of discrimination, reinforced by the introduction – at EU level - of the Charter of Fundamental Rights in 2000. Both instruments extend understanding of anti-discrimination beyond race to include all forms of diversity, and take the basic human rights perspective which gives priority to the individual ahead of other distinctions. They can be seen as an attempt to resolve and merge the values- and group-based approaches along with the emerging human right consensus.

Whilst this in theory provides a framework for the whole Europe, it has been patchy in its implementation, and its cosmopolitanism has clashed with emergent nationalistic definitions of equality, which are defined by state-bestowed citizenship and 'cultural belonging'.

What is the Intercultural integration perspective on the issue?

Intercultural integration follows the models above in taking an individual rights-led approach, which tries to resolve the values- and category-led traditions. It respects the institutions and legal frameworks which have been established to prohibit discriminatory practices on the grounds of race and all other forms of diversity, and requires their presence as a pre-requisite of an intercultural city.

Intercultural cities are thus expected to carry out active anti-discrimination policies, by creating their own equality offices, training staff, raising awareness and taking action to redress discrimination occurring in institutions within their remit. At the same time, intercultural cities believe that in addition to the legal and administrative structures, non-discriminatory practices must also be instilled through proactive and agonistic processes of education and negotiation, leading to attitudinal and behavioural change.

Finally, an approach which focuses only on the relationship of individuals (discriminators and discriminated) risks overlooking the fact that discrimination is a product of systemic and structural inequalities in economic, social and cultural power relations. The democratic rights which we now take for granted have,

---

<sup>16</sup> Article 1§1 of Protocol 12 namely states that: "The enjoyment of any right set forth by law shall be secured without discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status

for the most part, not been achieved by the unilateral conferring of them from above, or deriving from the actions of individuals. Rights have been created as a consequence self-identified groups engaging in a process of debate and struggle for recognition, and there is no reason to believe that this will not continue to be the case in the future.

What is the added value of the Intercultural integration approach?

Intercultural cities should ask themselves whether interculturalism can add anything to prevention of discrimination that the anti-discrimination movement alone cannot achieve. One answer would be that – in spite of protective laws – prejudice and discrimination can thrive where there is segregation or a lack of contact and dialogue between people. Intercultural integration explicitly sets out to bridge the gaps in communication that can reinforce discrimination or even create new kinds of discrimination. It also requires practitioners to focus not only upon interactions between majorities and minorities, but also within different groups where hidden processes of inequality and injustice may also exist.

Despite constructive policy options, the fundamental tension characterising contemporary democracies, the relationship between rights-based cultures of equality and national traditions of belonging, is not about to disappear into an ideology-free zone. Moreover, we have come to a juncture where this relationship is not in a balance, but in the process of being hegemonised by ideologies of national belonging which threaten to dominate the discourse of equality.

Europe and other transnational entities remain a bulwark against the re-emergence of discriminatory practices. However, the city is another jurisdiction which can offer both equality, justice, and belonging in a combination which is much less susceptible to the exclusionary tendencies of the nation state. The intercultural cities take a formative, pedagogical approach to achieving non-discrimination by creating opportunities and conditions for people and organisations to experience the advantage of diversity in everyday life, and to make this advantage clear and explicit for all. By fostering an inclusive « We-culture », intercultural cities create an organic sense of community and solidarity across all types of difference, which makes discrimination « culturally » unacceptable.

### c. Cultural diversity and intersectionality

What is the issue?

The intercultural integration approach focuses on managing diversity based on cultural (ethnic, religious, and linguistic) difference. This has been a matter of deliberate choice because of the acute deficit, in the context of growing cultural diversity of European societies, of narratives, policies and tools to address effectively equality and inclusion challenges in relation to migrants. However, interculturalism understands that humanity and identity are dynamic and can be diverse in many ways: the entire range of “diversities” – gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, social class – which are all object of specific policies in Europe and at the Council of Europe level, necessarily intersect with cultural diversity.

The challenge for the future debate and practice of intercultural integration is how to develop a more explicit and clear narrative about the relationship between managing cultural diversity & inclusion, and ensuring equality across all range of “diversities”. Short of offering ready-made solutions, it should propose ideas and practice examples that cities could tailor to their needs when dealing with equality challenges in specific cultural contexts and under an intercultural perspective (eg. empowering women from diverse backgrounds, promoting LBGTI rights & giving voice and autonomy to youth in socially vulnerable contexts, etc.).

Anti-discrimination and inclusion are common goals for diversity policies in all areas and, indeed, for intercultural strategies, which provide a common platform for equality officers and intercultural organisations to work together. Intercultural projects and activities are likewise carried out with due regard to the diversity of participants on all counts. Interculturalism thus seeks to bridge those “identity politics”

divides and administrative and organisational silos which may make equality and inclusion policies less effective.

Some of the cities participating in the Intercultural Cities programme are already applying their intercultural strategies to dealing with other forms of “diversities”; in this context, the most commonly addressed issues are gender equality and gender mainstreaming on the one hand, and LGBTi rights on the other. The ICC programme should thus be able to provide clear guidance in these fields, so as to allow for a more coherent approach by all its members.

## 1. Gender equality

Achieving gender equality is central to the fulfillment of the Council of Europe’s mission: safeguarding human rights, upholding democracy and preserving the rule of law. The Council of Europe’s work on human rights and gender equality has resulted in a solid legal and policy framework aimed at achieving de facto equality between women and men. Gender equality is one of the priorities of the Organisation, which remains fully committed to addressing emerging challenges and removing barriers in order to achieve substantive and full gender equality.

