SEMINARE
vol. 38 * 2017, no. 4, p. 103-116
DOI: http://doi.org/10.21852/sem.2017.4.09

Fr. Gabriel G. Tata[1]
Pontifical University Urbaniana, Rome, Italy
Facolty of Theology

MIGRATORY PHENOMENON OF AFRICANS TO EUROPE CHALLENGE OF LIVING TOGETHER

Summary

The cohabitation in a multicultural society asks for an inter-subjectivity in terms of unity and specificity. It requires that the individual be recognized, and together become authentic partners of dialogue. In encountering others, some points of insertions may be needed but with the necessity to respect the principle of distinction, and to have an objective to look on the risk of separation or the one of confusion.

Cultural diversity allows then the dialectic that will be shown in the training liberties by constructive dialogue. When diversity, an archetypal value of cohabitation breaks the challenges of the exclusivist "we" and the one of a bitter "they", it results in a cross-culturality, as long as self and other gratitude, and to an interior and exterior reconciliation. Living together in a world of a plurality of culture, is not an impoverishment, or a personal ruin, because every cultural identity can reveal itself and transform our life.

Keywords: Cohabitation, culture, identity, relationship, diversity, otherness

ZJAWISKO MIGRACJI MIESZKAŃCOW AFRYKI DO EUROPY.
WYZWANIA WSPÓLNEGO ŻYCIA

Streszczenie

Życie w społeczeństwie wielokulturowym narzuca wymóg intersubiektywnego podejścia do spraw jedności i specyfiki. Oznacza to, że człowiek musi być postrzegany jako jednostka, a zarazem ma stać się autentycznym partnerem w dialogu. Kontakt z innymi osobami, może wymagać pewnej adaptacji, ale z zachowaniem zasady poszanowania odrębności, wymaga on również zwrócenia uwagi na ryzyko odseparowania lub poczucia zagubienia.

[1] Gabriel Gaston Tata is a Catholic priest of Benin Republic in West Africa. He received his Doctoral Degrees in Moral Theology at the Pontifical Urban University Rome(2012), and in theological anthropology in the Faculty of Theology of the Teresianum (Rome 2015). Since 2012, is Professor of Social Ethics at the Faculty of Theology of the Pontifical Urban University. His research perspective is the analysis of the anthropological structures and specific ethical problems in social life. E-mail: tagabus9@gmail.com

Różnorodność kulturowa pozwala na przyjęcie w procesie kształtowania indywidualnej przestrzeni wolności dialektyki opartej o konstruktywny dialog. Kiedy różnorodność, będąca archetypową wartością życia we wspólnocie, pozwoli na przełamanie wykluczających innych postaw typu „my" oraz nacechowanych uprzedzeniami postaw typu „oni", możliwe jest wypracowanie zrozumienia międzykulturowego opartego na poszanowaniu indywidualnej tożsamości oraz na osiągnięciu stanu pogodzenia z samym sobą i otoczeniem. Życie w świecie wielu kultur, nie prowadzi do zubożenia, ani zniszczenia jednostki, ponieważ każda tożsamość kulturowa może znaleźć swój wyraz i zarazem przekształcić nasze życie.

Słowa kluczowe: życie we wspólnocie, kultura, tożsamość, wzajemne relacje, różnorodność, odrębność

Introduction

The growing presence of foreigners, cultures and other lifestyle poses a challenge to all of us, especially to those who work in the society. This creates an ambivalent situation: suffering from multiculturalism, as a matter of fact, people have to accept the prospect of a "cohabitation" tends to increasingly confrontational, or to search for and to build the conditions for a mutually enriching coexistence.

The problem that arises in a social context marked by the presence of different cultures is the challenge of coexistence (Cotesta 2005, 42-57). How to protect relations, keying the live interaction of citizens and foreigners? How to understand the responsibility of each interacting in everyday life? How can't the Identity of a major citizen get excited, so as to make himself a universal model or an absolute rule for all? How can the minority of immigrants stand without humiliating themselves for desperation? Finally, can such minority know and accept his human condition, can recognize its dignity and that of others and take their commitment to the rights and duties of the community? (Donati 2008,32).

