

LUISS



Bachelor degree in Politics, Philosophy and Economics

Department of Political Science

Chair of Political Philosophy

Integration and Identity: a philosophical analysis

Sebastiano Maffettone

SUPERVISOR

Volker Kaul

CO-SUPERVISOR

Anna Maria Ghersi

086492

CANDIDATE

Academic Year 2019/2020

*A Claudio e Giacomo,
che sono sempre con me.*

This page is intentionally left blank

TABLE of CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I Defining the basic elements of the discussion	3
1.1 The notions of identity and citizenship	3
1.1.1 Identity	
1.1.2 Citizenship	
1.3 The relationship between membership and rights	4
1.4 The issue of integration	5
CHAPTER II Multicultural Citizenship	6
2.1 Multiculturalism	6
2.2 Minority rights	7
2.3 Multicultural Citizenship	8
2.4 Multicultural policies	9
2.4.1 Equality of opportunity	
2.4.2 Civil and political liberties	
2.4.3 Solidarity	
2.5 Critics and responses	10
2.5.1 A different multiculturalism	
2.5.2 National liberalism	
2.5.3 Cosmopolitanism	
CHAPTER III E pluribus unum	15
3.1 The basis of solidarity: social capital	15

3.2. The impact of immigration	16
3.2.1 The effects on social capital	
3.2.2 Analysing evidence	
3.3 Dealing with diversity	18
3.3.1 Policy strategy	
3.4 Comments	20
CHAPTER IV The reconstruction of ideas	21
4.1 Social constructionism	21
4.1.1 Idea constructionism	
4.1.2 Object constructionism	
4.2 Debunking project	23
4.2.1 Race, colour, and ethnicity	
4.2.2 Ethnorace	
4.3 Social structure and ideology	24
4.3.1 Materialist critique of ideology	
4.3.2 Epistemic critique of ideology	
4.3.3 Moral critique of ideology	
4.4 The integration project	27
4.5 Comments	27
CONCLUSION	29
BIBLIOGRAPHY	32
RIASSUNTO	34

INTRODUCTION

The countries we live in are based on two pillars: self-governance or democracy, and the nation-state. The former means that the members of the country, the citizens, who are part of a political community of equals¹ have the right to rule and be ruled. The second refers to the conception of state developed from the Peace of Westphalia, which defines states as constituted by three elements: population, territory, and sovereignty². In particular, these components delimit the validity of the legal system, that identifies rights and duties of the people subjected to it. In order to access the membership of this system one has to gain the citizenship, which requires to possess certain characteristics which vary in each country. Traditionally, the term population has been used as a synonym to the word nation, a group of people that shares and identifies with a language, a culture, or a number of traditions. Therefore, being a citizen meant also identifying with the nation on which the state was based.

After the end of World War II, as territories were re-defined and populations were dispersed, a new problem arose, that of different identities within a single nation state and their integration. Throughout the years diverse theories were developed with the aim of analysing and solving this issue, but none of them emerged as a universal model. Today in a globalized and interconnected world, migrations and, more in general, the movement of individuals is increasingly frequent. People move from a country to another for different reasons: economic crises, natural disasters, and conflicts are some of the main drivers. Therefore, the issue of integration is extremely contemporary and central in the international political debate.

The objective of this thesis is to discuss three stances on this debate: Will Kymlicka's *Multiculturalism*, Robert Putnam's *E Pluribus Unum*, and Sally Haslanger's *Critical Theory*. These three approaches have been chosen as they represent different perspectives on the issue. In fact, they apply three different approaches: multiculturalism has grown out from a theoretical debate, and only in the last decades its functioning has been practically assessed, Putnam's proposals instead are drawn from data derived from a study of United States communities, while critical theory is founded on the critique of the *status quo*, and aims at its rethinking. Moreover, they require different typologies of commitment from the populations involved, and different degrees of change in the state structure. While Kymlicka's model pleads for respect and recognition based on

¹ Characterized by social justice and individual freedom (Kymlicka, 2001).

² As Weber stated in *Politics as a Vocation* (1919), the state is the entity who possesses the monopoly on the legitimate use of force, on a limited geographical area.

dialogue and understanding, Putnam promotes a process of construction of a common identity founded on the continuous coexistence and exchange of diverse people, and Haslanger advocates a critique and reconstruction of the existing structures and relations. On one side, Kymlicka and Putnam's models not only offer interesting proposals, but they analyse already existing policies, and suggest possible concrete improvements. On the other hand, Haslanger's theory although it could seem limited to the theoretical domain, offers a stimulating starting point of reflection, through the critique of the *status quo*, and of action, through the modification of language and the focus on valuing each person as a human being.

Particular attention will be given to whether it is possible to preserve individual identities and being integrated in the society. Indeed, having to renounce to one's identity, in order to avoid exclusion and discrimination from the majority group, is a costly and difficult process, which cannot be imposed on the individual in the context of liberal democracies. Moreover, the exclusion of an identity often results in discrimination, and is associated with economic inequality as well. Therefore, it hinders the full development of the individual, who is only formally equal and free, but is constrained by the nonrecognition, and the resulting lack of means. In this context, acknowledging the potential value of each identity is the first step towards the elimination of many other forms of injustice.

However, before immersing in the core of the discussion, we should begin by defining the concepts at the basis of this discourse, and by explaining how they intertwine in the debate.

CHAPTER I

Defining the basic elements of the discussion

As the main focus of our discussion is integration, in this chapter we will clarify the elements at the basis of integration in a modern liberal-democratic state. In particular, first we will present the concepts of identity and citizenship, then we will analyse the discrepancy between membership of a political community and citizenship, and finally we will define the notion of integration and the problems on which we will found our discussion in the following chapters.

1.1 The notions of identity and citizenship

1.1.1 Identity

In developmental psychology the theme of identity was first analysed in the work of the psychologist Erik Erikson in the 1950s. In particular, he argues that membership and social roles are fundamental in shaping the sense of one's self, as they give an understanding of how to act in the world. However, identities are not only important for the individual, but for the others as well, because through the labels associated with identities, they can understand what each one's position in the society is (Appiah, 2018).

According to Parekh (2018) individual's identity is three-dimensional, we possess: a *personal identity*, a *social identity*, and an *overall identity* as a human being. The former consists in the fact that individuals are unique, the second in their social embeddedness, the third in the consciousness of belonging to the same species. Personal identity is the result of one's choices and tendencies and guides the person's decisions. While, social identity is defined both by our identification in a group, and by the fact that the other identify us. This typology of identification could be based on any characteristic³, but not everyone who possesses a particular feature identifies with it with the same strength. Because in the world there is a variety of social identities, each individual has plural identities. As each identity represents a heritage and a perspective on the world, this plurality enriches the individual and allows him to be freer and equilibrate (Ibid.).

Finally, some theorists argue that acceptable identities are only those that are chosen by the individual, as they believe that individuals decide the principle they endorse on an independent basis. However, usually the process that brings about the formation of a personal set of values is different, indeed, the individual

³ Culture, gender, religion are only some of the most important.

generally begins by discussing the principles he was taught, and then from this point of departure he decides which ones are important for him and at what level. Although, the person has formed a distinct identity, this identity is not static, but is constantly influenced and shaped by the events and experiences he goes through. (Miller, 1997)

1.1.2 Citizenship

Citizenship is a legal tool to define the subjects and contributors of a certain legal framework. In particular, it defines who is entitled to the rights provided by the law, “*citizenship-as-common-rights*”. The rights associated with citizenship have evolved throughout the history of modern states in order to guarantee the freedom necessary to exercise self-governance. According to Marshall (1992 [1949]), the first rights to be granted were civil, then political, and finally social. The first set of rights were introduced in the XVIII century and included the freedom of speech, and equality in front of the law. In the XIX century, the quest for equal political rights developed and ended with the achievement of the universal suffrage. However, citizenship represents the membership of a certain political community, a social identity⁴, which is based on common beliefs and values, with whom the citizen can, with different intensities, identify. In modern liberal democracies, these beliefs and values are those derived by the national tradition, which has been used to create a common ground. However, at the beginning of the XX century a group of citizens felt excluded from the community, the working class who did not have access to the cultural heritage of the nation. In order to achieve their integration, social rights, such as universal health care and education, were included among those owed to a citizen, as they would contribute to the creation of “loyal citizens”, who identified with the national tradition.

1.2 The relationship between membership and rights

As Benhabib (2005 and 2018) underlines, a discrepancy exists between the right to self-determination and the duty to respect human rights⁵. In particular, this contraposition has been intensified by the increasing migrations: the universal right to be recognized certain rights as a member of the same species is in opposition to the right of people to self-government. In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights this contradiction is inherent, as it supports the sovereignty of individual states, while promulgates rights that are not bounded to borders limits. In the context of migrations, the tension between universal principles and particularistic identities and cultures is stronger than ever. Indeed, as a result the entitlement to rights is not dependent on the ownership of the citizenship, while citizenship is conceded to long-time residents who do not share the national

⁴ As it is defined by B. Parekh (2018).

⁵ The “*Janus*” face of modern nations, Habermas’ definition of this contradiction (2013).

identity values in order to respect the principle of self-governance, as these people are affected by the decisions of the rulers. This evolution of the concept of citizenship, towards an independent legal status, is well exemplified by the European Union legal framework, where rights are granted on the basis of membership in the Union, and not on national identity.

1.3 The issue of integration

Being integrated in a group means not only being accepted⁶, but also being its effective member. Although, the people who own the citizenship of a country are part of the community, not everyone is fully integrated. Indeed, all the people who do not identify with the majority group, the decision-maker in liberal democracies, frequently feel excluded, as their interests are not taken into consideration in the public discussion. Hence, they are often forced to adapt and abandon their identity, in order to avoid marginalization. We should not make the mistake of thinking that this is a totally new issue. Indeed, the paradox of being an equal citizen, while identifying with a different culture has often been present in the past, an instance is the German-Jewish community⁷.

