

*Human Rights, Right of asylum, Refugees.
Migrant's Dignity as a Common good*

LUIGI DI SANTO

How to cite

Di Santo, L. (2018). Human Rights, Right of asylum, Refugees. Migrant's Dignity as a Common good. *Journal of Mediterranean Knowledge-JMK*, 3(2), 179-201. DOI: 10.26409/2018JMK3.2.05.

Retrieved from

<http://www.mediterraneanknowledge.org/publications/index.php/journal/issue/archive>

1. Author's information

University of Cassino and Lazio Meridionale, Italy

2. Author's contact

l.disanto[at]unicas.it

Article first published online: December 2018



- Peer Reviewed Journal

INDEXED IN
DOAJ

Additional information about [Journal of Mediterranean Knowledge-JMK](#)
can be found at: [About the Journal-Board-On line submission](#)

Human Rights, Right of asylum, Refugees. Migrant's Dignity as a Common good

LUIGI DI SANTO

University of Cassino and Lazio Meridionale, Italy

Abstract

The road toward the foundation of a necessary inter-ethnic civilization imposes us to build the meeting among each men's experiences. In this regard it is important, in our opinion, to refer to the concept of "migrant", particularly as "reserve of sense." The idea of "migrant" really can open, in terms of meta-cultural, new change of sense. Through the philosophy of Waldenfels we can imagine the migrant as being of border in the proposition of a pathos looking for answer, that is lent again to the dimension of the threshold of attention in a redefinition of a new type of intra-culturalism from the distinction between the "need" and "demand". The need of the different experiences of the migrant hides unexpressed question on our existential condition. As Dal Lago wrote, "the immigration more than every other phenomenon, is able of to reveal the nature of the society so-called of reception. When we speak about immigrants, we talk about ourselves in relationship to the immigrants". Now is the time of passage from inter-culture to "intra-culture" as dialogue between cultures in the space of the meeting.

Keywords: Migrants, Common good, Dignity, Inter-culturalism, Intra-culturalism, Peace.

1. In the beginning

The human being is linked to the physicality of the space and in it is constituted as an individual and as a community. In space he 'lives' his time, seeks his own life spheres in comparison with others, modifies his habits, 'tests' his vitality in doing, triggers his imagination in thinking of a world that before to be external, resides and thrives in himself consciousness. The spatial dimension is constituted of the human being. The migrant, to use a metaphor, very current of the man in movement, at a certain point of his 'journey' stops himself. The human being in a certain space, inevitably produces the identifying characteristics of a social and political nature that give meaning both to the lived space and to the same condition of 'existing'. In the years of globalization, an incontestable

modality of the 'transformation of space' has emerged, understood in particular as a space for coexistence and relating. The space, therefore, as a constitutive dimension of the individual in its specifications, through the explication of human vitality that translates into facts, with the consecration of the effective presence in the physical's space of social bodies, which 'humanize' spaces of simple nature with the complexity of conscious individuation. Being in such a perspective is not immobility. There is no doubt that the individual in his finiteness cannot 'fill' the merely physical space, but in the search for the other, 'spatializes' the intrinsic human condition that connotes it primarily. Man fills space, space fills with man. The 'signs' and the 'signals' of this intense and mysterious relationship are evident. Physical space and human space become a single one through the 'projects' and the 'products' of knowledge (Kern, 2003). The *jus migrandi* recognized by the Universal Declaration of '48 (Art. XIII e XIV), can be considered as the landing of a story that has marked, between triumphs and trajectories, the whole history of humanity. "Migrations are one of the most important factors in the evolution of civilization: they have contributed to the wealth and even the formation of many modern nations, have allowed the population or the repopulation of entire continents, have been decisive for the construction of cities and metropolis and for the same phenomenon of urbanism on which industrial civilization rests" (Onorato, 1989, p. 303). We know that there are various causes that animate the phenomenon, of an economic and political nature, anyway definable in the substantial's sphere of the humanitarian emergency. We also know which questions are raised, above all in relation to internal and international security, with the relative crisis of 'sovereign spaces'. On the one hand, immigration, on the other, the right to asylum, naturally 'sides' of the same coin, which impose a reflection on the right of the other "as a need to be" (Rizzi, 1995, p. 111) in the search for the fullness of his rights. This is plausible if we first understand that administrative barriers to prevent those seeking shelter and work or cross the border of another country, cannot be considered a satisfactory answer to the problems of security provoked by international migrations (Lohrmann, 2000, p. 103), so it becomes necessary to look for other options that at the same time feed on the irreparable ethical dimension in a condition of reciprocity with the normative action (Maffettone, 1992; 2016). It is therefore unthinkable that

the idea of a state-border can be revised on the basis of an erosion of the 'barrier' from the outside, in the sense of pressure exerted by migrants, but paradoxically it can happen from within, in the sense of awareness of values of the solidarity's subject who recognizes in the other his own human affair, then subject of rights in a global context that aspires to the overcoming of every "statecentric" type closure. If the horizon is human-centric,

everything suggests that a consequent development of human rights in planetary civilization [...] should lead to a restructuring of the national state and a relativization of sovereignty. A theory of politics born of European culture -the theory of the national state-should be rewritten under the pressure of an "extra theory born of the same culture - the theory of human rights" (Onorato, 1989, p. 328).

The phenomenon of international migration, in the last decades, has taken on aspects so revealing for its intensity, to such an extent that it is characterized as epochal. The so-called migratory flows, produced for the most part by the disparity of wealth among the 'worlds', forcefully 'rise up' in the limelight as a new frontier for the recognition of human rights. It is unthinkable to consider that it is possible to contain the phenomenon through control measures that find their consistency on the precariousness of the legal *status* of immigrants. The closure of national borders not only affects by the use of fundamental rights but also touches nodal points that bring into play 'the inviolable rights of the person'. Suffice it to think that the discipline of expulsions, the ambiguous legal qualification of the centres in which foreigners and asylum seekers were based, to the dubious constitutional interpretations of the rights. C. Hein writes that

the fact that there is no real path towards the integration of refugees, a path planned and financed by the State but then managed at regional and local level, with the participation of qualified associations, is today the most serious problem. Thousands of refugees recognized with a regular residence permit live in extreme precariousness, in metropolitan areas as in the countryside, forced to endure exploitation in work without a contract and without union rights (Hein, 2010, p. 84).