As the European Court of Human Rights has recognised, “the advancement of gender equality is today a major goal in the member States of the Council of Europe and very weighty reasons would have to be put forward before such a difference of treatment could be regarded as compatible with the Convention [...] In particular, references to traditions, general assumptions or prevailing social attitudes in a particular country are insufficient justification for a difference in treatment on grounds of sex”.<sup>17</sup>

The Council of Europe Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017 sets out five strategic objectives to achieve gender equality: combating gender stereotypes and sexism; preventing violence against women; guaranteeing equal access of women to justice; achieving balanced participation of women and men in political and public decision-making; achieving gender mainstreaming in all policies and measures of the Organisation, as well as at the national level. On this point, gender mainstreaming means the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy making. This is of course also relevant for the policy work in Intercultural cities.

The next Council of Europe Gender Equality Strategy for 2018-2023 (currently being finalised and scheduled for adoption by the Committee of Ministers in early 2018) is envisaged to include the same five priority themes with an additional one: protecting the rights of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeker women and girls<sup>18</sup>. On this topic, one of the lines of action included in the draft Strategy is to support the systematic integration of a gender equality dimension in policies and measures regarding migration, asylum and integration, in order to secure the human rights and fundamental freedoms of migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women, regardless of traditional or cultural attitudes. Also, the Strategy emphasizes on the importance of mainstreaming “gender equality in all integration measures, so that migrant men are aware of the need to respect gender equality laws and policy, as well as gender roles even if they do not correspond to the situation in their countries of origin. This would not only foster integration in European societies and labour markets, but also benefit women and men. This work should be part of a general effort to make gender equality a norm accepted by both women and men in every society”.

---

<sup>17</sup> Konstantin Markin v. Russia, 22 March 2012, para. 127

<sup>18</sup> The new (draft) Strategy reminds, inter-alia, that “measures need to be taken to ensure that migrant, refugee and asylum-seeking women have access to their human and social rights in relation to employment, housing, health, education, social protection and welfare where applicable; and access to information about their rights and the services available”.

What is the Intercultural integration's added value?

Being based on the three principles of Equality, Diversity and Interaction, the intercultural integration policy paradigm for diversity and inclusion can be instrumental in achieving complete equality between women and men in the enjoyment of their rights as well as in accessing public services, to promote full participation of women in society and public life, and to promote full participation of women in society and public life, including increased presence of migrant women in leadership positions. First of all, "no community has a monopoly of gender equality or inequality<sup>19</sup>": gender inequality is a reality equally faced by women from minority and majority backgrounds.

Also, one of the goals of intercultural policies is to promote and contribute to achieve equal access to rights, services and opportunities for all (men and women on equal footing) members of the community. The Intercultural integration's principle of impartiality of – and the obligation of non-discrimination by – public authorities requires from them to embrace cultural pluralism and the complexity of identities through leadership discourse and urban pedagogy actions, promoting equal opportunities and a vision of diversity of the society as an asset for all.

Furthermore, in an intercultural perspective, public authorities work to the creation of (public) spaces and opportunities for meaningful interaction among the residents, and promote the co-creation between people of different origins and backgrounds, to build trust and realise the creative potential of diversity. The concept of meaningful mixing and interaction is fully applicable to the sharing of space and interaction between women and men. In this particular field, intercultural skills, competence, approaches and initiatives could help overcome tensions and contradictions around the perception of gender equality and gender roles in the context of different cultures.

In addition, the intercultural approach encourages interconvictional dialogue treating all sides as equals in the context of this debate, while not allowing for derogations to CoE human rights standards on the basis of culture, tradition or religion. For instance, in matters related to gender equality interculturalists work with women and men, and with religious communities on women's rights and freedoms, supporting individual and human rights vis-à-vis some questionable "traditions" and practices.

Power sharing is another key element of the intercultural philosophy, and it means involving people of diverse origins, convictions, gender and backgrounds in decision-making in urban institutions, be they political, educational, social, economic, or cultural.

Finally, the ICC Programme is at the forefront of busting myths and combatting stereotypes, in particular by using anti-rumours strategies to increase trust and social cohesion and thus favour integration and sense of belonging. Many of these myths and misconceptions concern the place and role of women and men in the family and in the society. And the ICC Programme should also address them through ongoing work on anti-rumours strategies.

Taking all the above into account, integrating more explicitly a gender equality component within the ICC Programme and intercultural strategies would certainly contribute to empowering women and girls with diverse background to experience autonomy through work, access to leadership, fully benefit from public services, contribute to community work, and participate in society on an equal footing with men.

How can the Intercultural integration approach integrate a gender equality perspective in practice?

Intercultural cities should start taking systematically into account the gender equality perspective at every stage of policy planning and service delivery process. They shall do so through identifying inequalities, considering differences, assessing specific needs, evaluating policies' impact on equal opportunities for women and men, analysing existing prejudicial attitudes, etc. The main output of a gender equality

---

<sup>19</sup> See: Intercultural dialogue on Campus (Council of Europe higher education series No.11) (2009)

perspective applied to intercultural policies is to empower women from all backgrounds so to enable them accessing rights and services at the local level, as well as to participate in local policies affecting them.

Apart from the very comprehensive set of legally binding instrument, guidance and recommendations elaborated over the years by the Council of Europe, most of the cities participating in the Intercultural Cities programme have also signed the [European Charter for Equality of Women and Men at Local Level](#). The latter recognises equality of women and men as “a fundamental right and an obligation for local communities to implement this right in all areas of their jurisdiction, as well as an obligation to eliminate all forms of direct or indirect discrimination”. It also sets some basic principles for achieving equality at the local level, including the preparation and implementation of dedicated action plans.

Intercultural cities can contribute to (and benefit from) this goal by a series of concrete actions to be embedded and implemented within their intercultural policies and strategies, starting from ensuring that their legal and administrative provisions on interculturality and integration use a non-discriminatory terminology and are gender sensitive. Also, they can establish (and are doing so already) institutional mechanisms for gender equality within the city's integration policies, encourage the setting-up of working groups on gender equality within their migrant's Councils, and promote the participation and representation of migrant's women in the city's gender equality bodies. When it comes to the re-organisation of public space, cities shall include the gender perspective in the design process, so to ensure equal opportunities and services, as well as positive interactions between women and men. Moreover, cities shall continue working at ensuring that in all their elected and administrative governing bodies, members represent the population diversity; in this field, they could strengthen their vigilance regarding the gender representation. Current practice has also highlighted some good initiatives from Intercultural cities, in supporting actions of and for migrant's women, overcoming gender stereotypes, combatting gender-based segregation and violence, in the city as a whole as well as within the migrant communities.