However, after the Second World War, due to an increase in diversity greater than ever before, the problem acquired a primary importance, not only for those who felt to belong to a different culture from that of the majority, but for anyone who believed to be different from the larger group who shaped institutions and public debate. In order to respond to this issue different scholars have intervened, this thesis aims to analyse and discuss the solutions developed by some of them. In particular, the proposal of “*differentiated rights*”, needed to preserve actual equality, will be discussed in the following chapter.

⁶ Acceptance differs from the process of assimilation; it means that all the individual’s identities are respected.

⁷ The condition of “*eternal half-other*” (Benhabib, 2018), endowed of a “*double identity*”.

CHAPTER II

Multicultural Citizenship

In this chapter the proposal of integration developed by Will Kymlicka in the context of the multiculturalist debate will be critically analysed. First, the evolution of the multiculturalist debate will be presented, then the role of minority rights in Kymlicka's theory will be examined followed by his idea of multicultural citizenship, through the use of data we will discuss the effectiveness of his model, and finally the main critics will be presented.

2.1 Multiculturalism

The presence of multiculturalism in the political debate can be traced back to the 1960s, especially in countries such as Canada and Australia, where different ethnic groups and cultures coexisted within the same nation-state. Indeed, not only these countries faced massive immigration in the aftermath of World War II, but they are characterized by the presence of indigenous groups and minorities, such as the Quebecois and the aboriginals. Therefore, a question emerged on what policies were to be adopted to face cultural diversity, in the context of liberal democracies.

In political theory, the first current that emerged was the communitarian one⁸, which envisaged the protection of minority groups in order to preserve their diversity. Indeed, they sustain that individuals are embedded in specific social roles and relations, and thus group practices are not the result of individual choices, but they stem from social practices (Kymlicka, 2001b). As a result, this strand was considered incompatible with liberal values, especially that of individual autonomy.

However, most of the people, even when they identify with a minority group, share the values on which are founded liberal democracies, in particular individual autonomy, and want to be equal and active participants of the community they live in⁹. Therefore, the debate is now to be collocated in the liberal framework, where the question of diversity is central, although it has been interpreted in different ways. Liberal

⁸ This debate developed and grew between the 1970s and 1980s, until the fall of the Communist bloc.

⁹ Not only true for immigrant groups, but for national minorities as well (Kymlicka, 2001b). According to Kymlicka the majority of public opinion polls shows nearly no difference in the support of liberal principles between minority and majority groups. However, some exceptions exist, such as religious isolationist communities (e.g. Amish or Hasidic Jews).

culturalists, as the supporters of this strand have been defined, believe that diversity and equality, fundamental liberal values, can only flourish when special rights are granted to minorities. Nonetheless, some groups pose an issue to the defence of minority rights, as their habits violate essential liberal principles, for instance through the restriction of individual autonomy. According to Kymlicka, in order to solve this challenge, it is necessary to distinguish two typologies of rights that can be demanded: “*internal restrictions*”, the right to force the members to follow undesired practices, and “*external protections*”, the right to be defended from the pressures of the majority. In his opinion, the first typology is not consistent with the liberal framework, and hence cannot be accepted, while the second is compatible with liberal principles, but should not become the justification to overcome another minority group.

Many thinkers criticize this second position, as it considers the state as “ethnoculturally neutral”, meaning that it does not promote any culture over the other, but it only sustains liberal principles. However, these critics argue that the State through the process of nation-building, thus through the promotion of a common language and social institutions builds a “*societal culture*¹⁰” (Kymlicka, 2001b). In particular, societal culture is fundamental to preserve liberal values, as freedom is the capacity of revising the options made available by it, and equality of opportunity is founded on the existence of equal institutions that use a common language. Nonetheless, these impositions are often viewed by minorities as limiting, indeed they confine the group culture to the private realm, while in public they are forced to adapt to this cohesive structure. From this group of thinkers emerged, in particular, Will Kymlicka, whose thought will be more deeply analysed in the next paragraphs.

2.2 Minority rights¹¹

In the context just described, minorities have three options to face the system: accept integration into the majority culture, while attempting to renegotiate the terms, “polyethnic rights”, demand autonomy rights to protect their societal culture, “self-government rights”, or allow their marginalization. In front of this choice, each category has taken a different decision. In general, national minorities have tried to recreate their own societal structures, while immigrants have consented to integrate. Indeed, the former aspires to a sort of independence, a form of autonomy or of self-government, in order to distinct itself from the majority culture.

¹⁰ It “requires the standardization and diffusion of a common language, and the creation and diffusion of common educational, political, and legal institutions” (Kymlicka, 2001b, p.54).

¹¹ When Kymlicka refers to minority rights, he indicates mainly cultural minorities, as he believes that once cultural diversity is accommodated, other identities will be as well (Kymlicka, 1996).

The latter, he argues, usually aims to integrate as full members of the hosting society¹², although they desire a recognition of their diversity by more accommodating institutions. In fact, the requirements to achieve integration are often difficult to meet and costly. Thus, they frequently demand fairer terms, based on two elements: recognition of the time needed to accomplish integration, and respect for their identity and practices by the common institutions.¹³ Drawing from this distinction in interests and aims between national minorities and immigrants, Kymlicka (1996) distinguishes between “multinational states” and “polyethnic states”, although he acknowledges the existence of states that include both.

However, an increasing number of people, including non-ethnic groups, have been demanding special representation rights. This set of rights has the aim to supply to the perceived lack in representativeness. They could include a simplification of the requirements to become a candidate, or the reservation of a number of seats in Parliaments to minorities. However, they are considered as a temporary response in order to give visibility to minority interests, so that to influence society to reduce the barriers that disadvantage these groups.

2.3 Multicultural Citizenship

In this framework characterized by pluralism, promoting the sense of belonging associated to citizenship is particularly complex and poses many problems, especially for immigrants. Kymlicka (2011, p.282) argued for a “*more multinational conception of citizenship, and a more multicultural conception of multinationalism*”.

As data have shown the main challenges to national cohesiveness are to be found in national minorities rivalries, more than in the phenomenon of immigration. On the basis of this fact, Kymlicka has expressed his support for a “*multinational federalism*” (Ibid., p.285), a model that consists in the creation of a federal sub-unit which allows self-government, and the introduction of a national language recognized at the state level. On this model are organized Switzerland and Canada, which have showed to develop the fundamental elements of “citenization”: peace and individual security, democracy, individual freedom, and inter-group equality, in economic, as well as political, and cultural terms.

However, this model does not resolve the issue for immigrants, thus Kymlicka (2011) has developed the possible scenarios of response: at the two extremes there are no adaptation and the use of immigration as a weapon to weaken national minorities, in the middle instead there is the post national approach which consists in the inclusion of immigrants in a civic identity that stands above the internal divisions. Although,

¹² Immigrants who instead wish to recreate their home country societal structures in a new territory are to be considered national minorities, an example of this type of groups are colonizers (Ibid.)

¹³ Similar claims can be advanced by all the other groups that believe to have been affected negatively by the nation-building process (Kymlicka, 2001b).

the latter has attracted the interest of many scholars, he has criticized it on different levels: integrating while remaining neutral to the national peculiarities is nearly impossible, the integration in a civic sentiment above the national identity risks to impede actual inclusiveness from the single minorities, and reinforces the majority culture upon which the state structure is based. Therefore, he suggests a middle way approach based on *dialogue and understanding*, which consists in the acceptance of diverse interests and which would represent the achievement of an actual *multicultural citizenship*. One in which everyone is aware that none of the ideal approaches would fit the needs of the entire community and aims at a peaceful solution that does not impede equality and freedom.

2.4 Multicultural policies

Social scientists have attacked the adoption of multicultural policies (*MCPs*), as it was based only on theoretical and normative claims, that had not been tested in reality. Therefore, in 2010 Will Kymlicka has published a paper in which he analyses the results of the previous 15 years of social research in order to test practically the validity of his arguments. In particular, he studies the compatibility between MCPs and the main liberal-democratic values, civil and political liberties, equality of opportunity, and solidarity. His findings will be further discussed in the following paragraphs.

2.4.1 Civil and political liberties

Evidence from Canada shows a higher probability for immigrants to participate actively to the political process than their “native” counterparts. Moreover, immigrants in this country are more likely to participate to the election as members of a party than in other countries. Although, many hurdles to the full and equal participation exist, experts have confirmed that MCPs have directly contributed to the improvement of civil and political liberties.

2.4.2 Equality of opportunity

In order to analyse equality of opportunity it is necessary to consider two sides: the opportunity of developing skills and the possibility of using them in a fairly remunerated job. Data shows that in both cases Canada offers better conditions than any other Western democracies. Despite the coexistence of different explanatory factors, MCPs policies of accommodation of linguistic and cultural diversity in education have contributed to make the difference.

2.4.3 Solidarity

In the countries where the multicultural approach to immigration is applied, many have raised the question of whether their increasing presence is eroding the principle of solidarity at the basis of the welfare state. These scholars argue that on one side ethnic diversity hinders the process of redistribution (heterogeneity/redistribution trade off), on the other “multiculturalism” policies implemented by the governments weaken national solidarity and cohesiveness (recognition/redistribution trade off). To support these arguments different evidence has been presented: ethnic and tribal diversity in sub-Saharan Africa as explanation of the low economic development in the area, and ethnic and racial heterogeneity in the United States as the reason for differentiated expenditure.