To answer these questions, it seems necessary to outline a social profile of life that takes into account either characterizations, or the reports related to coexistence. Such perspective leads us to emphasize the interaction with an information-education system that changes and that is increasingly sensitive to the expectations of citizens, to ensure the realization of the objectives related to the choice of following an existential journey, human and even spiritual.

The objective is to present, in a moral aspect, intercultural relations in society and the need for a coexistence that respects different beliefs and cultural sensitivities. The reflection of the society as a privileged place of experience of a dynamic living-together and the development of relational skills, but always keeps a careful and valuable look at various areas. Such a methodology is phenomenological-analytical and hermeneutic.

After an analytical approach to issues related to coexistence, we will try to outline some risks of cohabitation, thereafter we shall identify a certain hermeneutical privileged place for coexistence.

1. Society and cultural plurality

Living in social environment, one must focus his attention on meeting other persons from different cultures, particularly at the developed relations matured by daily encounters. This means that it is not just the way of living that forms us but also human relationship that we establish. It's desirable, especially for the immigrated people who have left their families and friends, so that the host societies make them feel at home, as if the new environment is the second family. Only in this way, it can be said that a country also produces a change of life in space and time (Sen 2008, 118-120).

There emerges an inescapable necessity of an ethics of living together, which favours the control and the exchange between peoples and between cultures. The growing interdependence between nations and the displacement of large part of peoples, of many peoples in a single territory, in fact determine the creation of a multicultural society (Birtolo 2014,3-68). Beyond the complex legal issues, there also emerge, however, disturbing issues related to difficult relationships between different cultures and people.

This contradictory situation reveals a state of discomfort which is not without motivations. Mass culture produces, in fact, a radical flattening of life. The society, therefore, risk of leading in homogeneity levelling, which by eliminating the differences leads to the wastage of any creative tension. On the other hand, too much immediate impact of different civilizations, bearers of opposing views, generates insecurity and feeds deep inner conflicts.

The negative reaction constitutes often a form of defence before a great fluidity condition which set up seriously to jeopardize the subjective and collective identity. Thus, the identity as diversity reason, become a complex place, capable to change the nature of a society. Whether for better or for worse, it's up to us to decide.

2. Cohabitation between identity and diversity

When we speak of identity and diversity, we are in front of a *singulus* and *diversus* (Mazzoleni 1999, 1-24). It's exactly to this ambivalence, that is tied our difficulty manifested in the ethical thought. The problem that arises comes from the anthropological valence as concrete situation that regards man in his existence besides others. Indeed, living together brings or forces us to think that, the other receives his complete and autonomous sense of being in the ontological difference.

From these characteristics of the society, the dialectical of singularity and diversity, that is: identity and difference, assumes even the rule of differentiation between selfhood and otherness in the inter-subjective constitution (Cavalieri 2006,7). The inter-subjectivity is not privation of being, because the subject has need of the other different for expressing his absolute difference. And if diversity is increasingly the fate of a multi-cultural society, then diversity comes to be known as elementary fact of the multiplicity of subjective differences.

The bipolar tension identity-difference, that is: the dialectical between citizens and immigrants, that qualifies a modern society, it shows us the complex fundamental nature, lived by a peculiar ontological need. In this logic, the existence of the society is the recognition of relationships of the subjects in their differences.

Unfortunately, the coexistence in the field of plurality without doubt, raises big problems that cannot be undervalued. Today the primary danger can rise from the forms of cultural identity that tries to preserve their identity adopting closed versions of culture or community or refusing to get involved with difficult problems that arise from searching of coexistence with the difference.

