BORDÓN
Revista de Pedagogía

Volumen 73
Número, 1
2021

SOCIEDAD ESPAÑOLA DE PEDAGOGÍA

RETHINKING THE FUNDAMENTALS AND PRACTICES OF INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION IN AN ERA OF INSECURITY

Repensar los fundamentos y prácticas de la educación intercultural en una era de inseguridad

MARISA MUSAIO
Catholic University of Sacred Heart of Milan (Italy)

DOI: 10.13042/Bordon.2021.86114
Fecha de recepción: 17/11/2020 • Fecha de aceptación: 21/01/2021
Autora de contacto / Corresponding author: Marisa Musaio. E-mail: marisa.musaio@unicatt.it
Fecha de publicación *online:* 18/03/2021

INTRODUCTION. In a globalized and multicultural world, one is increasingly challenged by encounters and relationships with the other. Intercultural pedagogy develops its reflections around these problems, while continuously updating its meanings and purposes. **METHOD.** Starting from a reinterpretation of the pedagogical foundations of the relationship between identity and otherness, this contribution proposes to outline the role and purpose of an intercultural pedagogy in relation to the framework of insecurity that characterizes multicultural society today. **RESULTS.** The interplay between the theoretical analysis of intercultural pedagogy and the various manifestations of risk, especially as regards the condition of vulnerability experienced by refugees and migrants, allows us to outline new educational goals for an authentic relationship with others. **DISCUSSION.** As a result of the above observations, the need for a continuous interpretation of intercultural education in relation to the constantly changing scenarios emerges. In addition, the training of educational and pedagogical professionals that make use of intercultural mediation to prevent conflict and upgrade living conditions and encourage a better education for the new wave of immigrants becomes crucial.

Keywords: *Intercultural pedagogy, Uncertainty, Otherness, Relationship with other, Intercultural mediation.*

Introduction

The processes of multicultural configuration of society have changed the education systems in order to recognize the other as constitutive dimension of relationships and ways of living, not neglecting the consequences that can arise in terms of risks and insecurity. In his interview on the concept of identity, Zygmunt Bauman summarized the presence of diversity and the other in our age with different images about the foreigner in our life (Bauman, 2003, p. 20). These images help us to become aware of the profile of a globalized society based on diversity. The presence of foreigners is now increasingly stabilized in different countries as a result of migratory processes as a phenomenon that influences various aspects of life: the welfare system, the response to basic needs, care and health promotion, the job search and continuous training. These needs are addressed by an increasingly oriented action by governments, services, and educational and training institutions, in order to promote a real inclusive integration.

Method

Starting from the assumption of an intercultural pedagogy (Giusti, 2017; Portera, 2013) we will try to become aware of cultural differences both as a source of risks and as the resources of a multicultural society. With the spread of migratory processes in the different European countries (Triandafyllidou *et al.*, 2014), the theme of protection and security has become central because it is connected to the wide range of reception and integration needs, as well as social welfare-oriented to respond to the basic needs of life: from the need for a home to health services, work placement, access to education and training. These different areas of welfare should be governed with policies and interventions aimed at ensuring a real integration of people arriving from other countries.

To prevent the intertwining of migratory processes and needs of migrants and refugees from increasing the condition of a merely dispersive physical, cultural and social nomadism, it is essential to look at the construction of a "plural community" of peoples and cultures able to coexist with each other. As Marc Augé states to address the problem of the other, it is essential to be aware of an identity that is expressed in multiple senses, of a "plural, relational and therefore relative self. […] Individual beings exist only by virtue of the relationship that unites them. The individual, therefore, is not the necessary but variable intersection of a set of relationships" (Augé, 2019, p. 26).

The adoption of an intercultural perspective in a pedagogical reflection addresses the issue of the cultural obstacles that still exist regarding the debate on the themes of the other, the relationship between identity and otherness (Mari and Pysiak, 2017).

Educating to the encounter with other, overcoming barriers, and building bridges (Colombetti, 2018) is not easy, especially in a global context characterized by strong economic, political and social instability. The ambition to build a single global market has in fact ended up creating strong inequalities and gaps between rich and poor, increasing the pockets of poverty, social fragmentation and marginalization. The record of unstoppable migratory flows is also determined by the global poverty that pushes people residing in severely tried territories to move in order to gain access to greater chances of survival and emancipation.

