

## **MIGRATIONS AND CITIZENSHIP. THE PEDAGOGICAL APPROACH FOR A COSMOPOLITAN CITIZENSHIP**

**Alberto FORNASARI, Matteo CONTE**

Department of Educational Sciences, Psychology, Communication, 'Aldo Moro' University of Bari, Italy

**Abstract:** *Being interested in intercultural issues is a necessity for pedagogical and educational research. The priority task becomes to draw a model of citizenship, which in recent years has greatly expanded, taking into account a real interaction between the different groups. In order to create an intercultural society, it is necessary to ensure the possibility of recognizing and sharing a minimum core of principles and rules that constitute the basis of a common coexistence. This article reports the most recent reflections in the pedagogical field on the concept of citizenship, within the global society, which can be harmonious and pluralistic, as desired by E. Mounier, only if education will appreciate the multiculturalism and multi-religiousness already present in our societies.*

**Keywords:** *intercultural society; citizenship; cosmopolitanism; global education*

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

In the current scientific literature, it emerges that education is undoubtedly a concept of relevance of pedagogy, but it is also considered a social phenomenon, since the human being is formed and grows in a certain environment, of which it gradually absorbs, and later internalizes, the culture (Annino, 2012). Contextually to the whirlwind of changes that have taken place lately, it's necessary to reflect on educational phenomena in relation to individuals and their social and cultural peculiarities, that is, on the subjects participating in the interaction process that involves the need to rethink some very important issues such as globalization, complexity and plural identity from the perspective of otherness. Therefore, among many problems to this level, one particularly representative regards the meanings that today are attributed to the dimension of citizenship and to the educational choices that should be made in relation to the new scenarios. The phenomenon of globalization, international migration indeed set new challenges and call for new reflections on the very concept of citizenship. The article, after examining the different meanings of the concept of citizenship evolved over the centuries, tries to reconstruct the ways in which man has inhabited the earth by interacting with his fellows starting from the concept of civis up to that of cosmopolites, illustrating the new prospects of global education.

### **2. REASONING ON THE CONCEPT OF CITIZENSHIP**

The concept of citizenship is complex and changeable, whether it is considered in its transformation over time, or whether it is analyzed in contemporary times from points of view that offer different interpretations and realizations. The different meanings of citizenship recognizable over time have in common the participation in public life (Santelli, 2010). But new meanings are emerging: migration processes, the communications system, globalization dynamics that question the traditional meanings of citizenship. No longer belonging to a nation-state, a juridical dimension, but cultural and ethical reasons extend the concept of citizenship to the sphere of universal human rights (Tarozzi, 2005:21). The formative approach focuses not so much on the first juridical-political meaning (what is indicated on passport and identity documents, and which is regulated by the laws on naturalization), but on the awareness of the social connection that this state entails (Santerini, 2010:6). In recent years, many expressions have been introduced: social citizenship, active, plural, differentiated, new citizenship, cosmopolitan citizenship, flexible citizenship, democratic citizenship. They are declinations of citizenship that summarize and enclose the meaning of these new perspectives, managing to combine the level of territorial citizenship with the national and

international level and emphasizing the "multiple loyalties" to which each of us is called (Prodi, 2003:165). In current debates, these issues are basically faced through two approaches: one universalist in favor of opening borders; the other institutional-civic in compliance with the rigorous conceptions of citizenship. About this issue, it is appropriate to question whether the territory within which one is born and the documents to which one is entitled are less arbitrary, from an ethical point of view, than other characteristics about which much has been discussed in recent years such as skin color, sex or other peculiarities of the individual. Following this reasoning, hardly disputable according to Santelli (2010), the democratic states, that are such indeed, are called to pursue more compatible politics with the vision of a world without frontiers. The aim is to have an overview as clear as possible so that it becomes truly broad, that it aspires to wider horizons, in order not to overlook any fundamental factor that could make participation in social and cultural life in the community effective and consequently progress civil law in the country. The history, the various norms, and all the institutions allude in different ways to the dimension of the nation-state, but the phenomena of change generated by globalization have inevitably undermined the very concepts of national identity, influenced by the phenomenon of 'immigration; for this reason, the need for a new form of citizenship that knows how to manage the pluralism connected to the presence of linguistic-cultural minorities arises directly. The question in this regard is whether the collective identity of the nation-state must always remain identical to itself, or should it not rather transform itself, enrich itself, and in a certain sense 'evolve', gradually including new elements, brought by the different groups that arrive (Annino, 2012). Citizenship is therefore a *being* even before a knowledge or know-how. In this direction, international studies and researches have developed a comprehensive and holistic model of citizenship, broader and deeper than those of the past, in which there are assumption of responsibility, critical thinking, availability to the non-violent solution of conflicts and sensitivity towards the defense of human rights (Cogan-Derricott 1998:116). According to these researchers, the educational project designed to enhance these attitudes must develop on four levels: *personal*, modifying the behavior of individual life; *social*, about the commitment in public life; *spatial*, considering the dimension of interdependence even with distant realities;