All that happens, on the other hand, in the context of one society that feeds the forms of suspicion that accentuate the fear of the other, on a closer inspection, the last reason for this suspicion and of this fear is sought in the absence of a consolidated and well defined identity (Wieviorka 1996,15)[2]. Mass culture in fact, is an undifferentiated culture that tends to homogenize the life and its expressions and causes the fear of the loss the identity directly proportional to its lack of consistency. Where subjective identity and the sense of collective belonging weaken, today this is the situation of some European cities; it produces a state of vulnerability that urges for reaction, the emergence of attitudes of closure (Bauman 2009,74)[3].

Far away from encouraging dialogue and the comparison with the different, the loss of identity constitutes rather the assumption for the fall of every communication. Diversity is perceived as an attempt to the singular identity as eradication of their certainties that, however limited, are nevertheless, the necessary support of the personal and communal selections.

The passage from one negative vision of diversity, which generates refusal to a positive vision, for which it transforms in occasion of enrichment, it's then related to the acquisition of a strong identity and it's necessary to create a cohabitation opposed to uniformity and to homogenisation.

[2] According to Wieviorka, above all, diversity generates fear in us. He says: "the differences are worrying because we don't know them. And the less we know them, the more we are worrying about them. In this sense, to put remedy to the problem, it's necessary to increase and to deepen sociological or anthropological analyses. The differences, in other words, appear worrying because we are not willing to admit that the political debate is possible" (Wieviorka 1996, 62).

[3] According to Bauman, the identity is a struggle at the same time against the dissolution and against the fragmentation. The intention of devouring and at the same resolute refusal to be devoured. The identity appears as a scream of war used in a defensive war. An individual against the assault of a group. A very weak and small group against a big group and with much resource (and for this reason very fearful). The sword of identity, however, can be contested on the other side, that which is very big and powerful, that which likes to belittle the differences, that likes that the differences are accepted as unavoidable and durable, but affirms that they are not important enough to hinder the loyalty through one big totality, that embraces and provides asylum to all those differences and to those who embodies them (Bauman 2009, 74).

3. Cohabitation between similarity and specificity

Before speaking about coexistence, it is necessary to touch upon the issues of similarity and specificity. Similarity and specificity are closely related. In fact, when we talk of coexistence, using the plural term, it touches in some way a structure, a relational paradigm. Therefore, it deals with the conditions of its possibility, of its giving itself, or of its negating itself that it needs to win by establishing relationships. If reality lies within these terms, what sense does specificity place as the foundation of the same giving of oneself in coexistence? What needs to be done here is an indispensable step: grasping unity from difference.

Without specificity, there is no giving some type of living together and vice versa. The recognition of the difference is positive otherness. To know himself, man always has need of another that takes him into the relational relativity of identity. His identity comes from the difference. M. Buber, in this sense, affirms that man is the only being that defines himself starting from his being-in-front- of the other (Buber 1992, 172).

This means that if European societies are consolidating on a global scale a mixture of cultures and identities because of the presence of immigrants, the worst gift is to make everyone believe that he/she is only, above all, exclusively white, black, or yellow, Western or Eastern. Human beings, just like they forge their own history, even forge their own cultures and ethnic identities.

The ethics of coexistence must therefore take seriously and deal with this reality. It must develop in persons the ability to stay within difference, without demonizing it; it must above all contribute to its positive development, transforming it into opportunities to search for new and more extended communion (Taylor 1993, 50-51).

That which must be avoided is, in fact, so much the attitude of intolerance as that, not less dangerous of the coverage of every tension that leads to an arrangement of everything unproductive. The coexistence between similarity and specificity requires the strenuous effort of creative harmonization of reality, starting from the full value of difference; otherwise, one might fall into some risks that make coexistence in the society problematic and complex (Life 2008, 23-24).

4. Cohabitation and possible challenges

The discourse about cohabitation with the human mobility is not without its limitations and risks, often structural, inherent in the very nature of life in society, fundamentally including like the place of meetings of different convictions, cultural and religious. The theoretical difficulty emerging today is relational, and comes from the labour of choice of individuals or groups.