The fundamental Charters have given great space to the explication and protection, by the way of the fundamental rights of migrants, both from a more general point of view of the Principle of equality, and also from this

particular point of view. The leading principles enshrined in the *Universal Declaration* have been repeatedly reaffirmed by successive Charters, on race and racial prejudice. But beyond the 'on papers' statements, there are questions that are widely discussed both from a normative point of view, in terms of evaluation and juridical consequence, both socially and culturally in terms of the debate on the characteristics of the relationship between migratory phenomenon and criminality, on the realities of racism in relation to prejudice, on the rights of national and cultural minorities, with the consequent questioning of the very idea of border-nation.

2. *The migratory phenomenon*

The *jus migrandi* recognized by the Universal Declaration of '48 (*art. XIII and IV*), can be considered as the 'heart of meaning' of the whole human story. The underlying causes of the phenomenon are defined in the substantial area of the humanitarian emergency, involving the classic 'spatial' category of the politician, in particular way on the side of the internal security of the states. As Dal Lago wrote, "the immigration more than any other phenomenon, is capable of revealing the nature of the society called welcoming. When we talk about immigrants, we talk about ourselves in relation to immigrants" (Dal Lago, 1999, p. 13). On this level, the migratory phenomenon appears above all in terms of analysis of the social fabric, not only Italian, beyond the distinction between the figures involved, such as the immigrant, the refugee or even, displaced person who invest in particular the legislative's side. For this reason, "integration among men can certainly take place through pragmatic techniques that use meeting opportunities; but the 'techniques', if they do not want to be provisional experiences, must sink their roots into a thought that has at its centre an anthropology that grasps the universal structure of the human being" (Montanari, 1989, p. 430). There is no doubt that migrations are perceived by the target companies as a danger to their own internal stability, to such an extent that they become the primary objects of debate and of a centre of normative interest in matters of public order. In reality the overall impact of immigration on crime and security of the host countries, is often incorrectly viewed and overvalued (Lohrmann, 2000, p.

88). As far as the Italian's case is concerned, according to some analyses carried out by specialized study centres, no particular increase in the phenomenon in question is observed. On the contrary, while recording that in a situation that is not favourable to immigration, it is not surprising to substitute the autochthonous with the immigrant in the ranks of marginality and deviance, the only way to effectively fight the criminal phenomenon is contained in the social and inclusive recovery of young immigrants. Today such a prospective is very unpopular, but it would be the most economical and 'would lead' to results more satisfactory than those achievable through simple repressive action (Lohrmann, 2000, p.179). In reality, we know that protectionist measures can only express a fallacious "sense of security" or at least produce elements of "social stasis" that prevent the free and vital democratic space of discussion. "The danger is that the collective fears for the increase of immigrants and the entry of the new refugees are suffocating a healthy debate aimed at the development of long-term political policies, on the phenomenon of immigration and integration" (Abella, 2001, p. 81). Psychological mechanisms come into play that are based on what Dal Lago has defined as 'strategic hostility'(Dal Lago, 1999), that is, the sense of the 'objective threat' that arises due to the migrants' presence only in a framework of pseudo-tolerance and in respect for "other cultures". The category of "endurance" keeps alive the thin line of distinction between immigration and deviance, in a sort of inevitable interweaving where the 'spectrum of difference' feeds on widespread feelings of fears that reflect the neuroses and insecurities of developed society. The dyad security-insecurity captures in the completeness of its being the typicality of our psycho-social condition. The social marginality of the migrant becomes a metaphor of the global marginality of the subjects of post-industrial civilization. Both the migrant and the subject of post-industrial civilization share the dimension of 'spatiality' as a distinctive feature of the global era. But if in the first case we are faced with the 'conquest of space' as a historical-formative phenomenon of the world order so far known, other considerations are due to the reflection on the condition of those who live and work in the reality of 'shared space', in the constitution of one's own individual identity on the basis of a social and value bond.

In fact, the process of globalization generates the crisis on the one hand, and on the other the reconstitution of the social bond in regressive and destructive forms. We are witnessing a sort of new polarization that sees on the one hand the emergence of a narcissistic individualism, on the other the configuration of a tribal communitarianism (Pulcini, 2001, p. 57).

The restoration of the communitarian sense in its perverse forms for the affirmation of the individual and social identity in crisis, can find again among the functional effects inherent in the security-insecurity dyad related to the criminal emergence, as a natural product of immigration, the symbolic elements for the re-composition of the global 'collective feeling'.

3. Multiculturalism, multi-ethnicity and immigration

In the Europe of our time, it is becoming increasingly clear, a framework of reference, in which there are strong minorities who claim the right to 'practice' systems of life and expressions that can be presented in very different ways. In particular, if we look in front of the traditions and the costumes of the welcoming countries. The migratory flows that are in Europe, as we have seen, put in discussion rights now codified and 'lived', seemingly almost 'not debatable', but at the same time reinterpreted in the light of the needs of new subjects who tend to be placed in a new socio-political structure. The new subjects are identified as 'national minorities', as part of part, in the game of claims suitable for the protection of the traditions and their values. On the one hand, therefore, the guarantee of the 'legal' which finds in the system of the powers of the political organisms its implementation; on the other the question about of the 'difference' to be protected through solutions able to build new platforms to 'tolerate' a coexistence of identities (this is a strong legal exigence of modern era). In the Europe of the rights, profoundly changed since the falling down of the Berlin Wall, in 1989, groups of different nationalities ask to participate in philosophical western 'dignity'. That senses have historically marked the new way of Man. The national minorities are a part (relative to identity) of an ethical, ethnic, cultural and religious heterogeneity. For this reason, if one wants to grasp the sense and the scope of the challenge that today is present in the world's global, in the name of a dialogic and inclusive pluralism, new parameters of comparison are needed. The debate on the

protection of the minorities' rights, in the sense of the coexistence and interaction of identities, calls into question the classic category of 'tolerance' and in particular the multi-cultural thesis as a 'test bench' of the democratic state of a socio-political aggregation, in all its interpretations. There are many open questions and all are played on the level of equal 'dignity'.

