European Migration Models: A Sociological Insight

Fabio Calzolari

School of Social Innovation, Mae Fah Luang University, Chiang Rai, 57100 Thailand
Email: Fabio.Cal@mfu.ac.th

Abstract: Contested Alterity

"We asked for workers. We got people instead." (Beth Lyon quoting Swiss playwright Max Rudolf Frisch on the cover of her book, 2016) This literature review evaluates the role of multiculturalism in Europe and its impact on social practices. Although ethno-cultural diversity has been for long the political kernel behind modern ideological state apparatuses, migration pressure on economic and political landscapes led to a growing skepticism in public fora, regarding the factuality of a harmonious heterogeneous world. Fears reinforced by the exposition of clandestine places of religious fundamentalism and seditious propaganda that put in peril the European civic fabric and its liberal values. Popular responses to foreigners and minority communities fluctuate from an enthusiastic acceptance to blatant intolerance; a state of emergency that brings the need of a new critical grammar of multiculturalism and integration (Leslie Adelson, 2005; Zygmunt Bauman, 2015).

Keywords: tolerance, multiculturalism, integration, religion, freedom, alienation

1. Introduction

Conflicts in Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Eritrea, provoked a dramatic raise in asylum claims, marking a turning point in modern European history. The plight of refugees and migrants has generally divided public opinion and policymakers (having the first influence over interest group strategies) between sympathetic grassroots movements and people who accuse migrants of being a threat. A political and cultural gap that has created a new ideological iron curtain, slowing down coalition-building. More than 480.000 people (escaping wars) arrived in Europe in 2015; an unprecedented volume that is bringing European countries to a breaking point (Natalia Banulescu-Bogdan, 2015, migration policy institute).

Multicultural counseling literature confirms the unavoidable reality of mass migration and the subsequent exigency of novel conceptual schemas to cope with ethnic otherness. Unfortunately, the management (national and community-based) proved to be ineffective, inducing differentialist and xenophobic practices. From theory to policy, we witness an emblematic rapture between a substratum of cultural openness (of non-separateness and dialogue) and the clamant failure of EU institutions to have it translated into significant social impacts. Henceforth, the idiosyncrasies of a political pattern that while theoretically granting recognition, it erodes it by the lack of uniformity in usage, thwarting effectiveness and a long publicized doctrine of *willkommenskultur*. What happened to Europe is the manifestation of a distorted understanding of ethnos and habitus; a dispute of rhetoric versus reality that spawns an aesthetic of sufferance and alienation.

2. Objective

The following exploratory essay questions the political validity of national and transnational mechanisms actuated in Europe (in the post Lisbon-era), to control geographical mobility and migration. It is also considered socio-philosophical aspects behind the ongoing hermeneutic deficit (manifesting itself in symbolized cultural boundaries) and the inability to construct a functional ecological model.

The debunking of alleged cultural universals has brought a re-formulation of the traditional political jargon with the annexion of what were considered less remarkable appendages of state-discourse: ethno-national identification and migration narratives. Scapegoating minorities groups, deportation of unwanted individuals, practices of inclusion and exclusion are new addenda of a sovereign power that, to enhance political desiderata, often fail to protect democracy. As a research, I wish to convey the importance of Σκέψις (skepsis/philosophical doubt) in investigating social events and practices, not to be controlled by

propaganda and embedded journalism. This paper should be considered a critical evaluation on what led the European Union to entrench exclusion and inequality.

3. Methodology

This manuscript is an exploration of modern perspective and contemporary political propositions regarding the cross-national humanitarian crisis that has wrapped the European Union. Construed on theoretical models of social attitudes/performances, it investigated the relationship between minorities groups and host societies. Although community development has a multivariate statistical history, I summarized political trends on an international scale, via reading of pooled cross-sectional and time series data.

Special interest is given to the philosophical treaties of Julius Wilson (1987), Jürgen Habermas (2001) and Zygmunt Bauman (2007) on how ghettoizing a *persona non grata* (the Agambian *homo sacer*), starts a downward spiral that outflow resources by the lack of suitable competitive advantages and escape routes.

Taking into account a highly polarized public debate, readers should interpret my work as a tentative to conceptualize political ecologies and praxes regarding immigration and by extension, those mechanisms opted by group-based ethno-cultural identities to adapt and survive (Fethi Mansouri, Boulou Ebanda de B'béri, 2014).

4. Results

Integration of migrants as implemented in European legal and ideological strata can be considered unsuccessful. Pima facie, liberal democratic administrations showed to be inapt or unwilful to solve ethnic and religious conflicts, embittering intern-ethnos historical tirades. Scholarly works indicate that aliens and group members of minorities are often treated as catalysts of psychological disturbances and violence. Moreover, asymmetries of economic and social development among citizens eroded cohesion and national wellbeing.