It is simply understandable that co-existence or cohabitation of ideal that we want to build, that is linked to an ethical principle: a moral obligation to care for others, whoever he or she is, and in a special way to all individual members of

society in which all groups are found. But there are some risks which we can try to analyse: prejudice, closure, indifference and conflict.

4.1. The drama of prejudice

The state of indisposition or uneasiness that can nest in the citizens and immigrant society is the existence of prejudice (Pickering 2005, 140-141) systems. If relationships between the natives and residents are poorly treated, can give the possibility to mental processes and structural behaviour to function well. This phenomenon often results in rejection or marginalization of those who belong to other cultures. But how to understand such a situation? In fact, the difficulty of encounter between different cultures and mentalities are not only chargeable to unwillingness or bad will of some individuals, but must be traced back to more complex phenomena, both structural and cultural.

As a result, underestimation, discrimination and racism are concretely analysed and verified to mean the persistence of structural prejudice. It could happen that a majority number of citizens cultivate the spirit of pretension on their own culture considering it as superior to that of others, and therefore the vision of the world and of man contained in it should be considered the best. This is the reason that induces one to consider other cultures of foreigners as subcultures, whose level of civilization is judged based on the parameter of values drawn from the model of the "higher citizen" or "more dignified" (Bujo 2009, 8-11).

The opposition between "us" and "others", which often arises in our way of thinking and even our language, reveals the existence of the underlined problem. It is, in fact, the opposition between evolution and backwardness. It is considered under the same use terms like "primitive peoples", civilization and barbarism, rationality and fatalism, religion and magic. In that sense, "others" are, in fact, considered as sub-humans and their way of thinking and living as a subcultural (Mazzara 1997, 20-39).

To confirm the belief of the superiority of one group can help to some extent, the development of a stiff and formal model of rationality as the ultimate criterion of judgment of reality which then leads to the devaluation of everything that is not clear according to the Western view. The risk comes when one group or expression of civilization is considered as the point of reference or of measure for other expressions of civilization. Therefore, the notion of citizenship can generate the tendency of closure or of self-centered prejudice.

4.2. Climate of isolation or enclosure

When an identity really wants to evade dialogue out of fear or inconvenience, and desires to be left alone in its comfort zone, it runs the risk of being a lost cause. When a tendency of prejudice grows, it rather leads to a non-desired consequence: isolation of an individual or of a minority, schematic thinking of a group within its limited perspective, like in any other group is considered to be erroneous in its fundamental principles and therefore a potential enemy to beware of and eventually to be fought against. The other is a danger, a rival.

The negative relationship, emerging in the world of today, between the growth of a multinational society from one angle, and the growth of enclosed sections from the other angle, is highly motivated by the fear of loss of peculiar values and the fear of loss of particular specificity. The explosion of interbreed racism is an expression of a will to preserve one's own identity.

We can easily call this phenomenon of identity-isolation "anthropology of the I-solitary" that is, a way of living in a well defined group. The rapport between other groups is interpreted as a solitary inclination, closed within oneself and isolated from the others. In reality, the co-existence of other groups is not negated, only that it is not considered to be of any value. It appears as not important for the comprehension that represents the value of cohabitation.

The complexity that characterizes the present moment of cohabitation unfortunately pushes single cultures to a process of simplified identity, with the tendency of absolutizing their point of view. The refusal of different cultures is, therefore, a subsequence of refusal or negation of one's own suppressed diversity. As a result, the other becomes disturbing because they pose to us drastic aspects of our own identity which we do not want to denounce. It is a situation that makes us enter progressively or immediately into discussion, obligating us to relook critically into our own paradigm of realization.

Weak identity and partial identity are, as a matter of fact two ways, right or mistaken, to define identity, two ways that align a state of in-determination and insecurity, from which discerns the enclosure towards the other. Conventionally, when openness to the other's diversity is not strictly interrelated to the capacity of accepting and developing its own diversity, it could lead to an ethics of indifference.