In a multicultural scenario, assuming differences as a paradigm for educating and training identity and interpersonal relationships is not simple: the encounter with other is in fact a tiring and risky path, marked by doubts and misunderstandings, in many cases by conflicts and distrust. For example, we are used to be distrust what is unknown. From these considerations the need to build an "intercultural space", arises through the

recognition of others as a constitutive dimension of every one, together with the need for "intercultural skills" as an indispensable prerequisite for educators in the social fields.

Intercultural education emerges as a central task for spreading *a culture of coexistence* and educating people to a critical thinking that enables them to decode and critically read the aspects of coexistence with the other, beyond the prejudices and rhetoric due to common sense (Fiorucci, 2011, p. 9).

As educators we have to take on both theoretical and practical problems, through the tools of culture and reflection, in order to imagine new ways to build a "new intercultural humanism" and to oppose those that Umberto Eco indicated as "entrepreneurs of fear and insecurity", to overcome the diversity as a sign of threat (Eco, 2001, p. 12).

Within intercultural pedagogy, the theme of the relationship with the other emerges as one of the main challenges to overcome the convictions rooted in ethnocentrism (Cambi, 2008, p. 15), which produces the rejection of the encounter with another culture and it induces to live the relationship with one's own identity in terms of exclusivity, superiority, and domination. Consequently, it is easy to fall back into a monocultural vision that tends to perpetuate presuppositions on the part of certain cultural frameworks, underestimating the specificity of other cultures.

Recognizing the existence of other ways and worlds within current societies means not only adding together different knowledge and educational options but promoting attitudes for allowing themselves to be solicited by the encounter with the other.

Reinterpreting intercultural pedagogy (Catarci, Macinai, 2015) then means not falling into sterile culturalism or relativism, to take note of the co-existence of multiple visions around identity, diversity, and relationship with the other, avoiding the principle that everything is valid, while inequalities continue to persist. Promoting intercultural dialogue implies trying to understand the social, political, and cultural mechanisms behind certain images of the other and his education, and recognizing how they have been socially constructed and reproduced. Interculturral education requires developing the ability to interpret the same situation in different ways, and thus imagine new possibilities for learning, knowledge, and growth.

The exercise of an openness of interpretation is certainly of greater interest on a pedagogical level. In fact, recalling Geertz's words, we can argue that "seeing ourselves as others see us can be revealing" (Geertz, 1988, p. 22) in view of overcoming fears and prejudices that can cause prejudicial drifts. As Todorov points out, "Fear of barbarians is what risks making us barbarians" (Todorov, 2009, p. 16); on the contrary, building conditions for positive coexistence and integration is a pedagogical project that calls into question the dialogue between foreigners and natives. The processes of integration are successful only if they involve both the migrant and native communities and if they act in contrast to the policies of the "entrepreneurs of fear and insecurity". These feed feelings of fear and insecurity in a period of severe economic and social crisis, they tend to perpetuate the processes of building the enemy as a scapegoat, diverting attention from the real problems that affect an authentic intercultural society.

Pedagogical response is to continually confront the challenge of openness to the other with an approach aimed at mutual knowledge, deep enrichment, in search of an opening to otherness as an educational response that our society is able to develop. Otherness is a constitutive dimension of every human being. It must not be seen as a threat or a form of inferiority, because it is inherent in the humanity that unites us. Otherness is a necessary dimension for our identity and for recognizing ourselves in the

humanity that unites us. As Marc Augé points out, the question "*Who is the other?* is a complex question to answer which one immediately realizes that these others do not stop asking the question of who is equal to themselves and who the other is" (Augé, 2019, p. 13). We understand then it is a question as much related to the education of identity as to the relationship.

From the "identity" side, we can see that it contains two meanings: on the one hand, it refers to the complex of characteristic data that allow the identification of a person and that guarantee his/her uniqueness and originality (according to Ricoeur it is the "*ipse*"); on the other hand, the identity recalls the "*idem*", the same. If on the one hand identity denotes the sense of one's being as a single "*ens*" and distinguishable from all the others, on the other hand it refers to being identical which establishes a relationship of equality or coincidence. For these reasons, identity is the cause and effect of the different belongings that characterize us and that we possess (Ricoeur, 1993).