4.1 Managing Integration

Due to the European immigration crisis ignited in 2015, by a massive influx of people, the integration of "new citizens" and the need to improve individual and environmental factors to understand cultural heterogeneity, are topoi of utmost importance. Tackling migration and managing denizens are problems that have to be addressed by concrete actions. Realpolitik-based government, although overlapping ethos with political calculus, seems to be the only fructuous choice. In examining social praxes and aspects behind the phenomenon, we should avoid a reductionist approach that evaluates the volume of immigrants only from a perspective of economic gain or loss (an echo of utilitarianism), to privilege one that also encompasses social and cultural coordinates. A way of dealing that allows a better understanding of the complexities and subtleties behind the diaspora and permits a more substantial management.

The huge flaw and the political vacuum created by an unprepared Europe, unable to curb the problem, have caused fear and insecurity among its citizens. A feeling of disendowment and powerlessness that can become a fertile humus for xenophobic and biased tendencies. Civic integration is an ample and articulated notion but in danger of becoming nothing more than a mere rhetorical exercise if social workers do not understand the needs of their clients (future human capital), in an ongoing struggle of inclusion. Hereby, a functional ecological dimension needs network-bridging opportunities based on institutions and communities level, an operational ground that targets service resources and develops mediating structures on a micro and meso-level perspective. An effective process is multifaceted, and it is designed *ad persona*, tailored on the subjects: a multidimensionality of strategic thinking that can be expressed by the following scheme:

a) **Economic inclusion**: it concerns the attainment of economic independence through decorous job opportunities. Immigration brings (potential) benefits to the market economy, being also an engine of demographic growth. The misalignment between population decline (in industrialized countries) and occupational possibilities, produces spaces that immigrants can fill. The new

workers can lower the dependency ratio of an aging population (with few children) and consequentially alleviate the tax burden. Financial access is linked to economic prosperity and independence for those migrants that opt for long-term stays (through the processes of integration and settlement). Even if temporary and illegal migrants are still outnumbered permanents, international surveys indicate that settlers, unlike the others, are able to start up small activities and, participating fully in the mainstream financial and social system. An encouraging crescendo of economic and civic integration thanks to bank services and products developed specifically for foreign customers (AL Paulson, 2006). Illegal migrants, unaware of labor laws are usually exploited by unscrupulous employers. They perform menial jobs without collecting benefits. Having unassigned wages, they are not eligible to receive (full) social security or public assistance and cannot ask retirement pensions. A situation that brings Europe close to the USA, as shown in "The Settlement Process Among Mexican Migrants to the United States" (Douglas S. Massey, 1986) and "Illegal immigration on the US-Mexico border: is it really a crisis?" (Tony Payan, 2014).

b) **Social inclusion**: a path that develops equality of access to enhance autonomous relations and kinships. The nexus immigrants-peril is emblematic of the difficulties of a multi-cultural dialogue. (Spatial) segregation, should be if not avoided, at least contained: a dichotomous approach that divides a society into opposite subsets, is fruitless because whereas it overlaps cultural singularities (underscoring assimilation), it promotes biases and sets the ground for future turmoil. Immigrant settlements need propinquity to the social arena, to expand solidarity and communality (to avoid what Giddens and Stein defined as "footloose relation"). In point of fact, institutional completeness of ethnic minorities has shown to foster integration and wellbeing.

c) **Cultural inclusion:** the process of acquiring linguistic and cultural competence that leads individuals to understand the society they live in. On a multi-ethnic landscape, claims-making can face the hardness of recognition or ostracism, whenever they move aside from the institutional framework. Religious demands that go against secularized *acta politica,* posing an ideological threat, need to be avoided to favorite a constitutional patriotism (H.G. Soeffner and Jürgen Habermas).

d) **Political inclusion:** In all three Esping-Andersen's welfare regimes (liberal, conservative and social democratic), the regulation of the legal status of immigrants (from aliens to citizens) conveys political incorporation and engagement. Although theoretically, migrants have the same rights of the host populations, Garbaye (2004), highlighted that under the skin of fairness, it is present a strong inequality (as political polarization). A mismatch (evolved into stark class differences) that can be lessened only when (local) government organizations take action to promote minority representation in electoral competitions (David Karl, 1983; Philip Oreopoulos, 2009). The same asymmetry is also experienced in the labor market, with lowered (nominal) wages and a higher level of unemployment. In a qualitative follow-up survey conducted by J-Pal (2008) in Canada and the USA, it is emerged that applicants with a white sounded name get more callbacks than others (with African or Middle-East origins). In a political playground, migrants and other disadvantaged groups are often excluded from useful participation (Young, 2000).

The main vehicles of a proficient integration (resulting in long term job careers) are language fluency of the host community (dual language development) and culture knowledge. It is a two-way process (between distinct identities) where both sides actively seek a common understanding to ensure sustainable results (Hans-Jürgen Krumm & Verena Plutzar, 2004). Awareness-raising activities are helpful to strengthen psychosocial adaptation and self-identification. Government incentives (on the job or vocational training), empower and engage individuals in civic life via political involvement.