4.3. Ethics of indifference

The attitude of indifference responds to the desire to live alongside each other, preserving their differences. Thus, the inclusion of foreigners in the existing social frame occurs without confiscating their identity and autonomy. Each one maintains their own identity and inserts it into a common frame where the differences are juxtaposed.

That which we call relationship of indifference is an expression of a rigid attitude. In living together, there is the "other", but he appears non-existent. He lives in a physical proximity that, however, does not allow mutual recognition. The "other" remains a stranger, indifference reigns and consents to a relatively peaceful coexistence in the society. The relationship with the "other" is lived in profound indifference, in a sense of acceptance of strangers, by citizens or natives as long as the latter does not feel threatened.

Such attitude expressed by a group to another, creates parcelled spaces, untouched by other people who pose a threat to the interest of the group. Other identities become so foreign, and considered as islands apart because of their beliefs. In this context, life in the society is carried out in a space outside

of collective existence, in which no one enters, except the few friends who are thus because they have similar trends, and are in some ways an extension of our identities (Tata 2014, 25-67).

In the sense of an ethics of indifference, relations take place in the third person (he), or generalized form. It is said for example: "European" rather than to point out that this is an Italian, "African" rather than to point out that it is a Congolese, as if all of Europe or Africa were a single nation. All this happens because it doesn't seem to matter knowing the people or groups in their specific identity, since the encounter and relations with them are limited to the functions they perform or to the tensions they create. It can happen that a group has its reason to exist in society because it has educational tasks. Even in such case it does not matter establishing any bond of friendship with them.

In this situation, every person, both indigenous and foreign, are likely to be confined in so many roles: at work he is a simple worker, at the bar he is a customer, and outside of these he is any other individual. In seeking to resolve the problem of de-personalization, we can progress to include living together. But even that has its limits.

4.4. Inclusive cohabitation: between assimilation and integration

Inclusive cohabitation research, sometimes, presupposes the assimilation or integration of immigrants. Assimilation, is meant here as a type of relationship in which the encounter with the stranger tends to dissolve him in the community that welcomes him.

The stranger or immigrant is expected to comport himself in everything as the citizens of the host society. E. Bianchi specifies that "when it goes beyond a duty of respect for the law «equal» for all and also affects lawful behaviors and habits although not usually, the right relationship with the idea of assimilation is actually an expression of rejection and the exclusion of the other because it posits an encounter that denies the difference" (Bianchi 2010, 44). This means that when the acceptance of the other is aimed at his assimilation, it is following a logic that, in reality, is exclusionary because one wishes to become the other, a photocopy of ourselves.

Even refugees are called to comport themselves in everything as the citizens of the host society. This call is not in itself negative, because the immigrant must first respect the laws of the country that hosts him. There can be no free zones, immigrant neighbourhood where these laws (with particular regard to fundamental human rights: the rights of women, children) are not kept. Respecting these laws, the immigrant will demand respect for human rights, personal freedom and freedom of (inviolability of the home, expression, religion, legal expenses insurance, education for minors) that the Constitution recognizes to anyone who stays in the friendly territory, as well as respect for the rights deriving from the payment of state taxes.

The other mode of inclusive cohabitation is Integration. It is not synonymous with assimilation, but it is the incorporation of foreigners in the host society,

through knowledge and respect of the differences, the exclusion of discrimination and the adoption of peaceful solutions to eventual conflicts. In a thwarted integration, the encounter with the stranger creates the will to live together, next to each other, but each retaining his individual security space, because the other is perceived as a threat.

On the other hand, in a good integration process, it is necessary to establish relationships lived in mutual recognition of, and harmonization of the differences in giving and receiving, with equalitarian logic. However, when the integration processes fail because they have been confused with assimilation, they often lead to a conflicting situation.