Kymlicka criticizes these examples as not only they are not representative of the welfare state conditions, but they do not take into consideration other possible explanatory factors. Moreover, he underlines that following this line of thinking in countries characterized by higher levels of immigration there should be a decrease in social spending or the rate of growth should be slower compared to other countries, which has not been demonstrated by data. However, through the study of OECD and United Nations data on spending and population, it has emerged that there seems to be a correlation between the amount of citizens born outside the country, and the money invested in social expenditure i.e. when the first increases, the second decreases. Furthermore, Kymlicka together with Banting (2006), in order to test the second hypothesis, has selected eight multicultural policies (MCP) and twenty-one liberal democracies classified on the basis of the number of MCP adopted, and analysed the levels of public support for the welfare state. As a result of this analysis, they did not find any systematic correlation to prove the trade-off.

In contrast to the critics, Kymlicka claims that MCP are able to promote social solidarity in different ways: fight stereotypes and stigmatization, equilibrate nation-building policies, and increase national pride. However, these policies are still based on a national-based citizenship framework, in which immigrants demand their rights as an exchange to the effort of becoming a national.

2.5 Critics and responses

There are many critics to multiculturalism, however the most influential are Bhikhu Parekh who has proposed a form of *alternative multiculturalism*, *liberal nationalists* such as David Miller, and *cosmopolitans* as Seyla Benhabib. In the following paragraphs the assertions that these theories have made will be first discussed, and then Kymlicka’s reply will be presented.

2.5.1 A different multiculturalism

A different form of multiculturalism is the one proposed by the philosopher Bhikhu Parekh, who on one side criticizes Kymlicka's support of liberalism as the universal basis of the state, on the other supports the use of intercultural dialogue as a mean to overcome the conflicts typical of multiculturalism.

Parekh argues that national identity is the one of a political community, hence it is a complex concept as it is composed by a large number of individuals, each with different characteristics and identities. Therefore, it consists of a territory, a language, common historical experiences, common values and ideals, and a reasoning methodology. National identity is best expressed in the constitution of a state, where the common grounds that distinguish it from the others are outlined. This identity is neither static, nor constantly redefined, it is passed from a generation to another, who shapes and modifies it. According to Parekh, although it is not possible to build a national identity which is neutral to culture, we should attempt to create one, that is able to accept and accommodate diversity as widely as possible. Therefore, he supports the idea of a common civic identity which allows dialogue, and hence understanding and cooperation. Intercultural dialogue, in his opinion, should allow a reflection and a critique on the practices and habits of the minority as well as of the majority group, through this process it is possible to revise and modify usages that were considered as given. Three phases constitute intercultural dialogue: the minority defends its practices that are accused of conflicting with the majority public values, then it demonstrates the importance of these practices as fundamental elements of the culture, without which it would not be the same, finally it attempts to prove that the practice is compatible with public values. The ultimate objective is the "convergence of identities" (Parekh, 2018, p.95) in order to secure a common belonging that goes beyond the division between majority and minority.

Kymlicka (2001) replies that there is no evidence that national minorities immigrant groups generally do not share liberal values, and he adds that immigrants' commitment to democracy becomes indistinguishable from that of the majority. Hence, Parekh's claim is limited to exceptional cases. Moreover, Parekh sustains that if minorities shared liberal values multiculturalism would be unnecessary. Instead, Kymlicka contends that the majority of disputes is not on the values, but on their implications, their meaning for minorities. Furthermore, although immigrants accept the societal culture, they are allowed to consider their culture as sacred, however they should not restrict others' liberties in the name of this conviction. Otherwise, if cultures were to be considered sacred, a liberal theory could not exist. Nonetheless, if some minorities do not share liberal principles, they cannot be imposed upon them, thus Kymlicka supports the need of dialogue in the development of a solution.

2.5.2 Liberal nationalism

Liberal nationalists argue that as the creation of nation-states characterized by nation-building processes, and the spread of liberal-democratic systems are two trends that emerged and spread together throughout the last

century, a correlation exists between them. Therefore, their aim is to explain the reason why the concept of nationhood is central in order to implement liberal-democratic principles.

However, when the state is characterized by the presence of sub-national group identities, a dilemma arises, whether to allow their independence, or to submit them underneath the same nationality. There are two different positions in this debate: liberal conservatism and radical multiculturalism. The former supports the idea of a single nationality, as not only it is the most important collective identity, but it is also essential in preserving state stability. The second defends the protection of minorities, as they see the state as the place where plurality should flourish. From this debate, David Miller has developed a different approach based on liberal principles: liberal nationalism.

First of all, he defines nations as based on the following elements: belief, historical continuity, active identity, a territory of reference, understood as fundamental in defining the identity, and a “national character”, a common public culture (Miller, 1997). The first consists in the fact that only the members can recognize each other as compatriots, the second refers to a common past while the third implies that communities, such as nationalities, act together, hence they take decisions and achieve results as a group. In this context, he considers immigrants as a resource that could enrich the national community (Ibid.). Moreover, he conceives nationality as one of the individual’s identities, not the only one or the most important, indeed he even accepts the possibility of dual loyalty for the members of two distinct national communities.

On the basis of this approach, he criticizes the multiculturalist model, which aims at going beyond simple toleration, as it is not sufficient to grant true equality and freedom. Miller argues that not only the main identity, the one on which the state relies, is socially constructed, but all the others as well. Indeed, group identity emerges and develops in relation to the others that surrounds it. Miller sustains that nationality is necessary. On one side because minorities want to be integrated in the majority, and without this common identity it would be impossible. On the other because the majority group cannot grant respect to groups, who do not share this value, hence a common ground is necessary to support it. The demand for recognition within a certain state shows that the minority already shares some of its features. Finally, although minorities have the right to be fairly represented, this representation is better to be achieved without the introduction of specific rights, however he recognizes the difficulty of obtaining such a result. Moreover, he underlines that political representation from the cultural point of view is hard to accomplish, as culture is fluid, and that when compromise is reached, some cultural identities could feel degraded. Liberal nationalists have argued that solidarity throughout a diverse society can be promoted through on one side abandonment the ethnic conception of national identity, on the other by proving to the majority group newcomers’ commitment.

Kymlicka and Banting (2019) analysed data on these two arguments on immigrants and minorities in Canada. On one side, they found respondents do not consider national identity as a fundamental factor to guarantee support for inclusive redistribution. On the other, it resulted that the majority perception of minority commitment is important in defining the attitude towards redistribution. This implies that the common identity

needed to promote solidarity is not based on the shared national identity, but instead on a shared sense of membership, which includes the recognition of the engagement and contribution of minorities.

2.5.3 Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitans argue that cultures are not static, they are influenced and transformed by other cultures, events, and identities. Therefore, protecting a culture means also limiting the process of exchange and alteration that characterizes them. They believe that the options available to an individual should come from different sources, not only a single one.

However, multiculturalists agree with the idea of fluid cultures, they believe that individuals are part of separate societal cultures, which become valuable and interconnected only if they are part of the daily language and practices of each of us. Benhabib argues that a new vocabulary is needed, in order to describe the multiplicity within every person. This would allow individuals to respect each other as equals, as bearers of human dignity, beyond their differences, which are acknowledged and accepted¹⁴.

Multiculturalists agree with the idea that cultures are fluid and interconnected, but individuals are nevertheless part of different societal cultures. In particular, Kymlicka sustains that the protection of minority rights is fundamental even if we endorse cosmopolitan ideas, as these rights empower minorities of preserving their culture as they wish to.

Other two critics could be advanced to Kymlicka's theory: considerable space is given to minorities representation, and the lack of consideration for economic conditions. On one side, the protection of minorities rights should not result in their over representation at the expense of the majority, who risks suffering reverse discrimination, hence the principle of proportionality should always guide decisions. On the other, unequal economic conditions could impede the achievement of actual equality and freedom, even in a context of recognition. Indeed, the power to influence political decisions is frequently related to economic capabilities, therefore the politics of redistribution should be implemented parallelly.

Setting these issues aside for the moment, we will now move to the following chapter in which a different proposal to reach integration will be presented and analysed. This second theory differentiate itself from Kymlicka's multiculturalism because instead of developing a theory and then testing its practical functioning, it stems from data acquired from United States communities. Furthermore, although they use as a starting point

¹⁴ This concept has been defined, by Hannah Arendt following Immanuel Kant, "*enlarged mentality*" (Benhabib, 2018).

of integration societal institutions, Robert Putnam supports the development of a new common identity, while multiculturalism promotes the respect of already existing ones.

CHAPTER III

E pluribus unum

In this chapter we will consider the proposal to achieve integration developed by the American political scientist Robert Putnam, and which can be expressed by the phrase “*E pluribus unum*”. This scholar has analysed the relation between the presence of diversity in a society and mutual trust between its members, as this value is the foundation of cohesiveness, respect, and therefore integration. In particular, he studied data from the United States, and from the results of this survey he published a paper in 2007, “*E Pluribus Unum: diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture*”, where he summarizes his findings and develops new proposals. In this chapter we will first present the concept of *social capital* which he has developed throughout his studies on civic traditions and democracy in Italy, a notion that is fundamental to understand the ideas that emerged from his field analysis in the United States, which will be subsequently discussed.

3.1 The foundation of solidarity: social capital

Putnam (1993) defines “*social capital*” as the characteristics of social organization which enable coordination among members of a society, and hence contribute to the improvement of efficiency in achieving its goals. It is based on pre-existing relations between the members, and it aims at overcoming the dilemmas that collaboration poses, when there is lack of information or enforceability, thus it helps limiting the free rider phenomenon. It usually consists of shared moral values, such as trust, and therefore it works better when these values are supported by a larger number of people. To generate social capital, it is necessary to use certain social activity that enhance the moral values.