The centrality of the (human) persona (seen as a summa of inalienable values/rights) is a condition *sine qua non* of any negotiation or discourse between immigrants and host countries, whose inter-action can be damaged by spins that equate aliens' to domestic and international threats (hence blurring the boundaries between immigration and crime). Offenses committed by denizens cannot be downplayed, but at the same time, it is unfair to allegedly connect them to illegal activities *a priori*. Even when we consider "illegal aliens" *personae non grate* we face an ethical conundrum: the conventional wisdom enlaces public opinion to a judicial consensus, but it is a misconception that can generate interpretational mistakes. Collective judgment is generally negatively biased, understanding their presence as an ongoing misdemeanor or offense, a mythical claim that has no legal base, being only a clandestine entrance a crime (actually only an administrative infraction) but not the consequential undocumented presence on a national soil. A foreigner whose existence can be interpreted as illegal entry is *de jure* expellable only if not eligible for asylum or refugee status but the position of being present without a Visa is not *actus reus* (Elie Wiesel, 2008). Words matter and mislabeling is a tool of politically overstretched accusations to dehumanize people and to cement prejudices, setting an inaccurate frame. The collateral civil penalty of deportation must be limited to grave felonies and act of moral turpitude, but not to light misdemeanors; we should avoid criminal charges as techniques of management and control.

Unlike the ground of exclusion, a proficient approach to noncitizens is based on a discourse of alterity, understood as a positive driving force, opposed to racism and cultural bigotry. Whereas racism involves categories and pejorative labels (literal or transitive sense) that destroy intergroup resources, functional (multi)culturalism recognizes the importance of positive in-group and out-group strategies to foster sympathy (as a communion of feelings) and understanding among social actors. In cluster analysis, siting and conceptualizing cultures on a correct perspective (that examines substantive differences among them) without erecting ideological frameworks, benefit cross-cultural comparison, and mediation. A vision that does not overrun cultural differences but disempowers racial markers.

In an organizational scheme, it is relevant to pinpoint how the integration (of migrants and ethnic minorities) refers, on one hand to background material conditions (constituted by economic and educational help) and on the other to multilevel social analysis (politically and community context). A conceptual dualism that avoids endangering the fragility of the interplay, whose tenet is a person-centered approach. Predictors of social incorporations recognize in disintegrating tendencies (religious fundamentalism and political radicalization) a likable outcome of a managerial inability to cope with the alterity (Collins & Yearley, 1992).

As written afore, secular states must take cautious steps when addressing cultural lexicons, not to permit a legal climate that favorites undemocratic claims[1]. No elements of arbitrariness can be conceded: understanding differences and tolerance are acceptable political conditions only when they are not detrimental to democracy and statehood identity. Longitudinal studies exhibit that integration of ethnic subpopulations is a phenomenon that takes time, in virtue of a knowledgeability inextricable from social practices (Collins & Hoopes, 1995). The effects of acculturation can start appearing substantially in the second or third generation of immigrants. Giovanna Zincone and Tiziana Caponio in their analyses of urban policies and governance (2010) believe that key elements of a successful policies are:

a) An objective-aspect concerning a social and economic profit maximization of the phenomenon of immigration for the host country, through the promotion of legal flux of high-skilled foreigners, in lieu of an uncontrolled one. A policymaking of integration and a sustainability ethic that better democracy. The Browne report (2003) demonstrated clearly how in England, an uncontrolled demographic mass immigration is a leading vector of social inequality, crimes, and diseases (TB and HIV *in primis*). The rapid growth weakened stability and augmented racism, leaving mindful integration unmet. The situation calls to mind the Hardin' lifeboat metaphor (1974) where it is explained that every nation has a limit capability that cannot be exceeded not to incur in a socio-economic collapse.

---

[1] Dismantling a sect or a credo when reputed hostile should be a possibility (fostered by judicious encouragement), in constitutional provisions (Russell Blackford, 2012).

b) The National tutelage of human rights and civil liberties (welfare regime) to rule out apartheid and favorite cohabitation (Darko Suvin, 2006) and the need of self-determination. In-state tuitions to guarantee educational services and encourage political engagement. In anchoring otherwise disqualified migrants (especially their children) to education and knowledge sharing, we enrich social cohesion. It is also noted that educational attainment is higher in those countries unaffected (on a macro level) by deep economic misalignments (Angelos Agalianos, European Commission, 2008).

c) A positive interaction between immigrants and national agencies that operate through territorial surveillance and control procedures, to avert conflicts.

d) Settling on state discourse about brain drain and the pervasive evidence of fiscal losses and the induction of occupational distortions, policy responses are aimed to enhance functioning governance of developing (or post war) countries, to block foreseeable hemorrhages of talents (Paul Collier, 2014). Political scientists should take into account Albert Hirschman, and his work "Exit, Voice, and Loyalty" (1970), where he subtly pinpointed how a borderless world causes harm to countries that need reforms but whose (best)citizens preferred to live abroad (choosing to exit in place of voicing their dissatisfaction). Loyalty to a cause (or transversally, to a nation) can make people stand and fight rather than moving away. The ideology of exit is a two-headed coin that while offering unhappy individuals the opportunity to start again, it weakens social environments of its most quality-conscious customers (Albert O. Hirschman, 1970).