*temporal*, which includes projects for the future (Cogan-Derricott 1998:118-137). This view, as underlined by other authors (Osler-Rathenow-Starkey 1995), is inclusive, it goes beyond the local dimension to embrace the international one. But given the overabundance of constituent elements of citizenship, it is necessary to understand how to organize them in an educational project. In this regard, the framework elaborated by Gagnon and Pagé can be useful to analyze and describe what is inside the "black box" of citizenship and identify the different ways in which societies face social pluralism. In this context, citizenship is presented on two axes: on the vertical side of identity, at the two poles there are the macro-concepts of national identity and of social, cultural and supranational belonging; on the horizontal side of equality we find the poles of the effective regime of rights and political and civil participation. The individual elements cannot be considered in isolation, but in close connection with each other. Each country will choose how to configure identity, how to manage memberships, which rights regime to affirm or which rules of participation to establish (Gagnon-Pagé 1999). Through this image-picture it emerges that the city is made of civic culture, as expressed in the Constitution, and of that complex balance that regulates the integration of differences, the system of effective rights, their degree of participation and so on, and that these processes on the social, civil, political and historical-cultural level must be used in their becoming (Santerini, 2010) as tools to analyze the civic framework, but also as guidelines for training. Identity and belonging, relationship and otherness, dignity / rights and participation are also proposed as learning objectives for the school (MIUR 2009). Therefore, starting from this assumption, citizenship cannot be limited today to the civic values of the Risorgimento of the family, of religion and of the homeland or of cultural belonging, but must be relocated in the global dimension, in that world context in which every individual finds himself by now living, now disoriented, now looking for landmarks, now as a member of social networks or as a traveler. We are in a *world-culture* about which we try to discover connections and interdependencies (Lipovetsky-Serroy, 2008).

### 3. EDUCATING IN POLITICS IN GLOBAL SOCIETIES

In this context, what Prof. Santelli (2010) defines as "*education to the politics*" differs from

political education not about content but about its purposes. In fact, both deal with topics such as power, state, government, but the purpose of political education is not to mobilize consent towards their particular configuration, but rather to help understand what this configuration is and to assent / allow or disagree with it considering the own personal interpretative criteria, in view of a possible improvement of social coexistence (Santelli, 2010). The clear goals of political education are: promoting responsible knowledge of political dynamics, questioning political choices to support or regain trust, participation but above all acquiring skills to evaluate all the results of action politic. The challenge is to pursue in the institutions that deal with education and care, an education in politics that is free from politicization, to promote and encourage a lifestyle as much as possible characterized by a cooperative behavior, able to overcome separation and conflicts (Ravasi, 2006). Engaging in the development of an education in politics means interpreting the continuous innovations of the present while maintaining its basic principles firmly and clearly. Today we are realizing with increasing awareness that the reference to the other does not concern only the neighbor, the similar, but also involves those who are far away, those who are not there yet, the different so as not to make the mistake of believing that there is nothing beyond one's time and the desert beyond one's boundaries or, if something is there, it is only charged with negativity and danger. A realization that is difficult to achieve, full of obstacles not only on the cognitive level due to the complexity of recognizing what is specific to different realities and what is configured as recurrent and permanent, but also on an emotional level because of the effort we must make to overcome the sense of insecurity triggered by what we do not know (Santerini, 2008, 147). This commitment helps to support what Piussi calls "politics first", a non-competitive and non-instrumental way of living and relating to others, aimed at making "civilization and civilization human" (Piussi, 2001, 9). The current complexity must therefore make us reflect on the path that man carries out in trying to become an 'active citizen', and education must provide a real paradigm for active citizenship since

[for the single subject] it is the practice of *care about* that must be placed at the center of the training processes and rendered as a constant orientation of these processes. And *care about* means the ability to read oneself, to give oneself an

orientation, to rework the image of oneself and to make it always open with respect to one's future (Cambi, 2010, 138).