Human dignity and theories of multiculturalism

The presence of migrants in the societies of destination/asylum reopens, in the post-industrial west, on the slopes of novelty, starts the new debate on the defence of human dignity. It becomes, in particular contexts, a kind of 'thermometer' to measure the level of attention to respect for the rights of the person, both in its individuality and in its collective and formative experience. The new reality entails a few answers on the level of socio-political reflection and due to regulatory interventions. In the last decades, classic issues of the theoretical liberal and democratic, from the guarantee of the fundamental possibility to the participation's right, in the name of social pluralism, were resumed and critically actuated, in the light of the many reflections on the 'multiculturalism'. First of all, it is necessary to differentiate between multi-ethnic and multiculturalism. The multi-ethnic society is imaginable as "a social aggregate consisting of ethnic components interacting with each other and organizing their behaviour on the basis of a supposed ethnic and cultural diversity, claimed within the group or sets 'Outside'" (Schellenbaum, 1998, p. 187). Multiculturalism, in turn,

is based on the claim and the request for recognition of cultural differences: it therefore refers to the affirmation of the equal dignity of individual cultural identities, that is, the same goes for the same lore of different cultures". The same author describes two versions of multiculturalism: the first "temperate" which is based on the equal dignity of all cultures on the basis of respect for human rights; the second "radical" which refers more profoundly to ethnic difference and to the recognition of every culture beyond any 'universalist' aspect. (Cesareo, 2002, p. 36).

In the age of globalization, the claim of 'difference' takes even more deepest meanings. The migratory phenomenon, which affects the developed countries, has within itself both conditions, as it expresses a growing ethnic presence from which it descends any claim of cultural heterogeneity which translates into the introduction on the ground of social

practice of so-called 'collective rights', a crucial issue as it constitutes the core of a sense of the struggle for 'recognition'. On this side, starting from classic debate between liberals and communitarianists, are concentrated the reflections and contributions of theorists of multiculturalism, who see in the process of globalization and the relationship between 'integration particular' and fundamental rights, in the terms of a preliminary ruling, if not resolute of the increasingly latent conflict of the multi-ethnic society, with diction no longer postponed for the Government of liberal democracies. In this sense, the clear distinction between liberals and communitarianism assumes less important meanings, despite the undoubted theoretical and methodological assumptions different, starting from the theses of Kymlicka that see in the relationship between the choice of the individual and Membership of the community, the ways to safeguard fundamental rights and cultural rights. Kymlicka introduces three versions of Cultural rights, that include rights of self-government, poli-ethnic rights and special representation (Kymlicka, 1996). Poli-ethnic rights are the expression of the claim by the ethnical groups of their cultural prerogatives. And there are still distinct cultural rights that express themselves as "internal limitations" and others become the form of "external protections". These sub-values which are both ethnic and national groups make it possible to identify the dangers of incompatibility, between fundamental rights and rights of minorities. In fact, in the first case the possibility of limiting the freedoms of the individual 'in the name' of the group are obvious, as in the second case is required external protection in relations with other groups or institutions that are able to carry out a domain action to the point of striking or threatening the same security as the new asking group. What the philosopher explicated, through the reflections exhibited, is the serious problem of the condition of limitation of individual rights in the case of "internal restrictions", especially as he argues that the external safeguards are entitled only to the extent that promote equality between groups, by correcting the conditions of prejudice or the elimination of risks to which the members of a given group are exposed (Kymlicka, 1996, p. 266). The rights of the individual are therefore worth on the poli-ethnic ones. The community in a general sense must be understood as a space for quantitative and qualitative training of the individual. In this sense it seems difficult to think that "in times of

globalization, assuming that cultures are all-encompassing ways of life, circumscribe able and untouchables, without continuous borrowing from the outside and without any continuous modifications” (Galeotti, 2000, p. 38), may have openings of sense compatible with the real social conditions of the migrants and the groups of belonging. Even more than Kymlicka, Jürgen Habermas argues that an elaboration of liberalism in a community sense is not desirable, indeed superfluous, since in order to safeguard the 'right to culture' of minorities there is nothing more than to call upon the system of individualistic rights. In fact, the German philosopher re-holds that the protection of traditions and forms of life constitutive of identity must only serve to recognize their members as individuals. It does not constitute a biological protection of the species, accomplished by administrative way (Habermas, 1994, p.89). The level of integration is outlined in the form of participation rights and political representation in the relationship between political sphere and legal, in the typical conception of Habermas' communication democracy. To a first level of integration, in the street of political-constitutional type where the universalism of the juridical principles is reflected thus in a consensus procedural (Habermas, 1994, p.95), it follows a second sub-political level on the plan of which the ethical integration of the groups with the themselves identity, which must detach itself from the level of the political integration, that includes, in equal measure, all the people (Habermas, 1994, p.93). One understands therefore the attention for the protection of the social balancing in a multi-ethnic reality where the coexistence legally equated of ethnic country, linguistic groups confessions and different forms of life must not provoke the fragmentation of society (Habermas, 1999, p. 158). In fact, Habermas still believes that if these societies are structured as democratic states of law, there are many ways to achieve the difficult goal of a 'sensitive to differences' inclusion (Habermas, 1999, p. 157). There is no doubt that the democratic platform is the most 'sensitive' to differences. But on the level of “reacquaintance”, the category of the 'difference', for some tendencies, should be linked with the principle of equality, in the sense of the search for a line of compatibility. The 'difference' establishes a new interpretative code of the principle of equality by promoting a decisive critical revision, since “from the theories of difference has been seen that equality as a treatment identity can take a scope assimilationist: it treats in