4.2   Following the White Rabbit

Nowadays the large majority of world countries is characterized by in loco cultural diversity. There are only few places where all citizens speak the same language or belong to a common ethno-national group. However, globalization and political interest in foreign markets, are making their borders porous. This ongoing difference in ethos/nomos is an unavoidable element inside modern societies and, together with the need of organizational development models, is behind the urge to question the limits of cultural comparability. Within any linguistic-territorial unit, there are groups that by virtue of body size or political superiority represent a majority compared to minorities that cohabit the same space. Eventually, minorities ask an acknowledgment of their political identities, fighting for their creative social role against the political inertia of the ruling apparatus.

The Western world after being driven for decades by liberal-democratic principles, it is now evaluating different formulations of justice, in approaching inter-group problems and migrants (that pose a vexing challenge). It is worth to remember that liberal democratic rights are not the same as human rights, being only the latter universally binding and therefore, they cannot be granted or enforced internationally by legal automatisms (John Rawls, 2005). After the second war world, philosophers like Robert Nozick believed that only a minimal state presence was necessary to solve ethnic conflicts, arguing against the conferment of tailored-privileges to minorities. It was thought that the universality of human rights was sufficient to guarantee political and civic engagement, leaving ethnos-national disputes to community consultations. Consequently, the general trend of post-war politics gathered around the idea that members of a minority who were bestowed an equality of treatment as citizens of a country (subjective human rights), could not claim further political instruments for their racial or ethnic identities.

The realm of cultural and religious ideas, (legitimated in traditions), was considered an area of the private sphere, closed to a public discourse (Preston, 2000). States offered elements of relative autonomy to individuals to express their beliefs but at the same time, enforced sanctions (both pervasive-formal and pervasive-informal) against who tried to extend an ideological network. A "benign neglect" approach (Nathan Glazer, 1975) that separates a state from ethnicity precluding recognition to group-specific advantages. It is true that many (left) political theorists outlined exceptions, setting a different framework (affirmative action) to help disadvantaged/discriminated minorities but always limiting it as a temporary and remedial measure (*extrema ratio*).

The governmental affirmative action in allocating (temporal) benefits did not end the political space between state and ethnicity, neither the constitutional doctrine that subdues private interests to public ones (Jed Rubenfeld, 1997). Minority rights could not be ascribed as constitutional, lacking homogeneity and a precise legal definition, standing on a theoretical dichotomy between universality and particularity (Ignatieff, 2003). We witness at this moment a gap created by the inability of political agencies to negotiate through a cultural narrative, falling into a structural inadequacy unable to move beyond basic human needs. A sterile abstract universalism that eclipsed particularism, overlapping individual demands with social necessities.

For Canadian political philosopher Will Kymlicka (2009), the erroneous ethnic conflict management failed to adopt formal acknowledgment of fringe cultures and recognition of special statuses, exacerbating the dilemma between *polis* and *oikos*. Jürgen Habermas (2010) and Charles Taylor (2012) also argued that the complete absence of a mere form of proceduralism and the ideological impossibility of democracies to be neutral (especially when cultures or ethnic identities are considered) perorate injustice. A disequilibrium that had its origin in the impossibility for a state to renounce its own cultural/social identity, as a set of rules and ideologies rooted in its history. On a constitutional perspective, judicial equality was referred as the product of the conferral of different rights (but always after the dutiful acceptance of common political values), aimed to create more progressive outcomes. A theory challenged by Turkish American political theorists Seyla Benhabib (2014) and Joseph Carens (2015) who emphasized its incompatibility with liberal philosophy, especially if rights were given *ad infinitum*. According to them, allocating privileges (or immunity clauses) undermines state power via internal restrictions of its authority, an unacceptable liability.

4.3   Theoretical and Political Perceptions of Multiculturalism: Rhetoric versus Reality

Charles Taylor suggested (1989) a project of modernity (based on historical contingent changes) in which individuals are driven by idea(l)s of dignity and freedom, in dialogic intercourses. Referred here is a discursive knowledgeability not to be interpreted as metaphysical but anchored to social processes (as stage-setting), where agency and selfhood are tokens of subjects relating to other subjects qua subjects. In fact, from a construction perspective, utterance is a basilar condition for human communities, enlarging of semantic meaning action-like modes of expression. To understand this axiom, one need look no further than the Saphir-Worf hypothesis and its conceptualized nexus between lingua and culture. A pathway that exposes the cross-cultural roots of modernity, bringing us to a critical recognition of pluralism as necessary sub-stratum and, transversally to envision its heterogeneity. Implied here is the logical difficulty for a functional society to be blind to differences and to the dangerosity of inter-group estrangement. The metaphors of location and positionality are useful strategies to understand personal narratives and permit political investment to be located into precise social spaces and hence, to determine capability. In this geography, exclusion and integration are both products of a communication competence.