In the field of refugee reception and integration, some Intercultural cities are already providing specific training on gender equality standards addressing both women and men.

An example of how this can work in practice can be found in the City of Ottawa (Canada) that made a commitment for gender equality already back in 1999; to ensure its practical implementation, the City Council further adopted (2002) a specific “Equity and Diversity Policy” to achieve equality for five targeted groups (among which women) and has then integrated gender equality into its strategic planning (2005) to “establish a framework that requires all departments within the City to embrace the spirit of equity and diversity in the development of their policies and programs that impact the delivery of City services, the use of City facilities, grants to external agencies and other outwardly focussed activities.”<sup>20</sup>

## 2. Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity

Fighting discrimination based on sexual orientation has been an aim of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe since 1981. The White Paper however had very little to say on the topic of LGBTI rights, but the Council of Europe has made substantial progress in policy development in the intervening period.

In 2010, the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers adopted the Recommendation [CM/Rec\(2010\)5 on measures to combat discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation or gender identity](#). This Recommendation is the first legal and policy instrument in the world dealing specifically with this type of discrimination and sets out specific measures that states can take to combat it. Since the adoption of this Recommendation, the case law of the European Court of Human Rights has further evolved, including rulings related to the freedom of assembly, hate speech and crimes, and recognition of same-sex partnerships.

---

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.cawi-ivtf.org/sites/default/files/publications/genderequalitylensguide-08-en.pdf>



Focussing more specifically on the local policy level, the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities has adopted Recommendation 211 on the Freedom of Assembly and expressions for lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transgender persons in 2007, which includes explicit support for International Day against Homophobia and Transphobia (IDAHOT). The adoption of Resolution [380/2015](#) *Guaranteeing Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) People's Rights: A Responsibility For Europe's Towns And Regions* in 2015<sup>21</sup> and the [Compendium of good practices on local and regional level policies to combat discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity \(2016\)](#) provide further guidance and directly call on local authorities to address these issues within their policies.

The guidance has made it very clear that there can be no distinction made between the rights of LGBTI persons and others in society, and that discrimination on these grounds is as reprehensible as any other. Finally the Council has been particularly vocal in identifying the importance of the locality as a stage upon which positive intervention must be played out.

What is the ICC added value?

The adoption of a broad definition of diversity seems entirely plausible given the experience of life as it is lived in the streets of many Intercultural cities. Intercultural cities' practical understanding of interculturalism has always been broad and inclusive enough to take account of the factors that intersectionality describes:

*Intersectionality refers to the added layers of discrimination that someone may experience by being part of more than one minority group. Intersectional issues can compound the challenges that exist in the lives of LGBT persons. A black gay woman, for example, may have to deal with racism, homophobia and sexism. Discriminatory behaviour may not just come from mainstream society; racism exists within LGBT communities and homophobia exists within racial minorities.<sup>22</sup>*

Intercultural cities have always acknowledged the existence of multiple forms of diversity in addition to ethnicity and race – including gender, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, legal status and social class - although, in practice, it has been ethnicity, and in particular migrant-influenced cultural diversity, which has been the focus of most of attention.

Intercultural integration is founded upon an understanding of humanity in which individuals are not defined by one signifier of identity but many. It envisages people who bear complex and fluid identities which adapt over time and according to context. It also sees identity not as something which is 'given' in a passive sense, but something which is 'enacted' and defined in the doing. In particular ICC emphasises cities because they can offer individuals an identity which complements, but does not overshadow or compromise, the other signifiers people might hold.

As previously explained, intercultural integration requires cities to adopt an inclusive approach to involving people of diverse backgrounds in policy-making and actions: it is of utmost importance to ensure that all residents take part in the city processes and activities.

How can the Intercultural integration approach integrate a sexual orientation and gender identity perspective in practice?

Intercultural cities have a diverse population including people of different nationalities and origins, and with different languages or religions/beliefs. These people have diverse sexual orientations and gender identities, which might not always be visible. Still, in their capacity of service provider, cities hold a specific responsibility to ensure equal access to social rights, goods and services to all their citizens, without

---

<sup>21</sup> Debated and adopted by the Congress on 25 March 2015, 2nd sitting (see Document CG/2015(28)9FINAL, explanatory memorandum), rapporteur: Yoomi RENSTRÖM, Sweden (R, SOC).

<sup>22</sup> "Intersectionality" is a term coined by Kimberlé W. Crenshaw to describe overlapping or intersecting social identities, and related systems of oppression, domination, or discrimination. This definition taken from Perry, J. and P. Franey (2017). Policing Hate Crime Against LGBT Persons: Training for a Professional Police response. Council of Europe Publishing, France.

discrimination. For LGBTI persons, full access to health care, housing, and employment, might be particularly challenging.

Moreover, while Intercultural cities are required to address issues around intolerance, hate and violence against LGBTI persons, they also need to deal with far right and xenophobic political campaigns that may be attempting to create and amplify divisions between LGBTI persons and other minorities, such as people with a migrant background. The transversal and locally-oriented approach of ICC make it more alert to such emerging trends and offers social engagement tools (such as Anti-Rumours) to tackle them at source.

Cities can mainstream LGBTI issues and equality principle into all policy areas, or, where needed, draw up specific policies targeting LGBTI persons. They should do this in co-operation with LGBT community organisations and other human rights non-governmental organisations. Migrant/diversity councils and municipal departments dealing with migrant inclusion and diversity should be made aware of the importance of challenges related to sexual orientation and gender identity, and encouraged to address them in their policies, keeping in mind that they can also be a catalyst for dialogue within communities. Homophobic hate speech and hate crime should be monitored and action should be taken to prevent and remedy, in cooperation with the police, the judiciary and other relevant institutions. Acceptance and inclusion, equal access to services and safety are the key focus of local diversity policies targeting LGBTI persons.