an equal way only those who become equal and constitutes the presupposed of policies that allow to reach goals and lifestyles of the dominant group only to those peoples willing and able to give up, at least to their own cultural identity" (Facchi, 2001, p. 54). Comanducci, in this sense, speaks of 'negative equality'. "For the principle of equality, it is unlawful any discrimination based on an essence (sex, race) or on a belonging (language, religion, status) of men. This equality is justified, at through the procedure of universalization, because it is subsumed under the ultimate value of individual autonomy. [...] The principle of negative equality [...] represents an ideal-limit of liberalism, especially if its formulation is correctly understood as historically situation: the most universal goal is the irrelevance of any being and of whatever belonging for the purposes of unequal treatment, both unfavourable and favourable. It is clearly a completely antagonistic goal compared to that constellation of approaches that make the difference (to be or to belong) an element that is relevant and not contingent that justifies treatments of not favour or favour" (Comanducci, 2000, pp. 48-49). Once again, we can only understand the complexity of finding ways out of the difficult interpretation of the relationship between the protection of the individual and collective rights. On the other hand, at the same time, from the normative point of view, the public/state power of the societies of asylum/destination cannot renounce its role as a *medium* in the perspective of the social balances to be reined. In particular on the plan of the integrative function, in the sense of taking into account the conditions of life, on the side of concreteness, producing legislative interventions to ensure some form of "equality" in order to eliminate or at least reduce the level of discriminating against groups and minorities, in raising the degree of opportunity to consolidate aspects of substantive equality. It seems undisputed that the resolution of the State of the material conditions conquers the scene and that the research and the defence of the identity and cultural approach are envisaged as secondary. In this sense,

the whole of the interventions attributable to the equality of oppositeness has a great importance in a multicultural policy, since it leads to the improvement of the economic-social conditions of immigrants and their integration into the society in which they live. This contributes to breaking the connection between cultural minorities, poverty, social exclusion, low level of education and individual right, can contribute to the safeguarding of

that of personal dignity which is the necessary prerequisite for a modern minority collective identity (Facchi, 2001, p. 77).

In fact, the problem of cultural identity can be mere the sense of the paradox. Firstly, it is not exempt from the risk of an 'excess of categorization', given that in the debate the question of 'other culture' could with-imagine itself

mainly as a result of a process of construction and labelling of countries of immigration, which transforms migrants into ethnicities, communities or subcultures to the extent that they want to identify, stratify and control them. The result of a differentialist vision brings into question the 'universalist holding of rights', in the sense of the consideration of every human being as a polycentric law of rights. The culture of belonging cannot be understood as discriminant in relation to the claim of individual guarantees (Dal Lago, 1999, p. 169).

This remains valid both for the protection of the migrant, within his own cultural, and in the proposition outside the existential. On the contrary, it is thought that the preventive concern to 'label' and 'categorize' migrants in specific cultural spheres who can be interpreted as a singular prerequisite for reflection on the 'other cultures', by the developed world intent on built forms of communication with the 'stranger' to but screen defaults on concrete issues, starting from development, or even worse to 'silence' inescapable feelings of guilt.

Human rights and tolerance

The search for the coexistence of identities strongly calls for the notion of tolerance. If at the level of communication between different cultures, as we have just seen, there are numerous interpretative difficulties, with extreme consequences on individual survival outside the group to which they belong, it is necessary to pose, without doubt, the problem at least to guarantee minimum *standards* of equal dignity. In this framework, revisit the concept of tolerance can mean opening up possibilities for intervention within the multiculturalist debate, which seems to be in full evolution in the search for answers to the questions still on the table. Without retracing the historical and philosophical steps of the notion of tolerance, in the ideal path that goes from John Locke, through Voltaire (Collotti Pischel, 1989) up to the preaching of Gandhi's non-violence, as far as our reflection is

concerned, both for the question of active recognition of differences and for locating a political-juridical space for the practice of rights. The interaction between the identities in their dynamic motion, the differentiation or opposition between the meaning of *tolerance* as a mere interpretation of tolerance in the classical-liberal sense and that of *toleration* in its positive opening to diversity, are the signals of a renewed hermeneutical attempt. And in relation to the pluralism of groups, in the sense of acknowledgment and inclusion, in contrast to the reality of lived exclusion, it is possible, according to Galeotti, to reconcile the theoretical requests of multiculturalism with the fundamental liberal principles. In fact,

apart from the ways and the language of the movement, the claims expressed in multiculturalism are related to questions of pluralist tolerance, to questions of collective inclusion *way* recognition and public protection of different identities. [...] It is therefore the task of liberal theory to produce an interpretation of the claims of multiculturalism that is both sympathetic to the question of equal respect of respect and inclusion and decisive against the destructive radicalism whose results then nobody is willing to accept" (Galeotti, 1994, pp. 198-199).

In such context the sense of liberal neutrality is modified, and on the contrary the level is enhanced for which it is determined a society capable of representing the libertarian drives of its citizens, paying attention to the multi-dimensionality of belonging. It often forms the identities of many of subjects, thus attempting to ferry the members beyond the conflict (Walzer, 1999, p. 95). We must never forget that the object of the speculations, around which the theories arise, is the human being 'both' in its singularity 'both' in its plurality. Now in the socio-political realities that regulate 'our world', the moment of the social integration of the individual's plan, can only have normative attachments, not only formal but decisively substantial. It is clear that for a real defence of human dignity it is not enough to appeal generically to the practice of human rights, but the latter conquer concrete condition only if filled by the confluence of different paths in the intertwining of relationships, first human and then cultural, through the guarantee of a flexible and able right to intercept the instances of society.