In particular, trust is fundamental to sustain cooperation throughout the community. In small communities where members know each other well, it is based on intimate familiarity with the other, and thus it has been defined “*thick trust*” or “*personal trust*”. However, in larger communities where it is impossible to know all the people, personal trust is useless, there is then the need for “*social trust*”. The main sources of social trust are norms of reciprocity and networks of civic engagement. The former indicates the possibility for the community to control the actions of an individual when they have external effects. Norms are usually

taught and passed from a generation to the other through modelling, socialization¹⁵, and sanctions. The norms that support social trust are fundamental as they facilitate cooperation, by diminishing the costs of transaction, in particular the most important to this purpose is reciprocity. *Reciprocity* can be “*balanced*”- “*specific*”, meaning that the exchange is simultaneous and of equal value, or “*generalized*”- “*diffused*”, refers to a continuous exchange based on expectation, which balances over time. The second indicates the *relations of interpersonal exchange*, which can be “*vertical*” or “*horizontal*” depending on the social hierarchy and level of dependence between the individuals. The denser the networks are, more likely it is that cooperation and engagement arise. The reasons behind the effectiveness of networks are on one side the increased cost of breaking the norms, and on the other the strengthened norms of reciprocity. Moreover, they facilitate communication and therefore diminish the problem of lack of information, and they are generated by past successful cooperation, which enhances trust in future collaboration.

Based on evidence Putnam claims that higher levels of social capital are correlated not only to healthier, more educated, and less exposed to crime individuals, but to better working democracies and economic systems.

3.2 The impact of immigration

As explained in the previous paragraph social capital is fundamental in preserving solidarity within a community, which is essential for its functioning. Therefore, Putnam (2007) decided to analyse the impact that the increasing level of *diversity* would have on *social capital*, and in particular on *trust*. Even though immigration and ethnic diversity do not coincide, generally the increase in immigration has increased ethnic diversity as well.

From the point of view of progress diversity increases creativity and problem-solving capacities, which are essential in achieving development. In the economic domain, we should first distinguish between short and long run, as there is no consensus on the positive impact of immigration on Native workers in the short run. However, in the long run data show that net national income increases. Moreover, as immigrants usually have higher fertility rates, in aging countries they would compensate the disequilibrium between active and inactive workers which risks hindering the social security system. Finally, a study of the World Bank has shown that immigrants by sending revenues to their home countries and by sharing knowledge and ideas acquired in the developed countries they moved to, are largely improving less developed countries conditions, and in the long run this benefit will outweigh that of international development aid.

¹⁵ Socialization includes civic education. This demonstrates the central role of education, for Putnam as well as for Kymlicka, in sustaining and passing societal norms and structures.

3.2.1 The effects on social capital

There are two stances on the possible effects of diversity on society: “*contact hypothesis*¹⁶” and “*conflict theory*”. The first refers to the idea that as we are in constant contact with diversity, there is a higher level of interethnic solidarity and tolerance, while the second sustains the idea that diversity promotes solidarity only within the group, and distrust towards outsiders. In particular, different data analyses over time have supported the second strand of thought. At the basis of this distinction there is the assumption that in-group and out-group trust are negatively correlated. However, Putnam believes that this relation is not the most important element to be taken into consideration. He prefers the distinction between “*bridging*” *social capital*, the relation between diverse people, and “*bonding*” *social capital*, the connection created between similar people. Many theorists believe that these two typologies of social capital are negatively correlated as well. However, Putnam does not support this argument. Moreover, most of the researchers have analysed only out-group ties, taking for granted in-group ties. Therefore, there is also the unexplored possibility that they vary independently. In particular, Putnam calls “*constrict theory*” the idea that the two variables could decrease together.

3.2.2 Analysing evidence

The evidence analysed by Putnam was gathered through the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey, carried out in 2000, with a sample of 30.000 people, among which there is a national representative sample of 3.000 persons, and 41 small samples representative of different communities. Moreover, in the meantime a national census was carried out, hence it is possible to know the social data regarding the area surrounding the interviewed domicile.

Data have showed a positive relation between inter-racial trust and ethnic homogeneity, trust towards the neighbours and community diversity, and trust in people of the same race and community homogeneity. Finally, “*ethnocentric trust*”, trust in one’s race minus trust in a person of a different race, is uncorrelated with ethnic diversity. Therefore, it seems that neither conflict nor contact theory are demonstrated by the reality of the world. Putnam instead has found that the in-group/out-group distinction frequently causes anomie and isolation.

Although until now only trust was considered, there is a negative correlation between other social capital variables and ethnic diversity, these variables are: confidence in local government, new and media, political efficacy, frequency of registering to vote, expectation of cooperation from the others, working on a community project, giving to charity and volunteering, close friend and confidants, happiness and quality of

¹⁶ “Four conditions are often said to be necessary for the contact theory to hold: common goals, inter-group cooperation, equal status, and authority sanction and support”. (Putnam, 2007, p.166)

life perceived, and time spent watching television. Therefore, diversity pushes individuals to diminish their engagement in the community, but it does not worsen inter-racial relations.

Nonetheless, many criticisms can be advanced on this finding. On one side, community is the only unit of analysis, individual relations and connections are not considered. On the other, the ethnic composition is not the only element that distinguishes diverse communities, they are poorer, people within them are usually less educated, crime rates are higher, thus the risk is to see causation where there is not. In order to resolve this issue a multivariate analysis, which allows to control the different factors, and individuate the actual cause, is needed. Moreover, other variables could influence and invalidate new evidence, however Putnam argues that these should not be considered. In particular, the idea that people choose where to live, which could invalidate causation, as individuals could opt for an area because of a certain characteristic, but in this study, people should have picked mixed areas to create causation. Furthermore, the possibility that the approach towards diversity depends on the person's demographic specificities, is contradicted by the multivariate analysis which has instead proved the same pattern independently. Another problem that emerges is that of defining the neighbourhood where the interviewed lives, but through the use of the data produced by the census the error was limited. The potential non-linear relations have been excluded by the study of evidence, together with the possibility that the effects on social capital were the result of economic diversity. Indeed, as acknowledged by Putnam, data from previous surveys have showed a positive relate between economic equality and the presence of social capital, thus in order to tackle the risk of misinterpretation of evidence, he has considered the Gini Index, a measure of economic inequality. As a result, he found that despite people who live in contexts of higher economic disparity have a tendency to reduce their engagement in social and political life¹⁷, ethnic diversity has the same impact on hunkering independently of economic conditions. Finally, it was found that common areas are more frequent in ethnic diverse areas, thus their absence does not contribute to decrease in trust.

3.3 Dealing with diversity

Social psychologists and sociologists have argued that when social distance decreases, cooperation and trust are easier, a feeling of common identity emerges. Social identity, the perception of who a person is, defines social distance. Putnam believes that identity is a socially constructed element, which can be de-constructed and re-constructed, namely destroyed, and recreated.

¹⁷ Putnam (2007) argues that this relation appears to be non-linear while there is linearity between diversity and hunkering. In particular, the effects vary depending on the area and the country.

Although the relation between social capital and identity is a new research theme, it is likely that they reciprocally affect each other. In particular, Putnam (2007) argues that diversity is constituted of different socially constructed identities. The process that drives the assignation to a certain category varies over time, hence he sustains the idea that in order to adapt to fluxes of diversity, individuals have to reconstruct, not only the newcomers' identities, but theirs as well. Deconstruction is not simple nor fast, but it is possible to build identities that do not depend on the provenance of the person.

Putnam hypothesises that in order to maximize the benefits of diversity, it is necessary to adopt policies that aim at the reconstruction of identities, in particular of a common identity in which both natives and immigrants can identify. Moreover, he supports the idea that this common identity does not exclude the peculiarities of each specific identity but prevents them from becoming divisive issues. He adds that despite in the short run there will be the need of balancing between diversity and community, in the long run through the implementation of the right policies, it will be possible to improve it. In fact, integration means also sharing a common sense of citizenship. Therefore, Putnam has developed a number of policy proposals that he believes will foster integration through a *shared sense of citizenship*. In the following subparagraph these proposals will be presented.

3.3.1 Policy strategy

Putnam argues that the first step is "*tolerance for difference*". In order to spread tolerance, a higher number of meaningful interactions among ethnically diverse individuals, for instance in the working place and in schools. Moreover, he adds that as most immigrants want to improve their cultural level, through the knowledge of the local language, language courses are essential, especially if they manage to combine people from different backgrounds.

Another proposal consists in compensating through national support for the shortcoming at the local level, as in the short-term negative effects will be more felt in small communities, rather than on the large scale. Indeed, local programs directed to immigrants are effective to create bonds, an example are the activities organised by religious institutions which allow the meeting of different individuals. Indeed, it would make possible to obtain bridging social capital, by building bonding social capital.

However, in order to produce fruitful developments, it is necessary to take into consideration the challenge that diversity poses to solidarity, indeed the objective is to achieve a "*e pluribus unum*", namely to create a novel "*one*" out of a diverse "*many*" (Putnam, 2007, p.165).

3.4 Comments

One of Putnam's main arguments consists in sustaining that in the long run on the national level diversity will have only a positive impact. However, he does not consider the risk that a fragmented society could result into an unstable government, or more in general in a ruling class that is not able to guide the country. In this scenario state action to construct a common identity could be ineffective, or even impossible to implement.

Moreover, he does not contemplate the possibility of resistance from the groups to policies imposed from above such as those he has suggested. Indeed, he does not confront with the issue of who is going to take such decisions, a frequent lack of minority representation in Parliaments, and more in general in political institutions, would result into policies elaborated by the majority perspective. Therefore, it could be hard for minorities to accept even the most advantageous decisions because of the low level of trust¹⁸.