In an example from the Copenhagen, migrant associations expressed their appreciation of the establishment of an intercultural board to encourage dialogue and debate. Civil society representatives noted in particular that the board improved their position as 'minorities within minorities', taking into account persistent conservatism in relation to gender norms and sexuality. One group of young migrant women characterised the intercultural approach as their first friendly contact with authorities in approximately 20 years in Denmark.

Other cities, such as London, are adopting diversity and inclusion strategies, which take into account challenges related to gender, age, culture, sexual orientation, disability, income etc. in a coherent manner, and offer measures to offset inequality in all areas of policy – from health, education and housing, to transport, business and sport. Designing an intercultural strategy as an element of an overarching inclusion strategy, is a powerful way of making diversity an asset for the city, and ensuring equality and non-discrimination.

#### d. Refugee inclusion

What is the issue?

Asylum-seekers are persons applying for international protection due to the risk of persecution in their home country. Refugees are those asylum-seekers that received a positive decision on their asylum claim. Rejected asylum seekers that are expected to arrange for their departure or receive a deportation order become irregular migrants if they decide not to leave the host country.

Asylum is a form of international protection given by a state on its territory to someone who is threatened by persecution on grounds of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular group or political opinion in their country of origin or residence. In the Council of Europe area, this consists of refugee status as defined in the UN Geneva Refugee Convention, and subsidiary protection for persons who do not qualify as refugees but in respect of whom substantial grounds exist that the person concerned, if returned to their country of origin, would face a real risk of suffering serious harm.

An unaccompanied child (UAC) is a non-national of the host country, or stateless person below the age of 18 who arrives on the territory of a state without the presence of a legal guardian.

What is the ICC perspective on the issue?

Intercultural cities have been dealing with refugee inclusion for some years now. In particular, by virtue of their geographic and geo-political locations, cities such as Limassol, Valetta, Patras, Palermo and Bari also face the challenge of accommodating asylum seekers from across the Mediterranean Sea. Intercultural cities have thus sought to build relationships with those countries that – being or not Council of Europe member states - act as either transit zones for, or sources of, migration, by building national networks of intercultural cities in Ukraine, Morocco and Jordan.

Since 2015, refugee inclusion has become more and more a daily work especially for those Intercultural cities in countries which have accepted large numbers of refugees (such as Neukölln and Erlangen in Germany, Botkyrka in Sweden, Bergen in Norway, Palermo and Milan in Italy) and that have developed particular expertise in rapid response programmes of accommodation and social integration.

The Intercultural integration approach recommends that asylum-seekers be given as far and fast as possible full access to rights, duties, facilities, opportunities and participation in the life and structures of the city. In ordinary circumstances, this does not represent a particular hurdle for cities. However the emergence of the Syrian refugee situation in August 2015, and its morphing into a more permanent state of refugee (management) crisis, throws down a challenge to intercultural cities and the network as a whole.

The intercultural cities can take inspiration from the entrepreneurial world which talks about ecosystems being required for the promotion of new businesses and technology - and offer in these ecosystems specific services and support for refugee entrepreneurs. The ecosystem metaphor may also prove useful in thinking about the complex web of organisations which need to be activated in order to make refugee inclusion a success. Housing, employment, education, technology, media, transport, community services all involve a wide range of interconnected actors that need to work in a relationship. There is a temporal relationship to the settlement and inclusion ecosystem - no-one person requires every one of these elements in the ecosystem to be activated at the same time and may not use an element of the ecosystem once settlement has truly occurred. For example, a newly arrived refugee may require trauma counselling for a period of one year after arrival but may never again access that service once they have settled and become part of a community. A newly arrived refugee may also not need the political element at the beginning as they are unlikely to run for office immediately but that element of the ecosystem must always be known to them and available to them.

The ecosystem thinking is also at the core of the Intercultural cities' belief that refugees, especially when they arrive in significant numbers in a short span of time, can be an important factor of social innovation, triggering a participatory re-think and re-design of local structures and policies, eventually making them more open and inclusive for all residents.

What is the added value of the Intercultural integration approach?

While local authorities do not have competence over Council of Europe member states' policies on the granting of asylum, they do have very considerable capacity to foster a 'welcoming culture' towards asylum-seekers and, particularly, to facilitate the building of relationships between those whose claims are successful, acquiring refugee status, and members of the host community. This is an important element of local strategies for Intercultural integration.

An important issue for local administrations, but also for civil society and social entrepreneurs, to take into account is that special services for refugees might be helpful at the beginning stage of their arrival and in certain areas, but can also have the opposite effect of ghettoising them, isolating them from mainstream services and treating them differently from the rest of the population. This has the double counter-effect of defining people by their asylum status and alienating part of the host community that feels neither cared nor considered enough by the administration. As far as possible, and when the situation and needs of refugees do not structurally differ from those of the broader community, existing services should be open

and accessible to all. As prescribed by *Resolution 411(2017)*<sup>23</sup> of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe on “The role of local and regional authorities facing migration”, key services should be provided to all residents without discrimination, addressing their needs regardless of their status, nationality or country of origin.

A key success factor for refugee inclusion is, finally, the takeover of activities by the refugees themselves in the optic of co-design of policies and strategies, as ultimately they know best what their needs are and they can effectively spread information within their respective communities. When traumatised and destitute people arrive, it is normal to care for them and help them, but in this situation it is easy to forget that they also have skills, resources and desire to shape their own destiny. Therefore systems of support more often than not deprive them of agency.