Veritably, daily life practices are loci of re-adjustment of meanings by which, differences and discourses are translated and adapted to be used in a continuum of scenes and possibilities. To this end, Mahoney and Thelen's researches highlighted the path-dependency of institutions and human groupings, whose inner plasticity and potential heteroclitism lead to a substantial degree of fluidity (Baumann) and the negation of a homeostasis. Thereof, unlike liberal theories that treat particularism as unwanted (cultural) dust to sweep under the rug, we should consider it the real base of a modern (polyphonic/liquid) society and move accordingly.

The concept of recognition is central because it allows the construction of a persona to be enlaced with both public-institutional (polis) and private-subjective (oikos) spheres. Political desiderata apart, having acknowledged the dynamic nature of social ontogenesis, there is the need to leave behind biased semantic alignments that negatively influence assumptions and expectations, to ensure a respectful interaction and to build up trust. Not to embrace multiculturalism (or symbolic actions) uncritically but, through an interplay of agency and structure, to understand the complexities and breadth of communication, while fostering practices of solidarity. From this point of view, a future-oriented perspective in the conflict-negotiation process (in-group and out-group), strategically staged to be proactive against low-grade situations (and thus preventing further escalation), is fundamental for the wellness of nations (Samovar &

Porter, 1994). In sum, to guarantee an interdependent construal of Self and move beyond the aridity of a cultural monotheism, we need to be mindful of cognitive and behavioral blinders, "*striving to reach a larger community goal*" (Samovar & Porter, 1994:371).

Multiculturalism and cultural pluralism are often confused as synonyms to indicate the ongoing presence in a state of different symbols, languages, and cultures. A misunderstanding that hides a subtle conceptual discrepancy: while pluralism is a descriptive category, multiculturalism is a normative/prescriptive one. Multiculturalism refers to politics that recognize a pluralist framework and adopt or change legal strata to promote equality and freedom. Liberal democracies can accept many forms of cultural diversities but not all of them, due to political limits. Further, Tolerance is considered intertwined with independence, a link that upholds unlimited personal development. From this point of view, liberalism cannot coexist with those ideologies that restrain individuals on a set of specific values. The outcome of facing un-liberal groups can be moral intolerance, the end of a multicultural stand (the ideological-conflict hypothesis) and the beginning of asymmetric violence (state-individuals). For Renzo Guolo (2009), Ambrosini Maurizio (2013) and Mario Catarci (2014), in contemporary Europe, there are four main responses to immigration crisis and minority claims:

a) The first reaction is a hardening of liberal ideals of universalism and equality against what is described as (detrimental) tribalism and fundamentalism. A sclerosis motivated by the fear that a rule based approach (secularism) is at risk with the antagonist and undemocratic cultures.

b) The second reaction comes from who (like Habermas and Michael Walzer) refuse multicultural claims as illegitimate and ethically wrong. In this view, minorities must abide to state laws and not ask different legal treatment. Professor Jagdish Gundara (2005) zeroed in on education as a medium to accept and introject social values of a host country, to avoid marginalization of groups.

c) The third response considers subjective rights and liberal neutrality (the separation between ethnic groups and state) insufficient to confer full equality/dignity among different individuals. Cultural rights are seen as a feasible choice to protect minorities against assimilation. Tailored treatments are part of an affirmative action that recognizes that minorities incarnate various cultural identities and needs. Will Kymlicka and Joseph Raz shoulder this position, considering it a healthy background for a modern multicultural scene.

d) The last riposte is similar to the first one, considering multiculturalism dangerous and unadoptable within a liberal spectrum. But, while the first adopts universalism and equality as key factors to protect society against fissiparous ideologies, the latter comes to refuse the liberal-democratic theory as (oppressive) unattainable utopia. It is a post-modern way of thinking that de-constructs without offering solutions, on the verge of constitutional anarchy. A critic to the western political philosophy that ends up in being an empty shell.

A multiculturalist inclusive model, able to guarantee social cohesion, should be based on a shared civic nomos, political engagement, and pluralism (to increase the visibility of minor groups). Hence, it is fundamental to build a popular consensus around procedural aspects, rather than on specific ethnic values. Normative interventions (on them) are to be avoided unless they violate the principles of public order, being influenced more by social interaction than proscriptive dimensions.

As noted in the previous paragraphs, claims that are in blatant violation of constitutional principles are to be banned. Conversely, there is a need to limit constraints on subjective rights to avoid de-culturalization, subsuming personal freedom under civic participation. Citizenship is an essential legal instrument to obtain political loyalty, and its acquisition has to be simplified, though the progressive extension to foreigners of voting right, starting from administrative elections. The lack of it weakens legal arguments against migrants and breaks the (liberal democratic) nexus between taxation and political representation. We should move away from a notion of voting as a privilege that can be discretionally offered or withhold, in an effort to stop disenfranchisement: social capital is ruined by discrimination and institutional inequality, pulses that bring into existence frustration and fractuosity.