4.5. Cohabitation and conflict

In the host society, there is always a big risk of wanting to absorb foreigners, this strategy, which is a condition for accepting foreigners, always leads to a situation of conflict. Safeguarding proper identity, however, appears like a battle cry out used in a defensive war: where groups oppose themselves. The small and weaker group (appears to be threatened), while the bigger and stronger group with enormous resources (proves threatening).

It is a tragic cry indeed since on the one hand, there is a complaint that is real and contingent, and on the other hand, there is a guarantee of the presence of an ethical pandemic that spreads and thwarts the nature of the same civil cohabitation.

Violence much more expressed in verbal aggression, describes the atmosphere in which we find ourselves today astonishingly witnessing an impotency to act that renders sad and bitter our days. In this sense, Bauman decries that "Identity is a fight and at the same time, against dissolution and fragmentation. Possessing the intention to devour and at the same time a resolute refusal to be devoured" (Bauman 2009, 74).

A big space can be granted to this form of intersubjectivity. The utopian dream therefore, of a regulated cohabitation limited to the walls of affection, and of friendship, from perfect structures and from a dialogue that resolves all conflicts, is continuously, contradicted with the presence of conflict. It is however certain, that conflict is a real form of intersubjectivity. It is not caused only from the aggression of man, but also from the will of self-affirmation: choices are hereby always presented as partial and often clash, meeting with the choices of others.

A multinational society can become a fertile ground for conflict harbouring tendencies of hegemony and anti-hegemony. Identical hegemony, is a form of an incomplete assimilation or integration that leads to an assimilation of differences. This type of cohabitation can only be introduced by the strong; this however, does not necessarily imply a big number in size but could be said to mean the strong in economic, political, and sometimes even in cultural terms. In the context of migration, the strong obviously are the citizens that is to say, the autochthonous (La Cecla 2009, 12-34).

Conflicts will certainly spring up even if all were liven with goodwill. On the other hand, it is detected that cultural identity is not irreconcilable with conflict. Authentic identity that searches for and wishes the objective and real good of the individuals, shall continuously fight against the disposals to which these are related and that often defend fury.

The identity that works for justice, becomes a sign of contradiction and of conflict. So that from closure, it is easier to arrive at conflict between identities that are not reducible (Mantovani 2004,73-74). The discomfort, comes because in identity exist contemporary various matrices (to stick, to dominate, to refuse, to rebel) and this fact creates a conflictual situation. But the difficulties can become axiological incentives.

5. Axiological reading

Nobody can be closed in himself. subjectivity is responsibility with and for others, without putting trust on their responsibility for us. living together means that we can authentically realize who we are only in the dynamic relationship with the other, in the capacity of relation and in the recognition of the other (Bruguès 1994, 46-47).

5.1. Cohabitation: relationship as a privileged parameter

The possibility to give in comparison with the cultures an enriched dimension is tied up to the individualization of human virtues around which human relations are built. The shuttering of the identity fabric, as fruit of the processes of differentiation and multiplication of affiliations within society, can be overcome only through convergence around humanity that is assumed as point of reference for articulating for him a relational life. In this sense it becomes worthy to note that the existence of plurality of choice of life does not necessarily exclude the fulfilment of this result.

What presses us to understand, and is again worth underlining is the impact of humanitarian ethics on relations and in particular on the very idea of cohabitation. In fact, if the idea that no identity exists that imposes, even in generic form, a form of humanity that invites attention from the other is accepted, then comes the fall of the necessary ethic foundation of consent on respect and on promotion of interpersonal and intercultural relationships. Unfortunately, nobody, not even government's authority, can impose those unavoidable duties of relationship that values for all the different convictions, personal and communal.

Diversity obliges us to interrogate ourselves on our own identity and to enlarge our own points of view, in order to find a common base. In fact, when it is asked to be part of a communal life, one has to be ready to put in discussion his own identified convictions; one has to be desirous to learn from others or at least to be prepared for it (Habermas 1998, 9-62). Every widening of one's perspectives implies renouncement

of his personal specificity. But all this is necessary in order to realize a dynamic cohabitation that knows how to value others, since every group or individual has the right to look for his own ease as he/she wants and can: that deals with felicitation in general sense or professional realization for studies achieved.