Intercultural cities have sought in addition to providing hosting services, to foster the sentiment of residents’ empathy towards asylum-seekers, and the setting up of networks of supportive social relationships. The more far-sighted have seen the potential which refugees can offer, over the long run, to local social, economic and cultural performance – an example of the ‘diversity advantage’ the Intercultural cities have sought more generally to exploit. Success in these endeavours, however, depends entirely on a well-managed process of integration.

For local administration, addressing public opinion with a strong political message about diversity as an asset is a key element for addressing public fears. Especially in times of perceived crisis, it is important to lean into the core values of Intercultural integration, and help people every day to understand how we all benefit by being welcoming to people from across the globe. An ongoing, positive communications strategy can help recognise and address the fears that people may have while also building greater longer-term understanding.

It is also important for local authorities to engage in active communication with their population, showing that they take seriously the questions, doubts and fear of the host community, but also showcasing success stories of integration, as well as the human side of the phenomenon.

Municipal approaches to integration therefore need to work with individual refugees and their associations, not *for* them. Across the Intercultural Cities network, a clear lesson has been that municipalities will perform much better in this arena if they work in partnership with civil society organisations, especially members of minority associations. This is, for instance, a key rationale of the co-ordination office for refugees established by Berlin Neukölln, liaising with the flotilla of NGOs and volunteers active in this arena.

The challenge of large-scale arrival of refugees has been for many cities the opportunity to affirm in an outspoken way their ethos as open and inclusive communities, to re-think their inclusion policies, to connect with civil society organisations in a more meaningful way, to create new partnerships with business organisations, to treat the diversification of their human resources and of their intercultural competence with more urgency, and to look for innovative solutions in the provision of services.

The Council of Europe has encouraged cities to apply the principles of non-segregation, mixing, interaction, and participation to refugee inclusion, and to apply the diversity advantage lens by involving refugees in the assessment and - if needed – in the rethinking of inclusion policies to make them more effective.

#### e. Terrorism & radicalisation

What is the issue?

---

23 Rapport CG32(2017)07 adopted by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe on 28 March 2017

Until quite recently, the most familiar manifestation of radicalisation and extremism within Europe and North America was likely to be 'home grown'. From the 1960s to the 2000s, entities such as ETA in Spain, the IRA and the UDA in the British Isles, the Brigade Rosse in Italy, the Baader-Meinhof Gang in Germany, the Front de libération du Québec in Canada and the 'Sovereign Citizen' perpetrators of such events as the Waco Siege and the Oklahoma Bombing in the United States were responsible for most cases. It is important to be aware of this context and to measure it against the current popular discourse around extremism, which gives the false impression that this is only a phenomenon of Islam.

Radicalisation and extremism can take several forms within cities. There are tendencies within the majority population which may be racially supremacist and/ or anti-immigrant, and these can be manifested in different forms ranging from random hate speech transforming into hate crimes, inflammatory news headlines, discrimination, political mobilisation or pre-meditated acts of intimidation, violence and terror, such as the Breivik atrocity in Norway, attacks on refugee hostels in Germany or the assassination of British MP Jo Cox.

Most forms of extremism, across this spectrum, can be said to be national or international in their scope. They are inspired by ideologies and prejudices which transcend national boundaries; they can be exacerbated by transnational policies and events, and are fanned by national media and global social media. However they generally find their ultimate manifestation in cities, be it random acts of hate speech in the street, a lone youth on social media, or a major terrorist attack.

What is the Intercultural integration perspective on the issue?

Common sense would suggest that in a global media-scape no city can make itself inviolate to extremism, particularly to the act of a lone individual. Many cities would argue that the very process of trying to fortify itself against extremism – through securitisation of public space and repressive policing of targeted groups - would undermine the very freedom and openness they are trying to defend. A case in point has been the highly controversial *Prevent* strategy enacted in the UK<sup>24</sup>, and subsequently imitated elsewhere. It has chosen to identify specific religious groups in specific locations to be targeted with an intense and co-ordinated surveillance and anti-radicalisation techniques. Whilst this may well have diverted particular individuals from taking a path to violence, it has undermined the fabric of community cohesion leaving behind a long term legacy of suspicion and resentment. For example, there have been cases where the secret security services engaged agents to masquerade as youth workers. In some towns this means that all youth workers are now routinely mistrusted by young people – a disaster for long term community-building.<sup>25</sup>

A more intercultural approach to radicalism would be to see it as a product of rapid modernisation, and the sense of anomie and alienation and a search for meaning than can be experienced by young people in particular. In the past this has attached itself to political or nationalist causes, but presently it is most likely to be inspired by religion. And a scan of world will testify that all religions (and not only Islam) are capable of harbouring it.<sup>26</sup>

Cities are put in an invidious position. They have very little influence upon the causes of radicalisation, and generally have to defer to their national governments, security agencies and media agencies in designing preventative or punitive measures. Yet it is cities that have to pick up the pieces the day after the media circus has moved on, or the crude backlash has been enacted into law. They can do that by relying on the Intercultural integration principles.

---

<sup>24</sup> <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN05993>

<sup>25</sup> Paul Thomas (2012) *Responding to the Threat of Violent Extremism: Failing to Prevent*. A&C Black.

<sup>26</sup> Pankaj Mishra (2016) *Age of Anger: A History of the Present*. London, Allen Lane.

What is the added value of the ICC approach?

An Intercultural approach against radicalisation consists in taking a city-wide perspective based upon the active maintenance of good relations, de-segregation of habitat and urban space, dialogue and interaction, conflict mediation, social justice and the eradication of discrimination, and addressing legitimate grievances. Amsterdam's comprehensive strategy for anti-radicalisation and Vienna's sustained intercultural dialogue have both been upheld as effective.

Whilst individual incidences of extremist behaviour are distressing to the people concerned, and are to be avoided, they are much less damaging to the long-term well-being of the city and residents than security crack-downs and knee-jerk acts of retribution for short term political gain or atavistic satisfaction. These undermine trust and reciprocity and poison the public discourse and beget nothing other than the need for even more draconian security measures.

#### f. Inter-convictional dialogue

What is the issue?