Starting from these considerations we can affirm that among the aims of an intercultural pedagogy there is primarily the promotion of a reflective openness to mental forms, cognitive and emotional styles that recognize how the human being is formed by recognizing first of all otherness as inner fundamental in itself and as a guiding value of one's feeling and acting (Cambi, 2008, p. 71).

As Todorov explained, being able to know something that is other than oneself means understanding going towards what we would like to grasp the secrets of, having to respect the dimension of mystery that is contained in the "other than oneself":

We never have knowledge of the other from oneself in its absoluteness, in its objectivity, in its total understanding, in its unconditional transparency. We are only allowed to operate a "reliable interpretation" of the text (hermeneutic method), and never a decipherment or explanation of the simpliciter text, remaining open to what the other wants to tell us and how he wants to reveal himself (Todorov, 2009, p. 16).

Identity, difference, relationship are the terms of a reflective synthesis and an education oriented to approach rather than distance, to create an education to difference (Mantegazza, 2006). Unfortunately, however, the scenario of cultural pluralism of recent years has led to a proliferation of terms and conceptual categories that have led to see education of identity as a battlefield between identity and difference, as regards the recognition of the relationships between majorities and minorities, between citizenship rights and cultural affiliations. On the other hand, denial of cultural differences results in an increase in the sense of detachment between cultures, the drowning of difference within assimilation and the growth of a sense of conflict in different contexts.

Intercultural perspective engages in the construction of the space of the "*inter*", that is the space of the relationship between people, crossing borders and barriers, to intertwine spaces of identification and belonging, of difference and similarity. The role exercised by pedagogical reflection for the purpose of constructing intercultural thinking is fundamental to look at a subjectivity that is educated as the result of relational and dynamic processes (Dubrosc and Edres, 2017), as the result of the encounter between multiple identities and belonging that coexist in a single human being (Sen, 2017).

Our reference assumption converges on an intercultural pedagogy oriented to respect for differences in the consideration of the human similarities that bind us, in view of the formulation of spaces for intercultural education through the recognition and enhancement of diversity (Sharma and Lazar, 2019) and exercise of intercultural competences as an indispensable prerequisite for all and as a "toolbox"

for operators in the educational and social fields (Abbri, 2002).

Starting from these fundamental references, we will try to understand some of the main difficulties and risks that education encounters in the field.

Results

On an experimental level, the difference of the other confuses us, upsets us, forces us to review our beliefs and principles. The other brings back into play the ancient ghost of uncertainty. Despite the complexity of the reception and integration paths to be faced, what creates the problem is that the migrant, the other, the refugee, with all his diversity, is human like us, he has needs and desires, aspirations for the best, as for any person, in his/her own ethos. Nonetheless, the presence of the other makes us feel we are in danger which reflects our own human vulnerability, at the same time his arrival and his presence among us induces the fear of losing something.

Intercultural education is faced with the themes of *insecurity, risk and the search for security*, acceptance and detachment and includes the need for recognition that every human being feels and embodies. Along with acceptance, the encounter with the other is sometimes accompanied by indifference, hostility, but also conflict, and even violence, as happens in the case of the phenomena of terrorism.

The conditions of risk for humanity (Beck, 2013) are now wider due to several factors: due to the absence of effective actions aimed at facing traditional threats such as wars, due to the re-emergence of political tensions between countries, influence exerted by new forms of global power. To cope with all these difficulties, the 2030 Agenda wanted to propose a set of concerted actions to address the most serious problems that afflict humanity, also from an intercultural perspective, in order to reaffirm the value of collaboration and the construction of peace as factors of growth and prosperity, and, above all, to continue the fight against inequalities and poverty which in turn generate greater tension, conflicts and recourse to violence.

Perspective of an intercultural education is therefore not exempt from the risk of being hindered if we do not consider the implications that it maintains with everyone's need for security and recognition. Security is the most immediate of the individual's primary needs, a condition to be able to satisfy all other needs. In its fundamental meaning, security is a priority for survival and calls into question the protective dimension of life, without which individuals could not give space to their activities and exercise their freedom and the enjoyment of their rights. Security is to be distinguished into "detected" and "perceived" (Battistelli, 2016, p. 9): in the first case it is the result of a process of collecting data and indicators; in the second it refers to a spontaneous and informal phenomenon that it emerges in relation to individuals or a group of individuals. Beyond the dynamics of data collection, perceived security allows us to enter into the framework of people's experiences, in a subjective dimension that helps to understand how people perceive themselves, define and build their reality, in relation to changes or factors lived in their own space of belonging. On this front, intercultural education is confronted with experiences of insecurity and with the variables that influence citizens' perception and demand for security, or that have a bearing on prejudices and fears towards others as foreigners. Today the combination of security and insecurity is at the center of considerations in many contexts of European cities, as a source of misunderstandings in which public opinion and also political decision-makers run into. In any case, ensuring safety is a goal to be pursued in relation to the different areas of education and activities within the various contexts. In fact, if one considers that the