4.4   The Failure of European Models

The European Union was considered a successful model of integration where diverse populations share the same social space (agora). A structure based on agreed (joint) leadership that promotes regional cooperation among (continental) countries, to support the respect for linguistic and cultural diversities. However, over the last three decades, the impact of large-scale migration from the developing world (known as diaspora politics) reshaped EU, widening a spectrum of analysis focused on a democracy-mobility nexus. The emergence of the (uncontrolled) flow put the whole fabric of society at risk, having impoverished lives, due to its breakaway tendencies that erode democracy. The problem opened the door for a negotiation of perceiving compatibility versus enmity to influence to what extent political rights should be offered to denizens (Hammar T., 1990) and on what legal ground future citizenships can be given. It is a social issue cored in a globalized paradigm shift undergone by world states to free not only goods (economy) and workforce (human capital) but also individuals with specific cultural and religious grounds. Identities that unlike the past, demand particular rights and acknowledgment of their needs.

Forced to sustain social cohesion and avouch for rights, European societies elaborated different models (orbiting around an ethnocentric or universal scheme) to manage the cultural integration. France offered an assimilation policy with national loyalty as driving vector, while British and Holland adopted a multicultural stand. Germany implemented the *gastarbeiter* (guest worker) program to benefit the economy and fill labor shortages, under rotating shifts. For years, Belgium limited labor migration (without preventing family reunifications), formulating naturalization merely on the principle of the *jus soli* (citizenship/right of the soil*)*, without requiring any other social attributes (such as linguistic knowledge). Other countries, like Italy, followed for many years the *jus sanguinis* (citizenship/right of the blood) but offered partial welfare services. Although orienting public policies and prescriptive dimensions, these models are outlines, idealistic constructions that cannot completely encompass the difficulties of facing alterity, due to structural inadequacies present in every social theoretical formula.

I particularly find interesting the French model based on the principle of equality under the law. An ideological apparatus that grants memberships through the subordination of requests of collective rights and preferential treatments to secular and universal values (France banned face covering in 1989). The path to obtaining citizenship is based on the acceptance of national values, a nomos of rules that has to be introjected and followed. Public spaces are formulated on a negative laity that excludes the presence of religious symbols as inimical of Republican principles. (Mainstreaming) Integration of migrants is formulated on state ideology through social programming (area-based approach) to strengthen social glue and international linkage (Angéline Escafré-Dublet, 2014). This inclusive model does not drive back population-swelling immigration and, in theory, it simplifies citizenship requirements.

The effectiveness of the integration can be undermined by incongruities between naturalization and complete social coverage, especially among people from the Middle East and Africa, in scattered municipalities. The insufficient enforcement of civic rights under regional mechanisms can be translated into a general disengagement (not due to lack of attentiveness) of migrants from politics. Religious beliefs are generally kept private and disbanded when made public, a policy that can spark cultural controversies or racially-charged messages. Critics of French political system recognize in it and its fragmentary assimilation, causative elements of friction, a hiatus between citizens and state regime. A point of rupture felt by cultures that do not detach personal credo from the public sphere, apparently refractory to secularism and social equality. A disagreement that can inflame social conflicts or (Huntington's) clashes of civilizations, phenomena avoidable through stricter controls and more pragmatic political agendas.

It is important to remember that Western model of enlightening was erected on a refractory or at least unwelcoming framework to cultural pluralism (but now evolved over time) and that often gave origin to indigenized forms of secularism, antithetic to a globalized modernity. In France, after the Revolution, it became a learned practice, embodied in people' agencies through a didactic method, which formed a specific habitus (Michael Warner, 2010), averse to religious dogmas.

Dissimilar to France, Great Britain, opted (after the 1960s) for a "light touch" multi-cultural stand that recognizes not only individual rights but also (collaterally) those of the membership group, offering a legal conscience more prone to (religious) freedom; a sensibility that provided assurance of autonomy and privileges. A political landscape with social treatments that (rhetorically) champions diversity (not

equality), while encouraging compliance with the state (as guarantor), to avert discrimination. A balance of power based on collective negotiations that have social impulses, self-ruling. A sense of collective belonging (as a dialogic process) thought to supersede the animosity disparities created by the French policy of assimilation. Aside main stream rhetoric that pledges on the success of the system, excessive immigrations, and internal conflicts, have degraded public trust and alienated foreigners, fueling anxiety.

In a recent poll (2015), commissioned by the Huffington Post) it emerged that resentful citizenries believe multiculturalism to be synonymic of instability and unsafety, a not subtle innuendo to the advocates of a heterogeneous society. Multiculturalism failed because it was born on a deceitful base: a post-colonial syndrome that made the existence of a superior (meta-) culture able to fatherly embraces and organizes other cultures, an addendum of political calculations. A tolerance, placed into a top-down scheme that boxed in diversities (as sub-cultural classes) offering help, but demanding obedience.