4. *From inter-culture to “intra-culture”: dialogue between cultures in the space of the meeting*

Migrants, asylum seekers and refugees are to be considered as indicators of the soul, in a world community, which must strive to ban the 'excluded category', also because this

perhaps underlies the lack of awareness that the progressive extension of the excluded ranks, in addition to the risk of a substantial 'downgrading' of democracy, from a term of value to a mere technique of decision, would end up posing a serious threat to the political unity of the state, reducing the pluralistic legal system to a fiction devoid of real content (Baldini, 2012, p. 12).

Rights are embodied in interpersonal relationships and in the legal institutions that govern them (Di Santo, 2017). How is it possible today not to talk about intercultural sustainability, on the basis of the encounter between different cultures, between different “people”, where men in concrete build bridges and not walls, in the sign of Panikkar's lesson (Panikkar, 1995). This happens because the residuality that in each of us wants to manifest itself searches for otherness the open completion of one's own experience. Looking from the point of view of the other, to a level of epistemological “sympathy”, to avoid the misunderstanding of the cognitive resource that is ‘the other’. Opening experiences in the time of recognition and in the memory's space of the values of the other. The expected opening passes through the recovery of the person's idea as a relationship. Of every person, because every person is a relationship in his affective relationships, in the family, in the culture, in the ethnic, in the linguistic and symbolic belonging, therefore in history. Each person represents, in this sense, also his world, which is part of his dignity. In fact, a person cannot be thought if not in his network of relationships, starting from his uniqueness and depth. The theories of participation, without the necessary reference to the concept of person, are at the reward of unbridled smug and tragic individualism or the opposite of a communitarianism that feeds on the 'faith' in the identity group (Pope Francesco, 2013). The “third way” is the idea of “person”, equality and difference, “reserve of sense of human's dignity”. The person in his migrant's essence being is a novelty that renews the existing every time it is generated and introduced into

history, it is a new beginning but at the same time it is present in the already existing flow of life and which will no longer be the same as before. Man, in his dispersion in the flow, seeks an identity in the encounter with the other, with whom he shares the pathos sphere, the human dimension, where responsibility is the bond of revealing oneself in one's own uniqueness. In the polyphonic complexity, the person recomposes the limits with his own depth. The depth undermines the limits of modernity. The person, like the Time, is always new and places himself before the complexity in a path of co-orientation and open planning, always in search of the unpredictable, the host in the direction of a *plus of sense* in the law, that is not a norm omni-provident. The problem therefore is not to simplify the complexity but to meet it as an event in which the encountering (the person) and the encountered (the complexity) are both profound in the possibility of a narration, to put it with Ricoeur (2003), what has to do with man and his time in flesh and blood. It should not be forgotten, in this regard, that the concrete person is conceivable only according to the criterion of difference, *not* of equality. The term 'person' in the singular is tragically equivocal in that the person *has* relationships but as it *is* relationships. Each person represents, in this sense, also his world, which is part of his dignity (Di Santo, 2012). But there is another, essential, coordinate of "person". It is 'depth', which requires respect for distances and a threshold. In a "person", therefore, we can see coincide his concrete singularity and his claim to universality. The person "is, in this sense, as such, a common good. And this, despite being the person, as such, "partiality": *because it is its lack, its being defective*. And the person, in fact, is defective precisely in being in relationship. In fact, it is characterized as *constitutive lack*. The meeting becomes, in this context, a necessity. But, at the same time, becomes a necessity also a healthy distance. In fact, it is a matter of that "distance" that is better to live, often, the richness of one's being-in-relationship. If the person was complete, like the atom-individual, he would not need relationships, which would always be only "external", only corresponding to any "options". We live, today, in a time when we are, paradoxically, more able to understand, digging in its history, this semantic invention that belongs to the European matrix. But, on the other hand, let's say that this 'person' was too important invention because we can leave it, today, confined in the European's tradition, also because a

"person" is never thinkable by wiping out the intermediate spaces that bind it to the family, groups, homelands, cultures of belonging. In fact, it cannot be thought of except in its network of relationships, starting from its uniqueness and depth. And it is from the place of this difference that it claims its right to a universal consideration that is corrosive to any idea of 'universal' formulated too early. A person is, if understood as such, a *novum*. That is a living person who, although in a relationship, in groups, cultures, memberships, does not accept to be identified in already fixed types, because, in his being a person, he can find and find in himself the strong reasons to question any consolidated type. This being the *novum* of the person indicates, in reality, the strategic perspective for which it does not have the role of one who must simply adapt to the system in which he lives, because he can and must, instead, be able to elevate stringent demands to which the whole system juridical and cultural- must *open up* to give sensible answers. All this means rethinking, at this point, with progressive approximations, to a unity of essential meaning: the Dignity. The migrant is plural's good.

In the sense that the other is the end not to be reduced to a simple tool, economically or emotionally. Dignity, therefore, cannot be exhausted by freedom, by rationality, by logical connotations, by pure references of species. At whatever cultural coordinate we place, dignity is that specific trace that a man cannot lose of himself, because losing it would be to lose himself. In this sense, dignity can reveal itself, even in legal and institutional terms, a possible alphabet of our time. Because it shows the root of right to rights. In this sense, Rights, even if diversified cultural perspectives, go towards the affirmation of dignity. The civilization of the near future will have to be thought out and criticized, therefore, according to strategic nodes that put into circulation the possibility of its essential experiences. Spaces are never just physical but also symbolic. It will be necessary to study the meanings of the distances between cultures and their sustainability, of a theory that deepens the relationship of *conversion* and *misunderstanding* between lexicons and different styles (Waldenfes, 2006).