irreplaceable role of the city in making everyone feel safe even while in the midst of strangers (Battistelli, 2006, p. 70), cities are important spaces for educational practices aimed at incorporating the diversity of ethnic groups, cultures, religions, economic conditions, to limit the dimension of alarm and threat that inevitably occurs with the presence of different people. In this direction, the main subjects of alarm are immigrants, identified as factors of destabilization and social disorder.

In this regard, the situation of social security and insecurity in Italy and Europe in recent times is showing signs of deterioration in relation to the growing presence of immigrants (European Security Observatory, 2015), often used by political movements as a propaganda theme, without promoting social and educational conditions to build security as a result of intentional and concerted actions both in the reception facilities and in schools and socio-educational services. "In the complex relationship that is established between migrants and the host country, results such as inclusion, citizenship, legality are mostly the result of intentional political choices. However, in a not negligible number of cases, positive consequences take shape following even unintentional processes" (Battistelli, 2006, p. 87).

The point that remains firm is a preventive perspective with respect to conditions of insecurity that is determined thanks to the inclusive strategies exercised by institutions such as schools and in the context of health protection. In fact, these institutions continue to ensure effective ways of welcoming and socializing for immigrant people and families, as well as helping to overcome generalizations and misunderstandings that help promote and build security conditions based on knowledge and education (Battistelli, 2006, pp. 254-261), rather than on prejudice.

Overcoming an interpretation of the other only as a risk factor can take place with insights into the concept of identity, which acquires a new centrality if the theme of risk connected to multicultural living is tackled: we can think about the emphasis on the meaning of belonging and of identities necessary to be able to think about ourselves and others, which can turn into reasons of hostility and detachment towards those who do not identify themselves as us in a given community, nation or in certain cultural and religious characteristics. Identity plays an important role with respect to the awareness of ourselves in relation to the links with a specific community, even if the identification with a specific community or national belonging can be a factor that calls into question the effective freedom of people and authentic relationship possibilities. As Amarthya Sen says, we must try to take a step forward to recognize that in addition to an identity based on belonging, in addition to recognizing that we are different for this reason, we must realize that we are different in a great variety of ways: "Each of us, in his life, possesses, on the basis of different contexts, various types of identity" (Sen, 2017, p. 61). Consequently, knowing "our different diversities" is essential to understand which of them is a priority from time to time, to establish the relative importance of these diversities and to understand the priority relationships that may change in relation to circumstances. For example, it is necessary to recognize the importance of identifying with a community, if we think about the enhancement of responsibility towards the other members of the shared community and the adherence to a reciprocity, but at the same time identifying with one's community can also prove to be limiting when it ends. To privilege a certain meaning of identity to the detriment of others, or when cultural barriers arise that result in the rejection of certain intercultural behaviors, thus compromising the possibility of exchange and mutual understanding between different cultures (Sen, 2017, pp. 63-65).

Starting from these considerations the need to think about identity emerges in relation to a multiple belonging, considering that the world is certainly made up of a set of belongings to, nations and a set of people.

The crucial global issues we face must take into account the plurality of identities and the role of reflection and choice that influence crucial issues such as coexistence between cultures, security, the promotion of equity: "We must take responsibility for our lives, and also for the world in which we live" (Sen, 2017, p. 72).