Conflicts where faith has provided a communal marker have been a feature of both Europe's old and more recent past. How these world religions are expressed in Europe will, and should, inevitably be marked by the common values that build up Europe's cultural heritage, in which both religious and secular conceptions of the purpose of life have had a role.

Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights<sup>27</sup> is one of the foundations of democratic societies; it is in its religious dimension one of the most vital elements referring to the identity of believers and their conception of life, but it is also a precious asset for atheists, agnostics, sceptics and the unconcerned.

The Council of Europe has recognised since the outset that intercultural dialogue embraces interconvictional dialogue. Like everyone else, an individual who professes religious faith has a complex identity, which is not (outside of fundamentalist sub-cultures) defined by their faith alone. Interconvictional dialogue is thus best not compartmentalised from other aspects of intercultural dialogue and should be characterised by the same spirit of open-mindedness.

The Council of Europe has also encouraged thought to continue to be given to the "religious dimension of intercultural dialogue, particularly by organising meetings with religious leaders and representatives of humanist and philosophical worlds". Furthermore, it has promoted the identification and dissemination of examples of good practice in respect of dialogue with leaders of religious communities.

What is the Intercultural integration perspective on the issue?

The foundation of the Intercultural integration approach on Inter-convictional dialogue is to acknowledge the rights of all individuals and groups, whether religious or not, under the European Convention on Human Rights, and to positively engage with faith communities alongside those with other beliefs, including secular worldviews, for the purpose of building trust cohesion and positive intercultural interactions within the city as a whole.

It starts from the position of exploring how public discourse, policies, procedures and practices can have a significant impact in exacerbating and/or reducing experiences of prejudice and discrimination within local communities, and promotes interconvictional dialogue to overcome fears and work together on shared social issues while breaking down divides.

---

<sup>27</sup> [http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Guide\\_Art\\_9\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Guide_Art_9_ENG.pdf)



For inter-convictional and inter-perspective dialogue to support positive interactions between groups and help address possible conflicts, the Intercultural integration policy framework has to pose a series of questions which mixed communities and policymakers should seek to answer together. These questions include considering what are the aims of the dialogue, for instance, whether its purpose is to build mutual understanding and community cohesion, involve different faith groups in working together on issues of shared concern, represent collective views to local government, etc. Other questions include thinking carefully about who is involved in the dialogue (and who is still missing). Recognising diversity within religious groups and convictions as well as between religious groups and convictions is particularly important in terms of inclusion, as it means finding ways to involve significant groups who might be otherwise excluded from official leadership roles within some religious communities. Furthermore, finding positive and creative ways of engaging with those who would not normally be interested in connecting with people of (other) faiths is crucial in broadening the scope and impact of these activities.

Where civil servants lack knowledge of faith and faith groups, this can lead to fear and raise barriers to building positive engagement between them. Therefore, training professionals to interact with different groups and work positively and proactively with these issues (including in schools) is particularly important.

A priority for moving forward, building on these foundations, is to find collective ways to discuss remaining dilemmas and to develop effective processes to address the continuing underlying conflicts in practice. This includes the recognition that it can often take considerable time, even years, to build good relationships and effective dialogue with and between different groups. As a result, it is important for local authorities to invest in this relationship-building on the long-term. Recognition of the potentially-different agendas of different stakeholders involved in dialogue processes is important in facilitating ways of bringing these together.

What is the added value of the Intercultural integration approach?

Intercultural integration places a great emphasis upon cities investing in their intercultural intelligence by enhancing their knowledge and the networks by which they acquire it. An important factor in preventing discrimination against religious communities and responding to prejudice comes from promoting more thorough and widespread collection of data, improving public understanding of religious group and tackling misperceptions about them. In many cities, public perceptions of the numbers of people within religious groups, is much higher than the best data available on the actual numbers. As a result, the public can feel overwhelmed by increasing religious and ethnic diversity and fear of losing their historic rights and traditional identities in a context of increasing diversity. These feelings are a major factor in driving prejudice and discrimination on a social and political level.

In response to this, Intercultural integration encourages initiatives which share accurate information about the numbers of religious groups and raise mutual awareness of different religions and beliefs. Activities which help empower religious minorities (including different groups within each religious community) to give voice to their own perspectives are helpful in ensuring that understandings are based on listening directly to those involved. These can be particularly effective when designed in ways which help different groups to share perspectives with each other as a result.

Also, Intercultural cities are encouraged to undertake a reasonable adaptation of public service delivery: this can be achieved through improved religious literacy, dialogue and interaction that all contribute to better understandings of what each other's needs actually are. For instance, a specific area to be addressed is the use of the public space for religious purposes. Minority religious groups often experience difficulties in finding suitable places of worship in which organise both religious and social activities. Such spaces are important as gathering places for those sharing religious identities and, in some circumstances, they can also be used as spaces for interaction with wider community and for joint activities.

## g. New forms of citizenship: “urban citizenship”

What is the issue?

Intercultural integration makes the implicit assumption that a more equitable division of powers and responsibilities across different polities is necessary in an age of diversity and mobility.

Following the 2008 financial crisis, national governments and institutions held the system together and prevented a global meltdown. Also, the defence of national systems of social welfare has been seen as the most viable way of protecting people against the ensuing chaos in markets. However, this has become infected with a resurgence of nationalistic chauvinism which has created a space for nativist and competitive sentiments that had two main effects. The first has been an attack on many of the post-1945 institutions of supra-national cooperation including bodies such as the United Nations, the EU, and the European Court of Human Rights. The second effect has been to close down new thinking and discussion about the nature of citizenship, and to re-impose the nation state as the only legitimate authority through which citizenship can be understood and granted.

This creates some dilemmas for intercultural cities. Their message after the last 10 years is that the nation state would need to cooperate more with territorial and local authorities to be able to bring effective replies to the question of how people can live (well) together in a diverse society, recognising that there are important, complementary roles for all three polities.