Finally, Putnam envisages to preserve the majority language and the education system as they are, while promoting the construction of a new common identity. However, he does not mention the possibility that immigrants' identities could modify and influence these structures. Hence, a question arises, whether the integration through these tools actually allows the creation of a new common identity, or it just allows the majority to tolerate diversity, without including it¹⁹.

We will leave this discussion for the conclusion, and we will now move to the following chapter to discuss a different common identity, based on being part of humanity. However, it is not founded on the implementation of state policies, but on the critique promoted by philosophers and social movements, who have the duty to underline the existing identities that hinder equality and freedom. Language in this context becomes a powerful tool foster integration, by bringing about change.

¹⁸ Putnam does not consider trust towards institution which is a different parameter, and he has not shown any correlation between trust among individuals and trust towards institutions.

¹⁹ What he means is that immigrants have to gain trust, before being able to be accepted and to shape their neighbours, hence modifying the "*unum*", which should be dynamic.

CHAPTER IV

The reconstruction of ideas

In this chapter we will discuss the *critical theory* developed by Sally Haslanger, an American philosopher, who defines herself a feminist, an anti-racist, and committed to social justice, who has analysed the process of integration from the perspective of ideas. Indeed, she believes that ideas contribute more effectively to making a change than the modification of habits, traditions, or opinions. Through the adoption of a social constructionist approach she attempts to analyse the concepts of “*race*” and “*ethnicity*”, in order to discuss questions regarding what is “*real*”, “*knowledgeable*” and “*natural*” (Haslanger, 2012, p.6). Moreover, she sustains the importance of situating these concepts into the social and political context in which they exist and have been created, as their meaning and function cannot be understood as spurious independent ideas.

In this chapter two different sides of her critical theory will be analysed together with the solutions she has envisaged: the *debunking project* and the *critique of ideology*. The former consists in challenging existing categories, the second in discussing the implications of ideology, and its validity and adequacy. As ideology structures the different categories which become different identities, their analysis implies a discussion of the concept of integration. Subsequently the implications of these two processes for integration, together with the main problems in their implementation will be considered.

4.1 Social construction

Haslanger uses the book *The Social Construction of What?*, written by Ian Hacking, as a basis to discuss the social constructionist framework on which her analysis is founded. In particular, Hacking defines the social constructionist approach as one critical of the *status quo*, and distinguishes between two targets of constructionism: ideas, and objects. The former includes concepts, categories, and classifications, while the second is to be understood in a broad sense, as it indicates a variety of elements such as people, states, conditions, practices, behaviour, classes, experiences, and relations.

4.1.1 Idea constructionism

First of all, Hacking divides the social constructionist approaches on ideas into five categories, of which the first one is historical constructionism, which sustains that constructed ideas are the result of historical events. The other four draw on historical constructionism and include other characteristics. Ironic constructionism

states that the construction is so integrated in our lives that we have to change our mindset to modify it, reformist constructionism claims that there is no possibility of change envisaged, unmasking constructionism asserts that if we understand the social function of the construction, it loses its power of influence, rebellious constructionism alleges that the construction has negative implications, hence it would be better to completely transform or eliminate it, and revolutionary constructionism which is based on rebellious constructionism, but involves taking action to make a change.

Hacking individuates three focal points of the debate between constructionists and non-constructionists. He claims that constructionists focus on the understanding of the context, they deny the existence of an inherent structure, and they believe that the reason for the stability of certain elements is to be found in external factors. On the other hand, non-constructionists sustain the idea that there is a causal relation between the structure and the ideas that exist.

4.1.2 Object constructionism

Hacking argues that a large number of objects are the product of the historical events in which they were generated. Moreover, the *classification* frequently does not only describe groups existing in the social context, but it influences groupings so that they adapt to the initial classification²⁰. In particular, the question is how the classification influences the self-understanding of the individual, and how vice versa his perception of the classification is influenced by the modification of his self-understanding²¹. She adds that when we modify our self-understanding, and our perception of the classification, the others can decide whether to accept and consider the change. Finally, Haslanger distinguishes between “*thick*” and “*thin*” *social positions*. The first can be a reason to empower or disempower a group, while the second has limited social impact. As both internal and external factors in the process of construction should be taken into consideration, while giving each of them the importance they deserve, she suggests a two dimensional model of analysis: on one side, the impact of external classification on the characteristics that define membership, on the other the impact of identification and of the category on the classification.

²⁰ The constructionist approach that takes this position is defined by Haslanger (2012, p.124) as “discursive constructionism”.

²¹ This specific idea is defined as “discursive identity construction” (Ibid., p.126).

4.2 Debunking project

Haslanger defines as debunking project, the process of challenging the existing categories, by highlighting their existence. In order to achieve this objective, it is necessary to take into consideration two questions: whether using a certain classification is theoretically, or politically useful, and whether it is right to assert that these categories represent the aim of our discourse. Indeed, despite the fact that we do not always fully understand the specific element the word refers to, we can use it to successfully vehiculate meaning. Therefore, it is “*reasonable to suppose that familiar terms that we ordinarily think capture physical kinds in fact capture social kinds*” (Haslanger, 2012, p.134). An instance of this plan is her critical analysis of the race grouping, which will be presented in the following paragraph.

4.2.1 Race, colour, and ethnicity

It is possible to distinguish between the physical characteristics, which Haslanger conveys in the word “*colour*”²², and their social implications, defined as “*race*”. She defines a group as “*racialized*” if its members have a different power position in relation to others, privileged or subordinated, and the group is identified through the use of physical characteristics. However, only the context will determine who, when and how an individual is raced. Haslanger suggests that although for now racialization is associated with inequality, it could exist also in a just society, however new races would have to replace the old concepts.

In her analysis of race, she claims that because the classification into races varies widely throughout the world, they are not based on any scientific description, but on political and social categorizations. If we take into consideration the concept of race, although we identify a “white race”, scientists have not proved the existence a meaningful common biology. However, a social constructionist would argue that we identify common social traits that define the membership of the “white race”. Moreover, to define group membership the physical feature is not sufficient, a common history, a moral stand against injustice, or shared celebratory practices are generally more used to distinguish different racialized groups, this feature of identification can be indicated as “ethnicity”.

4.2.2 Ethnorace

Haslanger draws on the notion *ethnorace* introduced by Alcoff, in order to include the social and historical reality that is not described by race and ethnicity. Ethnorace involves the elements of agency and subjectivity which are usually considered in ethnicity, together with the body features connected to race. This definition is

²² It refers also to other elements such as eye, nose, lip shape, hair texture, physique, etc. (Haslanger, 2018).

important because on one side culture often supports membership in a race, on the other racial body characters are often connected to cultural features.

However, Haslanger maintains that race is to be considered independently from ethnicity, as people racialize individuals based on their body features, and her objective is to eliminate power disequilibria due to racialization. Nonetheless, she argues that the concepts of ethnicity, panethnicity, and ethnorace are important in the recreation of new identities, while taking into consideration the common history and experiences of individuals. Ethnorace could be useful in the short term, but in the long term she expects the surpass of the need of these distinctions, although taking into consideration the impact of body diversity will always be important.

4.3 Social structure and ideology

“*Social structures are networks of social relations*” (Haslanger, 2017a, p.20), which include both relations between people and to things. Haslanger argues that social structures are not imposed, but they are constituted by our daily behaviour and decisions, we do not passively endure structure, on the contrary we enact them, while enriching them of our perspective on the world. However, this is the result of a lack of alternative choices, in particular we have limited tools to represent the world, a condition that constrains our available options.

Social structures are constituted by sets of *interdependent social practices*. Social practices are the solutions envisaged by a community to respond to problems of *coordination*, and access to *resources*²³. They consist of *interdependent schemas*, and resources which mutually support each other. On one side schemas consists of culturally shared practices, beliefs, perspectives, experiences that allow us to interpret information and coordinate action. There are cultural and psychological schemas, the former includes social meaning, which must be recognized, but not supported, the second refers to the ability of processing and using information to drive social behaviour. On the other, resources are things considered to be valuable to a certain extent, depending on the value they determine power. In social reality schemas and resources create the so-called “*looping effect*”, as we interpret an element in a certain way, it acquires a certain value that in turn will influence its interpretation. However, schemas are not static, but dynamic, they evolve together with resources (Haslanger, 2017a).

²³As they organize the access to resources, they also establish power relations based on the ownership of resources (Haslanger, 2017a).

In this context, ideology can be defined as the “*cultural technè*”²⁴ (Ibid., p.23), the set of interdependent cultural schemas that constitute social structures. It allows to define relations of power, and to organize ourselves on the basis of resources, whose value is defined by the schema itself. When an ideology becomes hegemonic it is perceived as “*natural*”, hence it is nearly impossible to distinguish its social component.

The aim of a critique of ideology is to highlight the interdependence of schemas and resources, the way resources are influenced in order to fit schemas, which contribute to the development of the generics at the basis of our common ground. The following step is to raise normative issues, assessing the validity of these schemas, the adequacy of the distribution of resources, and if needed to create new structures.

4.3.1 Materialist critique of ideology

Haslanger bases her materialist critique of ideology on the theory of *economic determinism*, which consists in considering economic structures as the determinants of social ones, although she acknowledges the influence of different factors. Nonetheless she recognizes the impact of material conditions on our choices, as they are limited by the means we have available. Moreover, in her opinion, as a normative critique is founded on the distinction between what deserves to be valued and what does not, it is necessary to take into consideration material disparities and distribution of labour²⁵.

4.3.2 Epistemic critique of ideology

In order to criticize ideology, and thus schemas which are at its foundation, we should begin by identifying where it does not work, namely when it is clearly wrong, relies on false stereotypes, beliefs. As the primary tool of socialization is language, and it is at the basis of action, shared meaning, and collective organization, it is useful to understand how it contributes to perpetration of seemingly “*natural*”, but false ideas.