In this perspective, every truly humanistic ethics, demands active and pacific, tolerant and dialogic cohabitation. And vice versa, cohabitation imposes an absolute need of fundamental ethics. For this, there is a need for conscience, personal and collective in order to foster a responsible relation that grants positive significance to cohabitation. From here relationship puts in motion otherness.

5.2. Otherness as an indispensable criterion

The society at the same time is the place of cultural experience and the result of an agreed modality: to understand the other in his/her difference, considering the different opportunity of reciprocal enrichment. In the case of living together, a cultural identity does not request only for its recognition, but also, and above all, the recognition of the community into which one enters and forms or becomes a part. The request of recognition is in the substance of a full participatory request at the level of common life.

According to Hall, there is a need to put in discussion the same idea of irreducibility, unity, authenticity and the purity of an identity. To be far from united or harmonious entity, monologue or free from extreme influence, the cultures in reality assume more foreign elements, changes and differences than excluding its influence or knowledge. In fact, if an individual, a single is of an identity that refuses to be homogeneous, then he/she is different, that is, the kind of person who differs and refuses to vanish or to disappear in the homogeneity of the majority class (Hall 1993, 349-363). In fact, the identity of a person as far as a creature, is a dialogically structured identity.

In this sense, it is easy to understand this manifesto: "Your Christ is a Hebrew. Your car is Japanese. Your pizza is Italian. Your democracy is Greek. Your café is Brazilian. Your vacation is Turkish. Your numbers are Arabic. Your alphabets are Latin. Only your neighbor is a foreigner" (Bauman 2009, 29). This means that God created man, and did not create a nature in between, but a "you". Becoming a human person is not exclusively only in the vertical relation with God, but also in the horizontal relation, with the one similar in the flesh (Monceri 2006, 26-48).

In fact, the relation me-you, is not given from abstract concrete living, but from a given reality which comprise a multiple presence of the others. Therefore, you become as perceived between and with others. The relation me-you is comprisable and livable in the context of us, and of the community of humanity. The difference in order to be recognized, must form or make part of that which is common. A particular recognition is possible only on the base of a horizontal communion (common). At this point, it is important to note that the finding of the common base is fundamental, not only for the need of recognition of cultural

identity, but also for the community that must broaden or widen its proper sight (understanding).

However, the society of today does not have certainly a universal horizon, but is a form of a particular common life. The activation of an authentic reciprocal relationship, does in fact falls in any case on negative preconception, and gives place to the development of a winning growth that have as its outflow the production in form of big or large social advance agreement.

The collective identity aspires to a recognition, but must not request or pretend that all comes to make part of their cultures, nor they could (should). The cultural forms of life are not universal. It is the reason that looks to the universal, and tends to consider also the forms of a particular lives as a universal models. But from this point of view, every culture is defective.

The objective of an ethics of agreement is, therefore, in the last concrete analysis, is that of giving life to a model of multicultural world, in which the multiplication of cultures, far from its transformation in an element of disgrace, and becomes a fertile source of human integral formation (Ambrosini 2004, 24-47). This brings the realization of an effective interculturality which presupposes exceeding of an attending attitude for making space in the logic of exchange between the cultures, that is, a dynamic interaction between cultures. Because such a model will be effectively put in action, and is necessary for the simple principle of tolerance. This, in fact, hides the conception of the fundamental reality on the absolution of difference, and therefore on the assumption of the existence of a radical hetero-nominative between cultures that renders possible facts only of temporary and limited forms (Manzone 2004, 213-252).

Therefore, we must compare with others in order to see what are the values that are incite in their hearts before arriving to rules that can be shared and without which can't be established in the future a good agreement in our community. Saying this, the cultures which are closed to change, are cultures that have died or are destined to extinction.