In this sense, it will be necessary to prepare specific studies concerning the 'personal equations', that is, the cultural perspectives from which we look at others and from which we look at them. In an *intracultural* civilization it will be necessary to be able to 'invent', or bring out, in adequate centre, living spaces that start from the *multi-ethnic* to get to the *interethnic* and *intercultural*, up to that intrapersonal in which everyone is a person. The civilization of the near future will have to generate places

where *the experiences* can truly live in the confrontation between different, because the other is not only displacement, but also a question and resource (Bauman, 2013). It is a long road, this one, along which the essential question that lives hidden in the manifest need can meet -the question that always comes from the "bottom back" to a "high", always daring to call into question a "universal" closed too early. Along this road, we think that the original idea that Europe can bring -as its historical and civil contribution- to the "universal's open" of the Mediterranean, exists and is strong: the idea of a person in the sign of integral humanism (Maritain, 1974). What are we able today to bring us Europeans, to the common dialogue with the contemporary world, when the need for an 'interethnic civilization' is pressing? It is well known that Europe can be considered a sort of Asian's peninsula with a *bridge's* function. In such a context (Baeck, 2006), Europe can be seen, together with the Mediterranean area, that constitutes its essential moment, as a hinge of permanent mediation within a great itinerary of future's civilization. In this perspective the Mediterranean becomes the place of this meeting. According to Braudel (2009, pp. 7-9), the Mediterranean is a thousand things together. Not a landscape, but countless landscapes. Not a sea, but a succession of seas. Not a civilization, but a series of civilizations stacked on each other. For the French historian, the Mediterranean is a very ancient crossroads. For thousands of years everything converges, complicating and enriching its history: beasts of burden, cars, goods, ships, ideas, religions, ways of life. And, Braudel wonders, cataloging the men of the Mediterranean, those born on the banks or descendants of those who in ancient times furrowed or cultivated their lands and terraced fields, and then the newcomers who from time to time invaded it, would not have the same impression that it derives from writing the list of its plants and its fruits? In the physical landscape as in the human one, the Mediterranean crossroads, the Mediterranean heteroclite presents itself to our memory as a coherent image, a system in which everything merges and recomposes itself in an original unity. The Mediterranean is a good opportunity to present an "other" way of approaching history (Braudel 2009, pp. 7-9).

The other way advocated by Braudel supports and encourages meetings between the different cultures, religions and identities that characterize the Mediterranean lake. To understand "the Mediterranean we must

simultaneously conceive of unity, diversity and opposition: we need a thought that is not linear, that includes both complementarities and antagonisms" (Morin, 2000), both the equalities and the differences in the pluralism of cultures that characterize it. At *mare nostrum*, today as yesterday, the delicate task of weaving interpersonal relationships to build peace with the bridges of inclusion and solidarity. Human coexistence is possible and becomes reality when establishing direct human relationships, relational networks designed to protect human beings. The relational character of the human being is necessarily lived in solidarity. It is the recognition of the other through the acceptance, respect and esteem that strengthens the relationship bond and creates a reciprocity that improves human relationships. A "good gesture" creates in the recipient the willingness to reciprocate, activating a positive co-responsibility in the achievement of the common good. The essence of man lies in the possibility of the relationship with otherness: we do not exist for ourselves, but we exist in the implementation of existential relations. The relationship must necessarily be practiced, introduced into life. Dialogue, through education in the presence of others and listening to their needs, makes the society open, capable of embracing humanity in all its particularities and exceptions. The community is born of a reciprocal relationship and not of feelings, which are its content, nor of the institutions, which are its form. Dialogue communication promotes agreement: it is people who create the conditions for plurality to be respected and no longer be considered an intrusion, an imposition of lifestyle, values, and vision of the Western world. Cooperation between men, education, renewal, intracultural dialogue are the conditions necessary for achieving peace among men. The "way of peace" is the awareness of living in a divided world because of the incomprehension of differences and of having to cooperate actively and pragmatically in the coexistence of equal persons for dignity and recognition of rights. The essence of law is the person, indeed the person is the subsisting human right.

To establish international relations on a sound basis, one must affirm the necessity of a renewal of consciences. As La Pira said: the peoples and nations all over the world now constitute, every day more - at all levels - an indissociable unity, it means that the problems [...] of every people are problems whose solution organically affects all the other peoples of the

globe! All walls are broken: all barriers are broken; all the mental schemes of division are removed; the boundaries of peoples are transformed by walls that divide into bridges that unite (La Pira, 1964). Its waters, in fact, put in dialogue among deeply different continents (for cultures, ethnic groups, religions and traditions) play a fundamental role for the intra-culture, understood as a "bridge" for peace. Its geographic conformation and its historical scope make the cradle of civilizations also the cradle of inclusion and the seat of dialogue between the peoples who live on its banks. It is from the Mediterranean that we must continually stretch our hands as a sign of friendship and help, to favor the difficult processes of inclusion.