First of all, through the use of semantics, the study of meaning, and pragmatics, the study of words in reference to the context they are used in, she analyses *generics*, the expression of general ideas that lack a specific quantifier, in order to understand how language can mislead the understanding of reality. In particular, generics is a claim that is used to essentialize a kind²⁶, and it is more likely to be accepted by the interlocutor,

²⁴ Sally Haslanger affirms that “*cultural technè*” indicates ideology which uses culture with the aim of limiting people. However, using culture as a tool does not imply restricting individuals. Moreover, in this case the tool of culture is not always used consciously.

²⁵ An instance of this claim are successful women in the workplace, who are generally those that have the means to delegate housework, and childcare to someone else (Haslanger, 2017a).

²⁶ This approach is called essentialism and it affirms that people even before being taught to, have a tendency to essentialize, meaning divide others in categories based on a certain feature (Appiah, 2018).

if it refers to a negative feature, which has the aim of indicating a risk (Appiah, 2018). Generics can be divided in three main typologies: characteristic generics, they highlight a characteristic of the kind, striking property generics, underline a kind property with the purpose of warning, and majority generics, emphasises a feature on the basis of a statistical observation. Moreover, language is based on a common ground which is founded on schemas, although it changes as people speak, as each party adjusts its beliefs to take into account what the other has said.

Haslanger offers an approach to face the issue by connecting language to hegemony and giving the tools to respond to such discourses. When we are confronting with a striking generics such as “blacks are violent”, a person committed in supporting this idea could use the observation of a small number of cases to infer its truthfulness and include it in the common ground, only the interlocutor can reject it. Another instance is represented by the majority generic “blacks in the U.S. suffer racism” is expressed, two options to approach it are available. The first, when it is clear that there is no casual relation between the kind and the characteristic expressed, it is possible to negate it. The second, when the kind is a good predictor of the characteristic, it not necessary to negate it because it is true. However, this sentence highlights a moral injustice, which should be addressed as well.

4.3.3 Moral critique of ideology

Haslanger maintains that human beings can distinguish between basic forms of good and bad, justice and injustice. Generally, the process through which they are able to make such a distinction is reliable, hence often moral beliefs are considered true and constitute a form of knowledge. However, through our epistemic capacities we can recognize the wrong of certain situations. Nonetheless, a large part of our moral knowledge is defined by social practices that assign meaning and value. Therefore, the question is how it is possible to challenge these social practices: on one side you should want the practices to be open to new information and to avoid misinformation, on the other you should assure that no one has an interest to defect from coordination. The issue arises when the person is forced to coordinate as a result of subordination, and thus the person in power is not obliged to comply to these principles. Despite unbalanced power relations, the dominant part could decide to hear the demands of the subordinate and accommodate them, in order to create new forms of coordination. Critics have imputed this scenario of being paternalistic and unrealistic. However, Haslanger has replied that it only argues in favour of a human treatment that gives *value to every individual*, and that it is dependent on the contingency of the context.

4.4 The integration project

As the main aspects of Haslanger's critical theory have been presented, we may now analyse their implications in the process of integration.

Haslanger believes that identity does not only exist *per se*, but it is constantly influenced and reshaped by outside factors, which modify the self-understanding of the person. As a result, even in the context of injustice and exclusion, it is hard to identify the causes and to tackle them, in fact they are usually perceived as natural. Hence, Haslanger proposes to introduce a critique of the structures and mechanisms that govern identities formation in order to highlight the problems and challenge their sources. Thus, the following step consists in the reconstruction of problematic identities in order to create new ones detached of the negative implications. Meanwhile, it is fundamental that the recognition of the value of each individual grows parallelly, in order to build more egalitarian relations of coordination which are essential to a state.

Therefore, in order to achieve integration, and avoid exclusion and subordination, she envisages the reconstruction of the relations of coordination, which should not be based on social and personal identities, but on human identity. Indeed, social, and personal identities after being deconstructed and reconstructed, should be abandoned as they imply a dangerous categorization. Instead, the focus on human identity is essential to tackle discrimination and exclusion, as the individual is recognized and respected independently of the power they have acquired, and of his material possessions. This type of acknowledgement would compensate for the problems that often derive from diversity and would allow each person to be an active and full member of the state, thus fostering integration. In this context the role of the state would be that of promoting a culture of humanity, especially through education and the appropriate use of language. Moreover, it would have the duty to develop spaces of expression and exchange, where diverse people are able to make their voices heard and could spread their critique of the status quo. These policies aim at the creation of a new *cultural technè* that values individuals as human beings.

4.5 Comments

Haslanger's approach to humanity is particularly positive, as not only she sustains that a person will be willing to discover the truth on another's statement, but she believes in the human capacity of distinguishing right and wrong. Even in a case in which a person can perceive the wrongness of an action, the power to change it is left solely to the dominant group. Indeed, she affirms that the decision to hear the requests of the subordinate is in the hands of who has the primacy. Therefore, such a scenario seems strongly unrealistic, or at least hardly achievable without any other external support to those in the inferior position. In fact, even if some persons have the power and the willingness to act in order to accommodate the requests of those subordinated, it is plausible that their impact would be limited by those who have decided not to change.

Moreover, she believes that through critical analysis of generics on one hand, and of ideology on the other, it would be possible to raise people awareness, and reconstruct new common bases. However, as stated before, the control over any change is in the hands of the ruling classes who are likely to have an interest in preserving the status quo. Hence, not always it would be possible, even through social movements, to accomplish social justice²⁷.

As we have concluded the presentation and discussion of the three theories considered in this thesis, we can now draw the conclusions of this analysis in relation to our question. In particular, we will evaluate which theory best fulfils our aim, namely which one fosters effective integration of diverse individuals without forcing them to renounce to their identity.

²⁷ Probably individuals when realize the wrongness of the *cultural technè* could attempt to raise awareness through social movements, who would be supported by political philosophers.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this thesis has been to discuss and analyse different stances in the debate on the process of integration. The focal point of the dissertation has been understanding whether integration is possible while preserving individual identities, and which of the proposed theories is best suited to this purpose. To this aim, the role of identity and citizenship in the three models have been examined together with their practical feasibility, and their shortcomings.

The first model we analysed was Will Kymlicka's *multicultural citizenship*, whose aim is to recognize and respect those identities that differ from the majority. He therefore proposes *differentiated rights*, in order to achieve representation and a multicultural citizenship based on dialogue and understanding. As he contends that the majority of immigrants share liberal values, he maintains that the majority "*societal culture*" should be preserved as the grounds of the reforms. On the basis of data from countries that have introduced these policies, he argues that solidarity and the other liberal civic values have been reinforced by the implementation of multicultural ideas. This proposal has been criticized by many scholars, such as Bhikhu Parekh, David Miller, and Seyla Benhabib. The former believes that more importance should be given to those that do not share the majority values. The second supports the idea that nationalist values would be fundamental in creating a common sense of community. The third argues that individuals should respect each other on the grounds of being equal human beings.

Although, Kymlicka's proposal guarantees equality and freedom, it protects every identity, and it has contributed to the improvement of the communities where it has been introduced, it does not appear sufficient. In fact, it requires a high level of commitment from each person, a burden that not everyone is willing to carry. Dialogue and understanding demand not only a strong will, but also a lot of energy and time both from natives and immigrants. Complying with these principles becomes even harder if one lives in unfavourable economic conditions as most of nowadays immigrants. Despite this issue could be tackled through redistribution policies, the risk is to create frustration and resentment in the meantime, as immigrants and natives remain on different sides as if they were opposing forces. Once these sentiments become deeply rooted in the society, it is extremely hard to overcome them, especially through a tool like multicultural citizenship that tends to reinforce group divisions, instead of cohesion, hence making actual integration hard to achieve. In general, it appears to be a process that is forced upon the population in the name of higher values, but it does not seem to concretely involve individuals in its creation.

The *E Pluribus Unum* theory instead proposes to put in the hands of individuals the process of creation of a new common identity, a *common sense of citizenship*, which in his opinion should arise from people's daily interactions. The aim of this process is the construction of a unique identity from the multitude of diverse people living in a country. Robert Putnam argues that through the daily interaction during neutral activities,

people would learn to know and trust each other. Their interactions would contribute to change their individual identities, which would converge towards a new common one. The role of the State is only that of creating the conditions that foster this type of *meaningful interactions*, and the subsequent construction of this *common sense of citizenship*. Therefore, it is extremely dependent on the willingness of those in power. However, it requires a more limited commitment from citizens, as the process of creating tolerance and then trust is natural. Moreover, the construction of a common identity does not mean having to renounce to individual ones, instead they become an enriching element of the society, instead of a divisive factor.

Sally Haslanger's *critical theory* offers a different approach to analyse the divisive elements of diversity that result into discrimination and subordination of those that are diverse. On one side, she invites to analyse language in order to understand if the categorization that words imply is acceptable, and if it has negative social implications. Then, one should reconstruct *categorizations* in order for them to be egalitarian, and in the long term they should be abandoned in order to leave space to human identity, a conception that supports the idea that every human is valuable as such. On the other side, she suggests a critique of ideology, the *cultural technè* that determines the social structures that govern coordination. Not only, individuals should reject what is the result of stereotype and does not correspond to the concrete reality, but they should attempt to give *value* to every person, independently of their material possessions or their social position. In particular, those in power have the duty to act in order to create egalitarian relations of coordination, that avoid discrimination and subordination. However, her critique is interesting and stimulates an approach from a different perspective, it seems hardly feasible. In fact, the role of critics is given primarily to social movements and philosophers, but the power to change is mostly in the hands of the ruling class, who decides whether to listen or not to those that are disempowered and undervalued.