This imposes, especially in a context of an intercultural nature, that in a confrontation, even a tight one between members of different cultures there be no prevarication of one over the other, but rather a continuous confrontation, an openminded approach, a closeness, and, so that this encounter is fruitful and effective, it must absolutely be based on a profound and above all 'reciprocal' dialogue (Buber, 2009, 68).

#### 4. GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENTS OF COSMOPOLITANISM: FROM THE CONCEPT OF WORLD CITIZENSHIP TO THE ADVENT OF GLOBAL EDUCATION

The adjective "cosmopolitan" and the noun "cosmopolitanism" as claimed by Pierluigi Valenza in his essay (From Athens to Seattle. An Historical look and current considerations on cosmopolitanism, 2004:95-116) "both intend, in the most common acceptance of current language, the idea that the world can be traced back to a single unity, from which thence there is only one citizenship: cosmopolitan man is, precisely, citizen of the world, the one who is at home and can be at home everywhere. Cosmopolitanism therefore would be that philosophical-political theory that supports this possibility: that the world is a single city, that is, it is governed by a single system of rules in which man, every man, can be a citizen. In this way, then, the world-city combination unravels, always in language and current use, in a quantity of shades: the cosmopolitan man is not really the man as such, nor is he made such by the fact that the world is effectively brought back under a single system of rules. If this were the case, it could also be argued that having human rights as sanctioned in the 1948 UN Charter would therefore constitute a single system of rules, a kind of city, a world republic, of which men, for the sole fact of being men, would be a part, and then we would all be cosmopolitans. It is sufficient to call to mind the meaning of that adjective applied to man in ordinary language to realize that the sense is also something else, that we use that word equally to mean a person who has lived in many countries, who knows the languages, customs and traditions, and therefore is at home in different parts of the world because he has adapted to different contexts and knows how to fit in (Ulivieri, 2017). Still different then the use when

we refer to the city: when we talk about a cosmopolitan city we mean that the city became a world, that is, it is inhabited by a number of people of different cultures, customs, races, who live side by side without particular problems (Santerini, 2008). It is therefore, important to reflect on how the word "cosmopolitan" and the theory related to it "cosmopolitanism", take on actuality in the period in history in which we are living, in which imposing phenomena, such as mass migration or instant communication between the different parts of the world (through the internet), seem to realize that idea expressed in common language, that the world is reduced to a city, that men become citizens of the world, that the city itself becomes a world because it is inhabited by men very different from each other .

Valenza underlines how focusing on some significant moments in the history of the term can help to better enter the problems mentioned above and see them inserted into the cultural tradition to which we belong: the different layers of meaning show how the idea of cosmopolitanism has accompanied the transformations in cohabitation between men. It may be useful to start, for example, from the meaning of the single words that form the roots of the compound terms discussed here: polis and cosmos according to Greek culture. Polis is an ambiguous term, as recalled by Aristotle in the *Politico*: ambiguous in that it names, as indeed does our "city", both the geographical place, that is the place as inhabited by men, and the social place, or the State which the men who live there organize by creating a constitution for themselves. This ambiguity tends to move to the *polites*, because similarly the citizen can simply be the man who lives in a place, or the man as endowed with rights, a participant in the political life of the place in which he lives. In the discussion that Aristotle, again in the *Political*, makes of the notion of citizen the first case, however, is certainly excluded, and it can be said in this sense that that same first case does not belong to the line of thought of the Greek man of the pre Hellenistic age: "the citizen is not a citizen because he lives in a certain place"; rather a citizen in the strict sense, or, as Aristotle says, "in an absolute sense", it is the one who has the right to participate in public life, more precisely "those who have the right to participate in the office of councilor and judge this we say without doubt citizen of the state in which he has this right ". The terms polis and *polites* define an area that is human and conventional, that of the inhabited place founded or governed by a small or large number of