Nationalists imagine the world in distinct parts with distinct territories and membership, yet Intercultural cities argue that democracy can cope with different units of decision-making that are nested in each other and can connect different units of membership that overlap – as happens when migrants are simultaneously members of sending and receiving countries.

Nationalists also assume nation states should control all decisions that affect their citizens whilst the vision of democracy endorsed and promoted by the Intercultural cities has only required that units of decision-making should be functionally adequate for the decisions they take. This has opened the possibility to imagine cities granting their own form of citizenship, even to people who are not recognised by the nation state, as is discussed below.<sup>28</sup>

As such one could imagine the following ‘separation of powers’ whereby

- Supra-national authorities would take the lead in deciding upon immigrant flows, and on bodies which maintain universal human rights.
- Nation states would lead on maintaining comprehensive systems of social justice.
- Cities would provide alternative political spaces that are open for newcomers and solidarity of strangers, with citizenship derived from residence rather than birth, to ensure effective justice in everyday life.

Such a transnational formula is only possible if individuals come to regard themselves as multiple citizens across all levels of the polity and authorities accept that those who move across borders are transnational citizens who belong simultaneously to distinct polities.

What is the Intercultural integration perspective on the issue?

Following on from the discussion above, if one accepts the notion of ‘constitutional pluralism’ and that citizenship can be a meaningful concept at the global and local levels as well as in the nation state

---

<sup>28</sup> Rainer Baubock (2003) *Reinventing urban citizenship*. Citizenship studies 7.2: 139-160.

intercultural cities should, as an advocate of the city, be interested in exploring what 'urban citizenship' could realistically be.

This means asking the fundamental questions of who belongs in the city and who has a right to the city?<sup>29</sup>  
This way of thinking:

*... distinguishes between formal citizenship of the nation state, and the exercise of urban citizenship through democratic practice. The right to the city signifies societal ethics cultivated through living together and sharing urban space. It concerns public participation, where urban dwellers possess rights and cities—city governments and administrations—possess obligations or responsibilities. Civil and political rights are fundamental, protecting the ability of people to participate in politics and decision-making by expressing views, protesting and voting. The exercise of substantive urban citizenship thus requires an urban government and administration that respects and promotes societal ethics. It also demands responsibilities of citizens to use and access the participatory and democratic processes offered.*<sup>30</sup>

For a long time the idea of ownership of urban land and property has been a dominant factor but, with the hyper-mobility of capital, we are now seeing many cities where the major owners have no presence in the city or little allegiance beyond their own stake. Parts of many major cities, for example, are becoming devoid of people, trade and culture because their sole purpose has become the accrual of property value for their absentee owners. This threatens the core purpose and potential decline of cities and thus must be challenged with a new concept of the 'right to the city'. Migrants, on the other hand, have a very visible presence in the city often with a defining stake in the maintenance of public and private services, and yet many of them are denied any rights of citizenship by national government.<sup>31</sup>

What is the added value of the Intercultural integration approach?

There is a burgeoning campaign to enshrine a sense of belonging through establishing the formal status of 'urban citizenship' which may be granted to all with an urban presence, regardless of national status and yet often in compliance with national law, and there are a growing number of experiments taking place. This is the case in Spain where the *Padrón*, a list of all the people who live in a certain town and *Empadronarse* is the act of registering on this list with the local town hall. Because registration only requires a passport and proof of domicile, but not a residence permit, it offers both a symbolic local membership and formal access to municipal services. Several cities, including Madrid, have experimented with elevating this to a more explicit form of urban citizenship, but the most effective has been Barcelona.<sup>32</sup>

Meanwhile Utrecht seeks to connect asylum seekers to the city from the day of arrival. By offering them all (regardless of status) language lessons, entrepreneurial classes and general education the city departs from the general Dutch policy of only acknowledging those with formal status<sup>33</sup>. Paris recently introduced a *carte citoyenne* which gives all Parisians access to municipal services and which 'carries the values of Paris, liberty, diversity and tolerance and connects Parisians to municipal life'.<sup>34</sup> The card is modelled on the IDNYC, the identity card of the city of New York which is recognised for interactions with the police, for opening bank accounts and gives all city dwellers – including the undocumented and homeless – access to

---

<sup>29</sup> Lefebvre, H. (1996) *The right to the city*. Writings on cities, 63-181.

<sup>30</sup> Brown, A. & A. Kristiansen. (2009) *Urban policies and the right to the city*; Management of Social Transformations Policy Paper. UNESCO/UN Habitat

<sup>31</sup> Linda Bosniak (2007) *Being here: Ethical territoriality and the rights of immigrants*. Theoretical inquiries in law, 8(2), pp.389-410.

<sup>32</sup> Dirk Gebhardt (2016) *Re-thinking urban citizenship for immigrants from a policy perspective: the case of Barcelona*. Citizenship Studies, 20(6-7), pp.846-866.

<sup>33</sup> Barbara Oomen (2017) *Beyond the Nation State? Glocal Citizenship and Its Consequences for Integration*. In R. Bauböck & M.

Tripkovic (2017), *The Integration of Migrants and Refugees; An EUI Forum on Migration, Citizenship, and Demography* (pp. 57-60).

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.paris.fr/cartecitoyenne>

public services.<sup>35</sup> Two other US cities, New Haven and San Francisco, have trialled initiatives aimed specifically at regularising undocumented migrants.<sup>36</sup>

One interesting aspect of the way in which cities are now shaping citizenship, is the degree to which they often refer to cosmopolitan norms, such as international human rights law, in setting out and defending their positions. The mayor of Palermo, for instance, is a strong advocate of the recognition of mobility as an inalienable human right. Palermo's 'International Human Mobility Charter' serves as the basis for migrant welcome and integration.<sup>37</sup>

More widely, these policies are in line with a trend of increasing numbers of 'human rights cities', which base their urban policies on international human rights law, often taking a more progressive stance than national governments. 400 cities have signed the European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City and forerunners, such as Dublin, Barcelona and Nuremberg, have human rights offices and engage in human rights monitoring.<sup>38</sup> Also there is the growing City of Sanctuary movement, which is particularly active in the British Isles<sup>39</sup> and in the USA.<sup>40</sup>

But whilst it is clear that an Intercultural city must be a welcoming city, it must be very much more than that. Too much emphasis upon the newcomers and too little attention to the settled populations (minority and majority) will exacerbate the feeling of injustice.