5. Human Rights, Justice, Peace for intracultural society

Fundamental philosophical questions should be raised, starting from the never discussed enough topic of otherness, especially today where regressive and dangerous tendencies are clearly visible before the idea of other cultures, traditions, religions. The research imposes a question on its path with force, or if it is possible to build a peace society in the Mediterranean theater. The themes of welcome and dialogue are brought to light with consistency and rigor. But the thought outlook surpasses the old categories of multiculturalism and inter-culture narrated by Panikkar and, through a very profound ethics of dialogue, wants to start a reflection and launch a scientific proposal useful for understanding the present times. It is about reflecting on the new path of intra-culture, delineating its importance and effectiveness. It is no longer the time of simple tolerance in its various forms, it is no longer conceivable to imagine not contaminating the beauty of a multicultural thought, since the certainty of common humanity puts people in relationship and designs bridges to unify the world. An intracultural vision, in my opinion, calls into question the same concepts of democracy and human rights as we know them, rediscovering in this key the common religious roots of the peoples of the Mediterranean, according to the lesson of Giorgio La Pira, but with a new message that gives a palpable sense of peace as a practical instrument of connection between freedom and responsibility, between the protection of human rights and plural

democracy. The person becomes people. The cultural dimension that is composed as a table full of different human colors needs to probe the proposal of intra-culture about the ontological foundation. The person who is about to become people must first comes into contact with himself and then, aware of the common truth, accept each other. In this way “the intracultural space of inclusion that is not tolerance of the other comes to life”, but respect for the person as an ontological being. The respectful meeting that realizes the recognition involves human, positive and particular knowledge, in a process of progressive discovery of the truth”.

This implies to 'discover the truth' of the crisis in the Charter of Rights, starting with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Not only is it noted, if it is still necessary, that the postponement of the foundation of rights in favor of action practice, has certainly not implemented the ethical dynamics of the consistency of rights but it is clear how detail has been sacrificed in the face of the myth of universality. Looking at the particular, diversity can avoid misunderstandings between peoples, promote solidarity among people. The “particular” brings out the concrete of/in the person in the fullness of his experience. The person makes contact with his body condition at different stages of life, realizes that his/her own feeling is particularized in the other as the latter bearer of his own difference. It is therefore a question of combining the same with the right. There cannot be any democracy without equality and justice, without peace and truth, as the events of recent years in the Middle East have shown in particular (Said, 2005) . The hermeneutical key that the culture of peace invokes must be found in the paradigmatic theme of peace as a primary condition for welcoming the other as an authentic person. Peace occupies the entire path of humanity with his humanity but opens the intra-cultural dimension to the philosophical level at the height of its tension. The challenge of forgiveness does not look to forgiveness as an act granted as a new perverse toleration but places our hearts in humble conditions in order to welcome the other integrally and insert it into our lives. Peace, the foundation of every dialogue, changes the face of the personalist doctrine (Pérez Esquivel- Ikeda, 2013).

Peace belongs to everyone, it does not look at the person as a 'mask' but recognizes its value as being a bearer of the inclusive good, especially

in the primacy of duties that gives meaning to a 'dignity', more than ever a true double bank for civilizations of the Mediterranean. The road is done. It is a return to the beginning. Understanding the authentic meaning of the person is to claim the primacy of ontology on the axiology. The perspective described refutes, at a hermeneutic level, the declination of peace as a philosophical principle which, while legitimizing human rights, anchors it to an exclusively theoretical framework. The most practical aspect of peace is highlighted. We want to capture in the relational dialogicity, true essence of the person, the key that can assert peace as a duty even before a right. If at the theoretical level pacification prevails, that is an infinite cataloging of rights in a sterile monologue, in practice peace is defined as the responsible action that favors the meeting with the other. What dominates today is pacification. Therefore, we live in an anesthetic phase which, in the most absolute indifference, lacks the memory of the past, especially of its most dramatic traits, denotes a consistent cultural poverty and roots an individualism that creates distrust and walls. What we try to describe through the juxtaposition of two words from the deep sense is, instead, an intracultural society centered on the person, understood as being ontologically founded, in which the responsible and respectful action of human dignity codifies a society open to sharing and collaboration for the common good. Ethics and dialogue become the foundations of intracultural society in search of common humanity, that is, of that sense of brotherhood that privileges proximity gestures and fosters meetings between people who travel together the paths of the world aware and strong of their differences. The new perspective has underlined the inadequacy of intercultural by rightly supporting the necessity of intraculture, of authentic contact between people expressed through: the care of the human being, the antecedence of duties on rights and justice understood as fairness and not blind equality. In the depth of the meeting of glances and in the exclusivity of the interweaving of experiences and experiences, intraculture is the "path" that connects the human through a fruitful dialogue, attentive to the needs and needs of each one. In the intra-culture there is no more justification for a lived experience of freedom without responsibility. On the contrary, responsibility becomes the instrument capable of directing action towards the common good and

not the exclusive individual action, thanks to which freedom is lived no longer in the absoluteness of one's own rights but in the relativity of one's duties as a person towards other people. In the guilt of having more than the other one subverts the usual and continuous logic of the claim of rights, restoring, through the duties, dignity to people, in a dialectical movement that always places it as a center and foundation.

The strength of intraculture lies in centering on the person the civil, economic, institutional and political existence, noting its wealth in the human and in the material profit or interest. Intra-culture to ward off symbolic or real barriers, which aspire to the discovery of a polyphony of humanity, to be experimented daily, not of a quantitative type of 'there is room for all' but that of meeting the incompleteness of cultures. It is therefore unthinkable today to propose an idea of the State-border on the basis of an erosion of the "barrier" from the outside in the sense of pressure exerted by migrants, but paradoxically it can take place from within, in the sense of awareness of the solidarity subject that recognizes in the other its human history, where it is consciously recognized as incompleteness simply as a continuation of its own. The questions and the answers, that the needs and the desires "make us similar in the fragility of the pathos". It is to be articulated, as claimed, as a kind of courageous permanent hermeneutic practice, always starting from the belief that it is not the man who is made for the law but the law that is made for man, always affirming that in the face of power of the primacy of the State, in the sense of the Hegelian *das Erste*, will undoubtedly be desirable that it is the last of the men who will have the primacy on the Nomos, in the introduction of a theoretical path of "Theology of the last" where the last are the first in the measure in which they will judge more or less worthy, those who hold the power of decisions on the lives of all.