people, who have given themselves an order, which varies greatly from place to place in the Greece of then. Even the term cosmos means an order, but this is an order independent of the will of man, it is a natural order. The two words then, associated with each other, continues Valenza, would seem to generate a sort of short circuit: the word *polites* referring to the cosmos would be improper because being a citizen has sense only within man made realities, of institutions that have conventional value. The birth of the term "cosmopolitan", however, intends precisely to achieve this, the rupture of the obvious organized political order of classical Greece into a multiplicity of polis. The first uses of the term and above all the political conception that assumes its nucleus are found in the time in which the world of the free Greek cities declines with the Macedonian predominance. It is the idea of a citizen remembered that no longer is: "Man as a political being, an element of the polis or responsible for the government of the city-state, had died with Aristotle; with Alexander the Great man is conceived as an individual. After the polis, you become a citizen so what? As will be most clearly expressed by the Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius, the Emperor Philosopher, the reference to the "cosmos" can represent a sort of superior citizenship, belonging to humanity, which can coexist in a non-conflictual way with the belonging to a State, as expressed in the fragment: "My city and my homeland is Rome because I am Antonino. As a man, it is the universe". The compatibility of universal citizenship and local identity, (we are in the time before the meaning attributed to the term *glocal*) (Robertson, 1995) because of the particularly interesting premises posed by the contemporary situation, is announced. In *Zum ewigen Frieden*, outlining fundamental principles and articles for perpetual peace, Kant distinguishes three levels of law: public law, international law and finally the "cosmo-political right", the right according to which "men and states in external relationship mutual with each other are to be considered as citizens of a universal state of men". Some of the problems that the term cosmopolitanism evokes have led philosophers, sociologists, scholars of politics, to take sides, more or less openly, on the right of the term to subsist and to represent a possible perspective of coexistence among men. Cosmopolitanism, understood in this sense, could designate the possible identity in the age of globalization, an identity that, without erasing the cultural and linguistic identities of a majority, takes as a basis for integration a core that

does not look upon these as a point of departure but more, if anything, as a point of arrival, in the awareness, however, that in individuals, families, communities with another story behind them, they will no longer be those, but others. But what is the relationship between intercultural pedagogy, the only way, in an era of migration and globalization processes of being pedagogy today, and global education? Starting with the “Global Education Charter” developed by the European Council, Global Education (P. Panarello, 2016) can be defined as the ability to educate people during their life to actively and responsibly participate in the construction of a planetary future in the search of peace, of intercultural dialogue, to the education off the appreciation of beauty, of the protection an of the safeguarding of the environment and all living species. From this point of view, it is necessary to develop a sensitivity and consciousness towards planetary issues - migration, war, hunger, poverty, structural violence, environmental disasters, climate change, human rights, democracy - using an interdisciplinary perspective, capable of highlighting crucial factors in the theory of pedagogy: anthropological-formative, socio-political, epistemological-cultural. In the “Global Education Charter” four specific fields of research and action are identified: 1) interdependence in a global horizon; 2) sustainable development; 3) awareness of the environment and concern for its protection; 4) human rights (including anti-racism), democracy, social justice and peace (North-South Center of the Council of Europe: 75). Therefore, working on global education paths in this way intended represents the true challenge of the new millennium.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The new horizon awaiting pedagogy today is represented by a profound 'critical responsibility' towards the new generations, that is to say to grasp the true value of social life, of the common good, which concerns everyone indistinctly, to promote it relentlessly, fighting apathy and disinterest, in short, to try to fill the current sense of void. The challenge that pedagogy faces today is that of the analysis of an education towards citizenship, inclusive of the intercultural dimension, aimed at the acceptance of others, equality and social cohesion, achieving the necessary balance between the peculiarities of intercultural education, which specifically is the ability to know and appreciate differences as well as the ability to direct them not