The urban citizenship agenda is complementary to the goal of facilitating, in the context of Intercultural integration policies, the obtaining the nationality of the host country after a limited number of years of legal residence (not more than 10), and for migrant children at birth. This is the goal, for instance, of the Italian citizens' initiative "L'Italia sono anch'io" is supported by the civil society, together with many Italian municipalities.

New developments in participatory and deliberative democracy must demonstrably enhance the life of not a few citizens but of them all.

## h. Solidarity & populism

What is the issue?

It is often argued that populism has arisen to fill a gap in society, because modernity and capitalist individualism have broken down the traditional bonds of solidarity which once held communities together. The need for solidarity is a basic human requirement and society has found various ways of creating it over time. Religion and the neighbourhood have often been the catalyst, and so has been the workplace – or the struggle for rights within the workplace and other parts of society. The period after World War II saw a nationalization of solidarity – the nation state fused with the welfare state offered four interconnected forms of solidarity:<sup>41</sup>

- Interdependence  
A national social insurance system recognised that citizens were dependent upon each other for their welfare and social protection.

---

<sup>35</sup> <http://www1.nyc.gov/site/idnyc/index.page>

<sup>36</sup> Els De Graauw (2014) *Municipal ID cards for undocumented immigrants: Local bureaucratic membership in a federal system*. *Politics & Society*, 42(3), pp.309-330.

<sup>37</sup> Stephanie Kirgaessner (2015) *From mafia city to a haven for refugees: Palermo moves on from its criminal past*, *The Guardian*, 27 December 2015.

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.uclq-cisd.org/en/right-to-the-city/european-charter>

<sup>39</sup> <https://cityofsanctuary.org/>

<sup>40</sup> <http://ojjpac.org/sanctuary.asp>

<sup>41</sup> Stijn Oosterlynck, Maarten Loopmans, Nick Schuermans, Joke Vandenabeele & Sami Zemni (2016) *Putting flesh to the bone: looking for solidarity in diversity, here and now*. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39, no. 5: 764-782.

- Shared norms and values  
Shared norms and values were declared to be no longer God-given but evolved and institutionalised through the process of creating a national state.
- Struggle  
The regime of social rights evolved from decades of struggle for rights in the workplace, housing and health.
- Familiarity and Encounter  
The state's efforts to organise solidarity were based on the territorialisation of social relations and the spatial boundedness of supposedly homogeneous populations. People's responsibilities and entitlements were made dependent upon their long term presence in a territory and assumed integration in the associated culture.

These traditional modes of solidarity have obviously been undermined by the period of neo liberalism. However they have also been challenged by several decades of growing cultural diversity, because:

- Ethnic minorities are often forced into either cheap labour or unemployment, traditional interdependence through the labour market is compromised;
- Shared norms and values are harder to define and maintain across more heterogeneous cultures;
- Struggle has become more complex because questions of social justice don't only mean distribution of resources, but also for cultural recognition and political participation;
- Territorial boundaries are undermined by globalisation, technology and mobility, so the national welfare state model has started to leak, whilst the locality is no longer the only place of encounter.

Thus the traditional models of solidarity have faded and – in order to fill the void – new ones are emerging. 'Welfare chauvinism' is propounded by the right (and increasingly by parts of the left too) as a means of returning to the way things used to be in order to assuage the anger and *ressentiment* of those who feel 'left behind'. This states that the welfare state can be remade, but only if the beneficiaries return to being a static and homogeneous tribe.

What is the Intercultural intergration perspective on the issue?

The challenge for Intercultural cities - and others who see reality as diverse, mobile and global as well as local – is to offer people more relevant alternative models of solidarity.

It should be remembered that solidarity does not have to be premised on the basis of homogeneous collectivism. Take the example of Sweden, a paragon of the solidaristic welfare state model, has since the war been an exemplar in taking in refugees as well as attracting migrants. Swedish social democracy has always been explicitly individualist (based as much upon freedom as upon equality). In this regard equality, is taken to mean something very much more than, and different from, similarity.

Fundamentally, what Habermas has called 'solidarity among strangers'<sup>42</sup> depends on a sense of common citizenship, so that individuals become fellow citizens (and not just fellow whites or Muslims or whatever). Thus the logic follows that whatever fosters citizenship fosters solidarity—and, at the municipal level, that can be buttressed by a common civic identity vis-à-vis the city.

What is the added value of the Intercultural integration approach?

This issue has always been at the heart of the ICC approach and, because notions of exclusive or tribal solidarity can form early in life, there has always been an emphasis upon early intervention. Through schooling, sports and play and other collective actions, children very open to identifying with, and accepting

---

<sup>42</sup> Habermas, J (2004) *Why Europe needs a constitution*. Developing a constitution for Europe, 1, 19.

their place in, groups of great diversity which may differ significantly from the options offered by their parents or neighbourhood.

If these conscious interventions have been made in a systemic way through an intercultural policy framework, it is much more likely that once children reach adulthood – by which time their feelings about solidarity are likely to translate into political and social decisions – they will have a much broader palette of experiences and opinions to draw upon, and will be much less likely to adopt a nativist identity.

ICC believes it is fallacious that in order for there to be an 'us' there has to be a 'them', and that an inclusive 'we culture' is attainable.

The challenge of a new solidarity is probably the most challenging new frontier for the Council of Europe and Intercultural cities – one that will decide whether interculturalism will fade as yet another temporary "hype" or will become the foundation of inclusive, integrated societies of 21<sup>st</sup> century.