Anthropology teaches us that an inter-cultural dialogue is an osmosis between two different personae, who without dismantling their ethical substrata face diversity, weighing their assumptions, leaving open the possibility of a change. An equilibrium made by a similarity of roles and not subduction. Accepting social diversities is of great value, but it is more important not to stereotypes individuals, framing their lives into a unmovable pattern of recognizance.

The English arena and its immigrant-host model put on display clear institutional limits even before the terroristic attacks of 2005 (London bombings), heinous acts organized by British Pakistanis, integrated into their ethnic community but not in the mainstream political culture. A dangerous divergence that makes the management scheme standing out as one of the culprits behind the formation of parallel societies that while living together do not share the same values or principles. Self-segregation and the consequential withdraws from social interaction, created ethnic enclaves that cause community tensions (Deborah Phillips, 2003). A gullibility that has no excuses having resulted in the loss of innocent people, individuals who expected their government to protect them. A rupture that could have been averted, following what liberal philosopher Will Lymlicka (1995) proposed as an effective model of multicultural citizenship; a scheme construed around a governance that actively contributes to defining cultural and symbolic dimensions. An approach that suggests to use specific (but limited) rights to enfranchise poly-ethnic and national groups, to limit encroached discriminations to whom minorities are subjected.

Noticeably, in Lymicka's thought, against a larger jurisdictional openness toward national minorities, foreigners who voluntarily come to a country are granted less tolerance. Inspired by a theory of justice that has roots in moral philosophy, he interpreted any human exodus (when not forced) as a willful act carrying a degree of responsibility (and a consequent minor legal malleability).

4.5 Bloodlines and Contracts

The Latin locution *ius soli* is a juridical expression that underlines the possibility of anyone born in a state to citizenship, regardless of the legal status of the family. In a debate that tackles whether the conditions for naturalization should become more or less restrictive, it sets a strong non-nationalist argument. The *ius sanguinis* is counterpoised to it, contrasting its expansive inclusion, with an acquisition of citizenship only trough parental lineage. Many European countries considered the right of blood a *condition sine qua non*; a limit inclusion (against the expansive inclusion of the *ius soli*) that grants privileges only to those who are born into the ethnos (Philip Spencer, 2003). Immigrants are accepted as temporary guests (especially in Germany), often only on a workfare perspective (cheap labor shortage) as compliance with an economically driven approach to immigration (with states brokering connections in a sort of human trafficking play). Eventually, exogamic marriages, economic development, and schooling modify the situation, merging immigrants with autochthones.

Amid international similarities, the Italian situation can be considered worse than other European ones: the acquisition of citizenship is not regarded as a subjective right but as a discretional administrative act, not even construed on precise legislative criteria. It is a hybrid (groundless) scheme, a disciplinary model often influenced by xenophobic policies. Italy showed a multiculturalism without "multiculturality", a situation that often leaves individuals in dismay.

The *ius sanguinis* was the legal scaffolding of Risorgimento (Italian unification), inducing communal participation and feelings of ethnical belonging, a true Weberian *politische vergemeinschaftung*.

Libertarian municipalism and localism, connected with an organic theory of the state (a contractual nature would have cast a shadow on its perfectibility), were the main axis of a country that was left almost untouched by migration. This conceptualization became the political mantra against modern processes of de-centralization and differentiation, of the 18th and 19th century, posing state legitimization beyond the limits of a political sphere. In 2015, the government accepted a limited form of *ius soli* but at the same time, it did not dismantle the persistence of laws that denote a form of territoriality based on the all-inclusive ideological stance of the nation-state (Salvatore Natoli, 2014). Nowadays, with the breaking of cultural homogeneity, we should ask ourselves if democracy and liberal values are being empowered or damaged. It is a dilemma that, apart from the inadequacies of the Italian legal system, concerns us all.

5.   Conclusion: In the Eye of the Beholder

Integration is a polysemic notion characterized by an un-univocally spectrum of meanings with qualitative-quantitative variations. On a cultural group dimension, a critical exploration would lay down also its background elements of creativity and reactivity that always stimulate resistance to cultural homogenization (John Berry, 2011). In complex modern societies, the ethno-cultural groups dialogue is characterized by a multidimensionality of meanings and praxis whose nature cannot be easily absorbed or assimilate.

The negotiation of ethnic identity is a political event that, in acting as a catalyst of social climate change, exasperate conflicts, and insecurity. Lassègue and Serenest, in their "Adskillelsens politik" ("The Politics of Segregation," 2008) criticized multicultural agendas as unproductive in preventing ethnic and religious clashes. Attempts that failed to bring political enfranchisement. The circular causality into which particular rights are formulated on behalf of a universal equality (that cannot be imposed institutionally), creates insular communities, blocking true democratic stimuli. An illogicality that lacerates unity, forming spaces of abysmal (legal) differences among minority groups, in a parody of a common ground dialogue. A mistake that did not promote cultural vivacity but a hardening of inter-group differences, often confusing individual freedom with *libertas ecclesiae* (as the right to promote religious roles and traditions even against the state), shifting from an Illuminist conception of the human persona to a dysfunctional political one. Social frictions and dissident movements, testimony the unpreparedness of a system cocooned in unrealistic expectations. The mismatch between immigration and integration has eroded the nation-building stage (Kenan Malik, 2015); a paradoxical truth hidden in systems that while promoting cohesion and understanding, *de facto*, institutionalized diversities (through laws *ad hoc*), creating those inter-groups divisions that were thought to reconcile.