Conclusion

The phenomenon of human mobility requires us to change and encourage more clean living conditions for ourselves and for immigrants. To this end, we must strive to achieve greater functionality of public administration, in the measures that regulate the life of immigrants. Yes, it is a trial to give an overview of the challenges and difficulties related to the new geography of relational life.

Comprehension of multi-identity is a norm rather than an exception. The alternative is between exclusivism identity and coexistence, which must be perceived and experienced as enrichment and more opportunities, rather than as a punishment. Therefore, identity and coexistence should never rule one without the other, nor do you have to exercise force for the inclusion or exclusion. Self-

knowing, talking, informing and interacting have such a consequence that we deal with the others than the better we could do. Everywhere in fact, the diversity and plurality are richer uniformity, simply because they offer a fabric of relations, a possibility of expression and relations between the people much more articulated, with many more options.

Reconsidering the phenomenon of migration requires a study and research of the possible forms of integration between similarity and specificity. We must promote the integration that, certainly, will lead on the part immigrants an observance of duties as citizens but also on the part of the natives, their greater acceptance at all levels, with more openings in the economy, cultural, and religious, avoiding even that God is invoked to counterpoint one another.

Bibliography:

Ambrosini, Maurizio. 2014. *Non passa lo straniero?Le politiche migratorie tra sovranità nazionale e diritti umani*. Assisi: Cittadella Editrice.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2009. *Intervista sull'identità*. Bari: Laterza.

Bianchi, Enzo. 2010. *L'altro siamo noi*, Torino: Giulio Einaudi.

Birtolo, Pietro. 2004. *Pluralismo, Convivenza e Dialogo*. Napoli: Editrice Domenicana Italiana.

Bruguès, Jean-Louis. 1994. "Alterità." In *Dizionario di morale cattolica*. Bologna: Studio Domenicano.

Buber, Martin. 1992. *Je et Tu*. Translated by Geneviève Bianquis. Paris: Aubier.

Bujo, Bénézet. 2009. *La pretesa universalità della morale occidentale. Fondamenti di un'etica africana*. Assisi: Cittadella Editrice.

Cavalieri, Maria P. 2006. *Identità e diversità: due concetti complementari*. Roma: Anicia.

Cotesta, Vittorio. 2005. *Lo straniero. Pluralismo culturale e immagini dell'altro nella società globale*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Donati, Pierpaolo. 2008. *Oltre il multiculturalismo*. Bari: Editori Laterza.

Habermas, Jürgen and Charles Taylor. 1998. *Multiculturalismo. Lotte per il riconoscimento*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Hall, Stuart. 1993. "Culture, Community, Nation." *Cultural Studies*, 7(1): 349-363.

La Cecla, Franco. 2009. *Il malinteso. Antropologia dell'incontro*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Mantovani, Giuseppe. 2004. *Intercultura. È possibile evitare le guerre culturali?* Bologna: Il Mulino.

Manzone, Gianni. 2004. *Società interculturali e tolleranza. Un contributo: la dottrina sociale della chiesa*. Assisi: Cittadella Editrice.

Mazzara, Bruno M. 1997. *Stereotipi e pregiudizi*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Mazzoleni, Gilbert. 1999. *Verso il diverso. Costanti e variabili della concettualizzazione occidentale della diversità*. Roma: Seam.

Monceri, Flavia. 2006. *Immagini dell'altro. Identità e diversità a confronto*. Roma: Edizioni Lavoro.

Pickering, Michael. 2005. *Stereotipi. L'altro, la nazione lo straniero*. Firenze: Mediascape.

Sen, Amartya. 2008. *Identità e violenza*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Tata, Gabriel. G. 2014. *Vivere-insieme. Aspetti etico-sociali dell'antropologia africana*. Roma: UUP.

Taylor, Charles. 1993. *Multiculturalismo. La politica del riconoscimento*. Milano: Anabasi.

Wieviorka, Michael. 1996. *Une société fragmentée? Le multiculturalisme en débat*. Paris: La Découverte.