As a result, the model that best achieves integration, while preserving individual identities appears to be the *E Pluribus Unum*, as the *common sense of citizenship* that is created is founded on each one's contribution and allows space for individual peculiarities. Robert Putnam's model fosters trust, cohesion, and solidarity, fundamental elements in making individuals feeling accepted. Most importantly, Putnam's proposals gives the same opportunity to each and every one to participate to this process, thus being effective members of the community. Nonetheless, it is important to consider unequal economic and power relations that could hinder effective participation, in order to tackle them. To this purpose, *critical theory* could be an important tool in pointing to the sources of these issues, which is a first fundamental step towards their resolution. Moreover, Kymlicka's principle of *understanding* through dialogue could be crucial in the short term to counterbalance the effects of distrust, although its concrete implementation and success present many problems.

Finally, it seems unlikely that a theory alone could achieve the perfect result as the problem of integration is complex and multifaceted and requires a multitude of instruments and perspectives. The use of

different theories as different tools to resolve specific issues could be essential in developing a new effective approach that succeeds in *actually* including everyone.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Appiah, K. A. (2018). *The lies that bind* rethinking identity. Profile Books.
- Benhabib, S.
 - (2005). “Borders, Boundaries and Citizenship”. *Political Science and Politics* 38(04):673 – 677 [online]. Available at: [10.1017/S1049096505050328](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096505050328) (Accessed 13 May 2020).
 - (2018). *Exile, Statelessness, and Migration: Playing Chess with History from Hannah Arendt to Isaiah Berlin*. Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (eds.) (2013). “Lo stato-nazione europeo. Passato e futuro della cittadinanza” in Habermas, J. (ed.) *L'inclusione dell'altro. Studi di teoria politica*. Milano: Giampaolo Feltrinelli Editore Milano, pp. 119-140.
- Haslanger, S.
 - (2012). *Resisting reality: social construction and social critique*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - (2017a). *Critical theory and practice*. Kroninklijke Van Gorcum.
 - (2017b). “Culture and critique” in Haslanger, S. and Chambers, C. (2017). *Ideology and critique*. Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume, 91(1):149–173 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/arisup/akx001> (Accessed 13 May 2020).
- Kymlicka, W.
 - (1996). *Multicultural citizenship: a liberal theory of minority rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - (2001a). *Contemporary political philosophy: an introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - (2001b). *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - (2010). “Testing the Liberal Multiculturalist Hypothesis: Normative Theories and Social Science Evidence”. *Canadian Journal of Political Science / Revue Canadienne De Science Politique*, 43(2) : 257-271 [online]. Available at : <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20743149> (Accessed 13 May 2020).
 - (2011). “Multicultural citizenship within multination states”. *Ethnicities* 11(3):281-302 [online]. Available at: [10.1177/1468796811407813](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811407813).
- Kymlicka, W. and Banting, K.

- (2006a). *“Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State”*. *Ethics and International Affairs* 20(3):281-304 [online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00027.x>.
- (2006b). *Multiculturalism and the welfare state recognition and redistribution in contemporary democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W., Banting, K., Harell, A., Wallace, R., (2019). “Beyond national identity. Liberal nationalism, shared membership, and solidarity” in Gustavsson, G. and Miller, D. (ed.) *Liberal Nationalism and Its Critics: Normative and Empirical Questions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Marshall, T. H. and Bottomore, T. (1992). *Citizenship and social class*. Pluto Press.
- Melidoro, D. (2015). *Multiculturalismo. Una piccola introduzione*. Roma: LUISS University Press.
- Miller, D.
 - (1997). *On Nationality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 - (2011). “Will Kymlicka ‘Multicultural citizenship within multination states’: A response”. *Ethnicities*, 11(3):303-307. Available at: [10.1177/1468796811407814](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796811407814) (Accessed 13 May 2020).
- Parekh, B. (2018). *A new politics of identity: political principles for an interdependent world*. Palgrave.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). “E Pluribus Unum: diversity and community in the twenty-first century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture”. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2):137-174. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x> (Accessed 14 May 2020).
- Putnam, R.D., Leonardi, R., and Nanetti, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton University Press.
- Song, S. (2010). *Multiculturalism*. *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* [Online]. Available at: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/multiculturalism/> (Accessed: 13 May 2020).
- United Nations. *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* [online]. Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> (Accessed 13 May 2020).

RIASSUNTO

Nel mondo contemporaneo, globalizzato ed interconnesso, le migrazioni ed in generale lo spostamento di persone da un Paese all'altro è sempre più frequente. In questo contesto, il problema dell'integrazione di diverse identità all'interno di uno stesso Stato ha assunto particolare rilevanza nel dibattito politico. Questa tesi si pone come obiettivo di analizzare tre teorie che affrontano tale problema: il *Multiculturalismo* di Will Kymlicka, lo *E Pluribus Unum* di Robert Putnam e la *teoria critica* di Sally Haslanger. Questi tre modelli sono stati scelti poiché rappresentano tre approcci e tre proposte estremamente differenti. Se da una parte il primo è stato principalmente sviluppato sul piano teorico e solo in un secondo tempo ne è stata testata l'efficacia pratica, il secondo invece si fonda su un approccio pragmatico attraverso lo studio dei dati raccolti in diverse comunità negli Stati Uniti, mentre il terzo si propone di analizzare criticamente la realtà. Inoltre, il *multiculturalismo* richiede un grande impegno da parte degli individui che cercano di comprendere e rispettare il diverso, al contrario lo *E Pluribus Unum* propone un processo naturale che si basa sulle interazioni quotidiane fra individui diversi. Infine, la *teoria critica* richiede una decostruzione dello *status quo* per creare una nuova struttura fondata su relazioni egalarie. La domanda che guida l'analisi delle tre teorie è se sia possibile il raggiungimento di un'effettiva integrazione senza dover rinunciare a una parte della propria identità. Infatti, questo processo di rinuncia è estremamente costoso e complesso per qualunque persona e nessuno dovrebbe essere forzato a compierlo. Inoltre, l'esclusione di un'identità implica spesso la discriminazione di coloro che si identificano con essa, ed è causa di grandi disegualanze economiche. La conseguente mancanza di mezzi infatti rischia di limitare il pieno e libero sviluppo dell'individuo, valore fondante di una società liberale. Pertanto, il riconoscimento di ogni identità è un primo passo fondamentale verso l'eliminazione di molte altre forme di ingiustizia.

Prima di prendere in considerazione i tre modelli è necessario però precisare il significato ed il legame delle nozioni che costituiscono le fondamenta della discussione: lo stato, la cittadinanza, l'integrazione e l'identità. Gli stati a cui si fa riferimento sono liberal democratici e hanno le loro radici nel modello sviluppatosi a partire dalla Pace di Vestfalia (1648). Pertanto, da una parte i cittadini, coloro che fanno parte della comunità politica dello stato, hanno diritto all'auto-governo e aderiscono ai principi di libertà ed uguaglianza, dall'altra il sistema legale è limitato da tre elementi, un territorio, una popolazione, e la presenza di altri stati sovrani. Poiché il possesso della cittadinanza rappresenta l'appartenenza a una certa comunità politica, essa può essere considerata una tipologia di identità. Tradizionalmente essa è stata basata sui valori, le credenze e le tradizioni comuni che compongono l'identità nazionale con cui il cittadino si identifica con intensità diverse. Nel contesto odierno caratterizzato da un costante movimento di individui, al fine di garantire il diritto all'auto-

governo, è diventato necessario scindere il concetto di cittadinanza da quello di nazione. Infatti, sempre più persone che non si riconoscono nei valori nazionali partecipano e contribuiscono alla comunità politica, e pertanto non possono esserne esclusi. Tuttavia, questo non è sufficiente a garantire una vera integrazione, che non significa solo essere un membro formale della comunità, ma esserne un suo membro effettivo. L'identità diventa quindi centrale non solo perché costituisce la concezione di sé, ma perché l'identificazione da parte degli altri determina il ruolo di ciascuno nella società. Non riconoscersi nell'identità della maggioranza può portare a sentirsi esclusi in quanto i propri interessi non vengono presi in considerazione all'interno del dibattito pubblico. Pertanto, molti sono costretti a scegliere fra l'assimilazione e la marginalizzazione, ma non hanno la possibilità di decidere di integrarsi senza rinunciare alla propria identità.

La prima teoria che è stata analizzata è quella sviluppata da Will Kymlicka all'interno del dibattito Multiculturalista, nato negli anni '60 in Paesi come Canada e Australia che non solo erano stati mèta di un grande flusso migratorio dopo la fine della Seconda Guerra Mondiale, ma dove diverse minoranze nazionali coesistevano da tempo. Se inizialmente il dibattito si è concentrato su una visione comunitaria opposta a quella individualista tipica del liberalismo, in seguito si è spostato nel dominio liberale. Infatti, ci si è resi conto che la maggior parte di queste comunità condividevano i valori liberali di libertà e di uguaglianza, pertanto l'obiettivo è diventato garantire l'effettiva realizzazione di questi principi. La prima proposta avanzata è stata quella della *differenziazione dei diritti* che aveva l'obiettivo di riconoscere e rispettare le richieste e i bisogni delle minoranze. Secondo Kymlicka però questi diritti dovevano avere lo scopo di difendere le comunità dalla pressione della maggioranza e non dovevano in alcun modo giustificare limitazioni della libertà all'interno delle stesse. Inoltre, Kymlicka sostiene che poiché lo stato non solo promuove i valori liberali, ma porta avanti un processo di costruzione del sentimento nazionale attraverso la lingua e le istituzioni comuni, questi diritti non sono sufficienti a garantire un giusto processo di integrazione. Infatti, il raggiungimento di quel senso di appartenenza associato alla cittadinanza è ostacolato da queste istituzioni statiche. Kymlicka pertanto propone un modello di *cittadinanza multiculturale* che consiste in *una concezione della cittadinanza più multinazionale e in una concezione del multi-nazionalismo più multiculturale* . A questo fine, egli promuove un approccio basato sul dialogo e la comprensione che mirino al riconoscimento e al rispetto dei diversi interessi, nel quale ognuno è cosciente di dover trovare un compromesso per rispondere ai bisogni della comunità, e il cui obiettivo finale è il raggiungimento di una soluzione pacifica che non limiti i principi di libertà ed uguaglianza. Poiché il modello di Kymlicka è stato attaccato in quanto troppo teorico, egli ha deciso di analizzare gli effetti delle politiche multiculturali sui principali valori liberal democratici in Canada. Da questo studio è emerso che sia libertà civili e politiche, sia l'uguaglianza di opportunità, che la solidarietà risultavano migliorati e rafforzati da queste stesse politiche. Altre critiche sono invece state avanzate dal punto di vista teorico: Bhikhu Parekh ha proposto una messa in discussione dei valori liberali, David Miller ha sottolineato

l'importanza di un sentimento nazionale al fine di creare un'identità comune, Seyla Benhabib ha sostenuto il rispetto dell'altro in quanto essere umano con lo scopo di costruire rispetto e comprensione.