The European models were unsuccessful because they did not critically face and analyze diversity, they simply let it in. Neglecting intercultural dialogue and overlooking geo-political limits cannot tie communities together, and in the end, they produce only chaos.

6.   Afterword: Brexit

After a long campaign scarred by bigotry and nationalistic slur, on Thursday 23 June, the UK has finally abandoned the *Vieux* continent, leaving the population in dismay and sparking numerous debates about its (clumsy) future. Although the overall impacts are still uncertain, Woodford Investment Management and The Centre for Economic Performance (London School of Economics) believed that gross domestic product, financial services, and foreign direct investment, will face only short-term negative outcomes, lowering the national economic level of output. The UK did not leave Europe (as a free trade area), only the European Union (as a single market). Actually, it has never been really inside, only partially: one foot in and one out. It had relaxed Maastricht parameters, it was tactically placed outside the Schengen area, and it was even allowed to have its own coin, but it was not enough. English people were scared, afraid of hordes of unwanted immigrants (an improbable consequence of free movement rules), even undesirous of their Europeans brethren.

We cannot say that they were the only carriers of an anti-European virus, it should not be fair. They never had the exclusive in disliking unity, only a historical defensive vocation for isolationism. After all, even Europe and America, seem to be victims of a gradual desegregation and implosion, with behind-the-scenes stories of squalid xenophobia and hate crimes. Extreme positions that, as Noam Chomsky

pinpointed, are iconically represented by a legion of less educated working class white people. (Injected) frustration and a sense of uselessness are gorging brotherhood and comradeship, sinking families into despair.

In this worrisome panorama, the specter that wrapped London has the outlines of a populism without flags, a hybrid product of ultra-conservationist right-wing parties and a lost leftist enclosure. Brexit is a product of a fraudulent populist demagogy and a widespread social myopia, unable to recognize the difference between equality and equity. We let it happen, preferring the easiness of localisms (and passive obedience to faulty politics) to the difficulties of an inter-ethnos dialogue and a more social openness.

7. Acknowledgment

8. References

Appiah, A. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. Norton & Company.

Agier, M. & Fernbach, D. (2011). *Managing the undesirables: Refugee camps and humanitarian government*. Polity.

Barnett, M. (2008). *Humanitarianism in question: Politics, power, ethics*. Cornell University Press.

Benhabib, S. (2004). *The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens*. Cambridge University Press.

Butler, J., & Habermas, J. (2011). *The power of religion in the public sphere*. Columbia University Press.

Caldwell, C. (2010). *Reflections on the revolution in Europe: Immigration, Islam, and the West*. Anchor.

Cox, C., & Marks, J. (2006). *The West, Islam, and Islamism: Is ideological Islam compatible with liberal democracy*? Civitas.

Chomsky, A. (2014). *Undocumented: How immigration became illegal.* Beacon Press.

Chomsky, A. (2007). *They take our jobs!* Beacon Press.

Chomsky, N., & Naiman, A. (2011). *How the world works*. Soft Skull Press.

Crepaz, M. (2012). *European Democracies*. Pearson.

Dancygier, R. (2010). *Immigration and conflict in Europe*. Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, G. (2016). *Flashpoints: The emerging crisis in Europe*. Anchor.

Gatrell, P. (2015). *The making of the modern refugee*. Oxford University Press.

Gilbert, M. (2011). *European Integration: A concise history*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Gundara, J. (2005). *The case for intercultural education in a multicultural world*. Mosaic Press.

Habermas, J., & Seidman, S. (1989). *Jurgen Habermas on Society and Politics: A Reader*. Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An Inquiry into a category of Bourgeois Society (Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought)*. The MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (2007). *The dialectics of secularization: On reason and religion*. Ignatius Press.

Hashemi, N. (2008). *Islam, Secularism, and Liberal Democracy: Toward a democratic theory for Muslim societies*. Oxford University Press.

Hirschman, A. (1970). *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.

Ignatieff, M. (2003). *Human rights as politics and idolatry*. Princeton University Press.

Kivisto, P. (2014). *Religion and immigration: Migrant faiths in North America and Western Europe*. Polity

Lyon, B. (2016). *We asked for workers. We got people instead*. Open Society Foundations.

Rawlence, B. (2016). *City of thorns: Nine lives in the world's largest refugee camp*. Picador.

Rawls, J. (2005). *A theory of justice: Original edition*. Oxford editions.

Rieff, D. (2003). *A bed for the night: Humanitarianism in crisis*. Simon & Schuster.

Sniderman, M. P. (2014). *Paradoxes of Liberal Democracy: Islam, Western Europe, and the Danish cartoon crisis*. Princeton University Press