An open question and on the agenda and in a historical moment that sees the advance which concerns sovereignty in economic and political processes, with a tragic fielding of an 'ideology of closure' (Magatti, 2018). There are many questions analyzed and evoked, susceptible to various readings, as I briefly shown on this thinking and, the identification of common and shared values, with a spiritual value capable of nurturing a new "Ethics of Dialogue", could courageously to nurture the growth of a more supportive and responsible culture.

References

- Abella, M. (2001). Globalizzazione, povertà e migrazioni internazionali. In R. Papini (ed.), *Globalizzazione: solidarietà o esclusione?*. Naples: ESI.
- Baeck, L. (2006). Il dialogo interculturale e lo sguardo dell'Altro. In G. Häbich (ed.), *Culture, religioni e democrazia nel Mediterraneo* (pp. 21-33). Rome: Aracne.
- Baldini, V. (2012). Diritto, Pluralismo culturale, Costituzione. La prospettiva storico-filosofica quale 'precomprensione' per l'interpretazione dei 'valori' costituzionali (pp. 1-13). In V. Baldini (ed.), *Multiculturalismo*. Padova: CEDAM.
- Bauman, Z. (2013). *Collateral Damage: Social Inequalities in a Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Braudel F. (2009). *La Méditerranée : L'espace et l'histoire*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Cesareo, V. (2002). *Società multietniche e multiculturalismi*. Milan: Vita e Pensiero.
- Collotti Pischel, E. (1989). *Gandhi e la non violenza*. Rome: Editori Riuniti.
- Comanducci, P. (2000). Quali Minoranze? Quali diritti? Prospettive di analisi e di classificazione. In E. Vitale (ed.), *Diritti umani e diritti delle minoranze. Problemi etici politici giuridici* (pp. 47-67). Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Dal Lago, A. (1999). *Non-Persone. L'esclusione dei migranti in una società globale*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Di Santo, L. (2012). *Per una Teologia dell'ultimo: riflessioni sui diritti umani al tempo della crisi globale*. Naples: ESI.
- Di Santo, L. (2017). Il declino della socialità giuridica. Il necessario contributo del pensiero cattolico. In I. Tarolli, M. D'Agostini, F. Reali & F. Rabotti (eds.), *Il tempo del coraggio. L'Italia fra rassegnazione e coraggio. La ripartenza dei cristiano popolari* (pp. 247-251). Soveria Mannelli, Cz: Rubbettino.
- Facchi, A. (2001). *I diritti nell'Europa multiculturale*, Rome-Bari: Laterza.
- Galeotti, A.E. (1994). *La Tolleranza. Una proposta pluralista*. Naples: Liguori.
- Galeotti, A.E. (2000). I diritti collettivi, In E. Vitale (ed.), *Diritti umani e diritti delle minoranze. Problemi etici politici giuridici*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Habermas, J. (1994). Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State. In Ch. Taylor & A. Gutman (eds.), *Multiculturalism: Examining of Politics of Recognition* (107-148). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1999), *The inclusion of the other: studies in political theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hein, C. (2010). *Rifugiati. Vent'anni di storia del diritto d'asilo in Italia*. Rome: Donzelli.
- Kern, S. (2003). *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. Cambridge-London: Harvard University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- La Pira, G. (1964). Discorso alla "Conferenza della gioventù e degli studenti per il disarmo, la pace e l'indipendenza nazionale". In G. La Pira (ed.), *Le radici politiche della crisi*. Florence: Giuntina.

- Lohrmann, R. (2000). Migrants, refugees and insecurity. Current threats to peace?. *International Migration*, 38(4), 3-22.
- Maffettone, S. (1992). *Le ragioni degli altri*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Maffettone, S. (2016), *Il valore della vita. Che cosa conta davvero e perché*. Rome: LUISS University Press.
- Magatti, M. (2018). *Oltre l'infinito. Storia della potenza dal sacro alla tecnica*. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- Maritain, J. (1974). *Integral Humanism. Temporal and Spiritual Problems of a New Christendom*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.
- Montanari, B. (1989). Soggetto politico e cultura giuridica. *Democrazia e diritto*, 6.
- Morin, E. (2000). *Penser la Méditerranée et méditerranéiser la pensée*. In J. Bethemont, *Géographie de la Méditerranée* (pp. 33-47). Paris: Armand Colin.
- Onorato, P. (1989). Per uno statuto dello straniero. *Democrazia e diritto*, 6, 303-328.
- Panikkar, R. (1995). *The Cultural Disarmament. The Way to Peace*. Westminster: John Knox Press.
- Perez Esquivel, A. & Ikeda, D. (2013). *La fuerza de la esperanza. Reflexiones sobre la paz y los derechos humanos en el tercer milenio*. Barcelona: Emecé Editores.
- Pope Francesco (2013). *Evangelii Gaudium*. Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane.
- Pulcini, E. (2001). L'io globale: crisi del legame sociale e nuove forme di solidarietà. In D. D'Andrea & E. Pulcini (eds.), *Filosofie della globalizzazione* (pp. 57-83). Pisa: ETS.
- Ricoeur, P. (2003). *La Mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. Paris : Seuil.
- Rizzi, A. (1995). *L'Europa e l'altro. Abbozzo di una Teologia europea della liberazione*. Cinisello Balsamo: San Paolo.
- Said, E.W. (2005). *D'Oslo à l'Iraq*. Paris: Fayard.
- Schellenbaum, P. (1998). Multietnico. In G. Bolaffi, S. Gindro & T. Tentori (eds.), *Dizionario della diversità. Le parole dell'immigrazione, del razzismo e della xenofobia* (pp. 187-188). Florence: Liberal Libri.
- Waldenfels, B. (2006). Inside and Outside the Order: Legal Orders in the Perspective of Phenomenology of the Alien. Ethical Perspective. *Journal of European Ethics Networks*, 12(3), 359-381.
- Walzer, M. (1999). *On Toleration*. Yale: Yale University Press.