Educational practices should consider a plurality of identities to be discovered, overcoming suspect towards people from other countries and cultures, as a consequence of poor knowledge of others and unjustified stereotypes. At the same time, the value of the relationship with the other acts as a modality of intercultural education in different contexts, from primary school to university, to overcome trivializations and increase individual awareness both in foreigners living in the West and in natives. In this field, the educational approach/practices based on the relationship comes into play, because it helps solicit knowledge and a curiousity of reality which enables one to grasp the infinite nuances of the other. This would help to modify one's perspectives, to perceive the diversities of the human value of difference, and to bring together rather than distance, by also healing contrasts and fractures between cultures (Musaio, 2013). The value of relationships is to be cultivated starting from the focus on the experiences and moments of personal life, to what people live in relationships, to the affections, to the fraternity, to the deepest aspirations to be fulfilled as a person within oneself and within community. As Edgar Morin argues, the rediscovery of the principles of a renewed humanism could allow us to face that need for meaning, that anguish of living that pushes us to seek psychic safety by entrenching ourselves within our own ethnic or national identity. On the contrary, we need of seeking an answer in perception to being all participants in a community of destiny, united by a common sense of belonging to humanity (Morin, 2012). These educational priorities are not only preventive with respect to the emergence of conflicts, opposition and violence, but also the response to crucial problems such as the influx of refugees, the reception and integration of migrants. If faced with fragmented and unintended approaches, these problems risk creating social imbalances, representing an additional risk for the security and success of an authentic intercultural coexistence.

A rethinking of an intercultural perspective could be projected in order to be able to address in a reflective and operational way the problems related to the conditions of risk and existential and social vulnerability of migrants and refugees. In this case the risk is connected to the experiences of abandonment, trauma, loss of belonging, entering a situation of lack of security, such as that experienced by refugees (Zangeneh and Al-Krenawi, 2019; Vercillo and Guerra, 2019).

Exploring immigrant and refugee experiences of vulnerability can help investigate their resilience and allow us to examine how cultural diversity influences promoting this attitude. Contextualizing the resilience of immigrants and refugees is also an indispensable educational resource not only for researchers and professors, but also for educational professionals and policy makers in the service sectors, in social and intercultural fields, in working with families (Güngör and Strohmeier, 2020).

If we pay attention to the status of the refugee, through the descriptions and narratives or reports that have helped to inform us in recent years, we can, first of all, see how refugees live in a situation of disorientation and uncertainty accompanied by multiple risks. In the collective imagination, the refugee has always been considered a political activist hostile to a dictatorial regime, who fled for political reasons, which usually chooses to reach a Western country. Recently the situation of refugees has been taking shape in a more complex way: they are masses of people who flee in groups, not always as the result of an individual choice, but for decisions imposed by the need to escape wars, violence, hunger,

poverty. The images of masses in motion, of growing numbers of populations have disrupted operational models of aid. The need to plan aid operations must not make us forget the human and personal approach to the different conditions of refugees who have emerged in recent years: from Cambodians to Kurds, Rwandans, Afghans, Palestinians, Syrians, and how, despite the diversity of the movements of human masses, there is in the background the suffering of individuals to be recognized and narrated.

Regarding the Italian context, starting in 2002, the protection system for asylum seekers and refugees (SPRAR) aimed at welcoming, protecting and integrating people was established. This provision represented the transition from unexpected and occasional responses to a systematic and planned perspective, even if the most recent legislation of 2015 tends to stiffen the differentiation of reception systems between alternative centers in order to host people for a longer periods, even months, often frustrating the integration process. The moment of initial reception in fact tends to expand over time because of control and safety dynamics that slow down the subsequent passage towards reception in places aimed more specifically at integration. This situation could lead to: the persistence of trauma and physical and psychological suffering; the inability to cope in a resilient way with the experiences of flight and abandonment; uprooting, desocialization, detachment from affections, the concealment of one's identity, with obvious risks of depersonalization (Dubosc, 2017, p. 268). In this way, the condition of refugees becomes a consequence and at the same time the cause of a context of reduced security. It refers to the anthropological condition of those who live along the borders, conditions dictated by humiliation, stories of constraints and hard daily lives, of separation from the family, from their countries, of minors removed from affections and from the possibility of education (Grandi, 2017, pp. 270-271). Around this abyss of despair, to which the words of the researcher often have little to add, there is the responsibility to interpret the multiform concept of security in relation to the most different human conditions, which see the refugee as an emblematic image. Also concerning this condition of life, intercultural education finds itself redefining the meaning of listening, care, resistance, respect for adversities that put people in a difficult life.