La seconda teoria discussa è lo *E Pluribus Unum* sviluppata da Robert Putnam, a partire dai dati raccolti nelle comunità americane sulla relazione tra *diversità* e *fiducia* reciproca. Alla base della sua analisi vi è il concetto di *capitale sociale* che egli definisce come quelle caratteristiche di un'organizzazione sociale che permettono la coordinazione fra i suoi membri. Solitamente consiste in valori morali condivisi, come la fiducia, e il suo funzionamento è legato al numero di persone che vi aderiscono. La fiducia varia a seconda delle dimensioni della comunità, in quelle più piccole dove tutti si conoscono si costituisce la "fiducia personale", in quelle più grandi è invece necessaria la cosiddetta "fiducia sociale". La fonte principale di "fiducia sociale" sono le norme di reciprocità e l'impegno civico. Più le connessioni fra le persone sono "dense", più è probabile che si sviluppino la cooperazione e l'impegno, e quindi la fiducia che si basa su esperienze passate positive. Secondo Putnam livelli maggiori di capitale sociale possono essere correlati con un miglior funzionamento del sistema democratico ed economico. Nella sua analisi della relazione fra diversità e capitale sociale Putnam sostiene che a lungo termine la diversità porti effetti positivi. Gli effetti nel breve periodo sono invece stati stabiliti attraverso l'analisi dei dati raccolti su 30.000 persone negli Stati Uniti. Da questo studio è emersa una correlazione negativa non solo fra diversità e fiducia, ma fra diversità e altre variabili che compongono il capitale sociale. Inoltre, la diversità diminuisce l'impegno e il coinvolgimento nella società, ma non peggiora le relazioni interrazziali. Poiché Putnam crede che l'identità sia un concetto costruito e che quindi possa essere decostruito e ricreato, egli sostiene che la diversità forzi tutti gli individui, non solo coloro appena arrivati, a modificare la propria identità di conseguenza. Il suo obiettivo è quindi quello di introdurre politiche atte a rendere il processo di decostruzione e creazione di un'identità comune più semplice e rapido. Egli propone innanzitutto di promuovere interazioni significative sul posto di lavoro e a scuola fra persone diverse in modo da incrementare la tolleranza. L'obiettivo finale deve essere quello di creare un *E pluribus unum*, un uno da molti diversi. Tuttavia, questo modello non tiene conto dei problemi che potrebbero nascere dalla scarsa fiducia nelle istituzioni che inizialmente non rappresentano correttamente la diversità. Qualunque politica potrebbe quindi essere percepita come una forzatura della popolazione nativa sui nuovi arrivati.

La *teoria critica* sviluppata da Sally Haslanger è la terza teoria analizzata in questa tesi. La filosofa studia il processo di integrazione dal punto di vista delle idee, attraverso lo studio del loro ruolo nella società e dei loro effetti sulle ingiustizie e le discriminazioni. In particolare, Haslanger affronta il problema da due punti di vista diversi: il *debunking project* e la *critica dell'ideologia*. Innanzitutto, poiché la base del suo ragionamento è il costruttivismo, ella definisce il concetto di *costruzione sociale* che agisce su due fronti: le idee intese come categorie e classificazioni, e gli oggetti, nel senso di persone, stati, condizioni, pratiche, comportamenti,

esperienze e relazioni. Generalmente la classificazione non descrive solamente gruppi di oggetti esistenti, ma essi ne vengono influenzati e vi si adattano. Il *debunking project* ha l'obiettivo di "smascherare" le categorie evidenziandone l'esistenza ed esaminandone l'utilità dal punto di vista teorico e pratico. Haslanger infatti sottolinea l'importanza di distinguere fra i termini che descrivono una differenza reale e quelli che indicano una posizione sociale di inferiore potere. Al fine di evitare di perpetrare una discriminazione, la filosofa propone lo sviluppo di termini appropriati che rappresentino la diversità, senza implicare la subordinazione. Tuttavia, Haslanger auspica il superamento delle categorizzazioni, se non necessarie a rispondere ai diversi bisogni dei singoli. La critica dell'ideologia invece si fonda sulla definizione di *strutture sociali*, *network* di relazioni sociali, costituite da *pratiche sociali* interdipendenti che hanno come scopo il regolamento delle relazioni di coordinazione e dell'accesso alle risorse, attraverso *schemi* interdipendenti. Questi schemi, definiti anche come "*technè culturale*", ci portano a interpretare ogni risorsa in un certo modo e di conseguenza a darle un determinato valore che a sua volta influenza la nostra interpretazione. Pertanto, gli schemi sono dinamici: non vengono imposti, ma sono attuati costantemente dalle persone. Il fine di una critica dell'ideologia è quello di esaminare l'interdipendenza di questi elementi e il loro impatto su di noi; ella utilizza tre prospettive differenti per attuare la sua critica: *materialista*, *epistemologica* e *morale*. Haslanger infatti riconosce il ruolo dei fattori economici nel determinare le nostre scelte e nell'influenzare il valore che diamo a ciò che ci circonda. Tuttavia, poiché il linguaggio è il mezzo principale di socializzazione, la critica dell'ideologia deve cominciare dalla sua analisi. In particolare, visto che il terreno comune di conoscenza si modifica durante la conversazione, noi abbiamo la possibilità di respingere le affermazioni non veritiere che tentano di perpetrare uno stereotipo. Infine, Haslanger sostiene che la *critica del linguaggio* non sia sufficiente, ma che serva anche una critica morale, poiché l'uomo è capace di distinguere fra semplici forme di bene e male. In particolare, la *critica morale* è importante quando alcuni individui in una posizione di maggiore potere costringono altri, in quanto subordinati, a partecipare al processo di coordinazione, di cui grazie al loro potere non devono rispettarne le norme. Tuttavia, poiché coloro che detengono il potere possiedono un senso della moralità possono decidere di ascoltare le richieste dei dominati ed eventualmente ristabilire un rapporto di coordinazione egualitario, fondato sul riconoscimento del valore di ogni individuo. Pertanto, al fine di abolire le diseguaglianze Haslanger propone un superamento delle identità sociali e personali al fine di riconoscere il *valore* di ciascun essere umano in quanto tale, indipendentemente dal suo potere o dai suoi possedimenti materiali. A questo scopo, lo Stato dovrebbe promuovere una cultura del valore umano, sia attraverso l'educazione che attraverso l'uso del linguaggio appropriato. Inoltre, ha il dovere di creare e sostenere luoghi di espressione e scambio, dove tutti abbiano la possibilità di far sentire la propria voce e criticare lo *status quo*. Il problema principale della proposta di Haslanger è la sua visione positiva dell'umanità che secondo il suo pensiero non è solo in grado di distinguere il giusto dallo sbagliato, ma di agire per contrastarlo. Tuttavia, è difficile che questo possa realmente avvenire, perché anche se fosse possibile riconoscere l'errore, coloro che detengono il potere raramente avrebbero interesse a cambiare. Infine, anche qualora agissero in questa

direzione rischierebbero di rimanere un caso isolato all'interno di una "*technè culturale*" che ha l'obiettivo contrario.

In conclusione, il modello sviluppato da Robert Putnam sembra essere il più convincente nel rispondere alla domanda centrale di questa tesi. Favorire le interazioni in modo che si sviluppino prima la tolleranza, poi la fiducia e infine un senso di appartenenza comune, non solo coinvolge ogni individuo in prima persona dandogli la possibilità di contribuire, ma questo processo avviene in modo naturale. Tuttavia, è importante considerare l'ostacolo rappresentato dalle relazioni di potere sbilanciate che rischia di compromettere questo progetto. È quindi importante sottolineare il ruolo che la teoria critica di Sally Haslanger può svolgere nell'individuare le fonti di questi problemi e che rappresenta un primo passo verso la loro risoluzione. Inoltre, i principi di dialogo e comprensione sostenuti da Will Kymlicka possono rivelarsi importanti nel limitare gli effetti negativi della diffusa sfiducia nel breve termine. Pertanto, ciò che emerge è l'impossibilità di una sola teoria di raggiungere un risultato perfetto poiché l'integrazione è un processo complesso e sfaccettato, che richiede una grande ricchezza di mezzi e prospettive. Tuttavia, l'uso di diverse teorie, come strumenti di risoluzione di problemi specifici, potrebbe dimostrarsi essenziale al fine di sviluppare un approccio efficace grazie al quale tutti possano essere inclusi, davvero.