to defend localisms and different cultural needs, but to develop serene 'civil coexistence' (Annino, 2012, 227). The wealth of meanings proposed by the intercultural perspective is articulated in the overcoming of solitude and inequalities, in the pursuit of peace, in the construction of a society that E. Mounier defines as “harmonious and pluralist” (Mounier, 1935). It is inevitable, today, that these issues be addressed with the awareness of their inescapability, since the presence of 'the other, the different', in our midst, will always be greater, and the inclusive process, both in school and in society, need to be the most natural and 'civil' the social fabric can offer: Pedagogy, operating in this light, therefore has the delicate task of critically analyzing society, and trying to hand over, mainly, but not only, to the younger generations the responsibility of the choices: “the value of values, that is the discussion of values because values are valid, are fundamental both for social life and for the affirmation of personal qualities” (Baldacci, 2010).

## 6. ACNOWLEDGMENT

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 are attributed to Matteo Conte; Paragraph 4 and 5 is attributed to Alberto Fornasari.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Annino, A. (2012). La cittadinanza nella pedagogia critica dell'emancipazione. In *Educazione e Costituzione 1948-2008: analisi critica di quattro paradigmi didattici, Cqia Rivista formazione, persona, lavoro*. Vol. II, no. 4.
2. Aristotele (2011). *La politica*, Libro 1. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
3. Baldacci, M. (2010). Progetto Generazioni. I giovani, il mondo e l'educazione. Abstract *Convegno Siped - Cosenza 3-4 giugno*.
4. Buber, M. (2009). *Discorsi sull'educazione*. Roma: Armando Editore.
5. Cambi, F.; Certini R. & Nesti R. (2010). *Dimensioni della pedagogia sociale. Struttura, percorsi, funzione*. Roma: Carocci.
6. Cogan, J. J. & Derricott R. (1998). *Citizenship for the 21st Century. An International Perspective on Education*. London: Kogan Pagé.
7. Gagnon, F; & Pagé, M. (1999). *Cadre conceptuel d'analyse de la citoyenneté dans les démocraties libérales*, vol. I. Cadre conceptuel d'analyse. Rappourt puor Direction du

- Multiculturalisme, Direction de la Participation des citoyens. Ottawa: Recherche et analyse stratégiques.
8. Kant, E. (1997). *Per la pace perpetua*. Translated by R. Bordiga. Milano: Feltrinelli.
  9. Lipovetsky, G. & Serroy, J. (2008). *La culture-monde. Réponse à une société désorientée*. Paris: Odile Jacob.
  10. MIUR (2009). Documento di indirizzo per la sperimentazione dell'insegnamento «Cittadinanza e Costituzione». PROT. N. AOODGOS 2079 del 4 marzo 2009. *Ufficio stampa*. March, 4.
  11. Piussi, A.M. (2001). Pedagogia e politica. In M. Tarozzi (ed), *Pedagogia generale*. Milano: Guerini.
  12. Prodi, R. (2003). Educazione e cultura. In A. Erbetta & P. Bertolini (ed.). *Senso della politica e fatica di pensare: atti del convegno "educazione e politica"*. Bologna: Clueb.
  13. Ravasi, G. (2006). *Ritorno alle virtù. Per una riscoperta di uno stile di vita*. Milano: Mondadori.
  14. Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In: M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds.), *Global Modernities*. London: Sage Publications
  15. Santelli Beccegato, L. (2012), Dinamiche multi e interculturali: significati di cittadinanza ed educazione alla politica. *Education Sciences & Society*. I, 2. 162-175.
  16. Santerini, M. (2008) Pedagogia interculturale e nuova cittadinanza. *Pedagogia e vita*. no. 1. 133-141.
  17. Santerini, M. (2010). *La scuola della cittadinanza*. Roma: Laterza.
  18. Tarozzi, M. (2005). *Cittadinanza interculturale. Esperienza educativa come agire politico*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
  19. Ulivieri, S. (2017). *Per un nuovo patto di solidarietà. Il ruolo della pedagogia nella costruzione di percorsi identitari, spazi di cittadinanza e dialoghi intercultural*. Bari: Progedit.
  20. Valenza, P. (2004). Da Atene a Seattle. Sguardo storico e considerazioni attuali sul cosmopolitismo. *Rivista della scuola Superiore dell'economia e delle finanze*. no.1. 95-116.