Today the problem of immigration lives through the identification of the management of refugees, with the narratives of war torn lives, repression, the hardships and dangers linked to flight, with the added phenomena of hatred and conflict towards these foreigners that often develop within the great European cities. For example, we should keep in mind the trail of refugees along the Balkan route that since 2015 have been moving through Greece towards the heart of Europe, the masses of Afghans arriving on boats and increasing the ranks of asylum seekers and that chain of "men traveling alone who intend to reach Europe" (Kermani, 2015, p. 17): they are above all men who face the fatigue and inevitable physical effort of the journey and, subsequently, the hardships of becoming a target of hatred in the cities where they arrive. In this case, the insecurity of their condition is intertwined with the insecurity that arises in the cities of a Europe which, although having to be a community founded on the principle of solidarity, finds itself instead raising its finger against refugees and that in many cases are trying to be freed from this problem.

The refugee crisis thus becomes an immigration crisis and a crisis found in towns and cities, with the detection of underlying ambiguities and contradictions: while there are many who help migrants along the coasts upon their arrival, unfortunately when they arrive in cities, the aid available decreases.

Refugees test the solidarity of communities in their ability to manage the serious crisis that this era is going through. With refugees, and with their stories of drama, pain, vulnerability, new reasons for crisis and insecurity have

arisen in Europe, which have to do not only with the political reasons that push people to leave their countries, but also with the reasons that cause the increase in poverty. In the global overview, the issue of refugees requires a continuous mapping of the state of research, policy, and practices implemented especially in the countries most exposed to tackle this problem, such as Italy. At the same time, it requires identifying and exploring practices and opportunities to encourage not only the organizational management of basic problems related to assistance but also the implementation of education and integration interventions. Practicable proposals to control and manage migratory movements in an orderly manner should be accompanied by differentiated measures for refugees, while taking into account the protection of migrants.

The distinction between immigrants and refugees remains fundamental in order to have differentiated reception and insertion paths, both in training and learning the language, and in ensuring the necessary methods for people to integrate in their host countries. Besides the issues of intercultural reception and integration measures, it is necessary to combine broader measures at the national level and social control in order to help refugees in places close to their lands, and thus be able to avoid refoulments or expulsion measures, as well as the often feared risk that exponents of terrorist movements infiltrate refugee camps (Kermani, 2015, p. 104).

Since 1991 Serge Latuoche has described these people as "the planet of the castaways", with reference both to the excluded from the North, to the poor populations of the southern hemisphere, to marginalized peoples, to the drowned at the bottom of the Mediterranean. Today these migrants and refugees have been united as an excluded people of a globalized society (Latouche, 1993, 2017) and reductively synthesized in a single condition of diversity and risk.

To support these beliefs there is the current situation that speaks to us of the multiplication of shipwrecks, of the increase in refugees, think of the case of Syria, or of the conflicts that are expressed in the form of terrorism, which complicates the integration processes, generating hatred and paralyzing thought. For these reasons the issue of the relationship with the other does not appear to be resolved but continues to question us. Intercultural education also resounds with references to the condition of refugees, the risks they run and their vulnerable condition.

Intercultural pedagogy is prompted by these issues to develop an understanding of the heterogeneity of worlds, cultures and the different emotional and affective resonances with which it is expressed in life stories at risk. Beyond any humanistic rhetoric of the other, pedagogy requires to be social and calls for a political reflection on the current entry routes for refugees (Amnesty International, 2014, p. 5). At this regard, the main questions are: the number of victims in the Mediterranean, the need to open safe and regular routes to reach Europe, the ensuring that refugees can access the European land borders, through resettlement and reception routes for humanitarian reasons. Until these measures are implemented, the European Union and its member states have an obligation to implement actions to protect human lives, those at sea, and to ensure access to asylum for many who have reason to request it. Refugees are the exemplification of the vulnerable of our day, of subjects at risk of poverty and destitution, especially when they are not guaranteed the right to assistance and health care, obligations foreseen by the European Convention on Human Rights, to stem the growth of conditions of misery among people (European Network of Statelessness, 2014).

Discussion

In a cultural scenario that still faces the migrant issue as an urgency today, it is necessary to implement the transition from "emergency" to "inclusive education" and integration (Sirignano, 2019). For this objective to be achieved,

intercultural pedagogy promotes transformation processes, especially as regards the training of pedagogical and educational professionals, in particular as regards the acquisition of intercultural knowledge and skills (Reggio and Santerini, 2014) and for the promotion of a pedagogical perspective more oriented to recognize the value of differences beyond unilateral and prejudicial logics (Bolognesi and Lorenzini, 2017).

Pedagogical professionals embrace the challenge of the multicultural emergency, helping to promote the recognition of personal identity, difference and relational reciprocity to allow all people to participate in the construction of spaces inspired by an ethical culture of citizenship. The educational spaces of interculture are certainly not free from disorientation, or cultural tensions, but in any case, they are projected in search of dialogue and active participation, recognizing that we need to find a "sense of the other" by delving into the paradox that talking about the other means talking of himself, "because each is another for the others" (Colombetti, 2018, p. 13). For these reasons, in every educational, school, social and health service, there is a need for skilled professionals prepared to respond in a personalized way to the multiculturalism questions, with the aim of preparing answers based on plurality and possibility of "maintaining and cultivating humanity and their respective differences" (Nussbaum, 2006, p. 86). In this direction, attention is to be paid to mediation as a facilitation of reception, integration and active participation paths (Piller, 2017).

The presence of the intercultural mediators with educators, teachers and social workers within the reception and guidance services, in the school, in the counseling centers, in the hospitals, in the courts, in work places, in the reception centers, contributes to a real intercultural configuration of services, proceeding beyond the mere emergency type reception. Intercultural mediation responds to the specific needs of each person, promotes and facilitates processes of empowerment and promotion of rights, promotes and acquires knowledge and tools to dialogue on an equal footing. It is part of an "intercultural citizenship project" aimed at building the conditions so that immigrant citizens and indigenous citizens can redefine spaces for interaction and collaboration (Luatti, 2006, p. 85). However, the project for an intercultural citizenship must not remain at a level of pure intentionality but promote the human rights of the most vulnerable people and the removal of the causes of social, economic, political, legal, labor and educational vulnerability, together with the active and authentic participation of new citizens within society. Intercultural mediation, which refers to the educational practice of being "between" cultures, indicates how intercultural education can only be expressed in places open to the recognition of all identities and aimed at building identities in relation.

The value of mediation is both practical, symbolic and educational in allowing people with different cultural backgrounds to come into contact and communicate (Luatti, 2011, p. 5).

Authentic mediation presupposes a form of dialogue and a relationship between people who are able to assert their subjectivity, their interests, feelings, fragility, their needs and rights (Fiorucci, 2011). Mediation urges the concrete abandonment of a self-referential and ethnocentric vision, promoting mutual openness and enrichment to make a communication tangible that draws on resources and also on the difficulties inherent in different cultures. Each culture of belonging, with its codes, the different visions of the world, presupposes peculiar ways of interpreting, perceiving, attributing meanings to events, categorizing and organizing the world according to specific codes that translate into different ways of living and thinking. For these reasons, it is essential not to underestimate the function of mediation by reducing it to linguistic and communicative interpretation, but to consider it as a set of tools to interpret, understand

and make different worlds dialogue. In its most profound and inherent function of promoting dialogue and, therefore, responsibility and competence, intercultural mediation has the task of making the different people aware of the efforts but also of the immense opportunities present in understanding the other.

However, mediating between otherness does not mean tending towards neutrality without conflicts, but indicating the space in which the otherness can coexist each with its own differences, materializing at different levels: in a project of society, in integration policies and in a vision of social and educational services as active, proactive and participation-oriented as possible.

Alongside a reinterpretation of the fundamentals of an intercultural pedagogy, there should also be a reconsideration of people, services and practices in an intercultural perspective, recognizing that migrants are not just a social group or a minority, not a "special" problem but a heterogeneous whole of different people, with the need for specific and personalized answers, as well as the educational needs they carry:

- Inclusion for minors in school and training.
- Inclusion for adults in work contexts.
- Access to assistance and care to meet the needs of sick people, disabled people and families, in order to avoid the establishment of phenomena of double diversity, with the risk of accentuating insecurity, ghettoisation, deviance, marginalization and social exclusion.

In an increasingly complex and fragmented social context, intercultural coexistence cannot be addressed as "a standard product generated on the basis of the operator's technical skills and not even as a response planned according to the purposes, but it is a process that arises from the relationship with the user" (Fiorucci, 2011, p. 45). Educators must be able to put into practices a de-standardization of responses, focus on the needs of each individual migrant, provide flexible interventions for involving different resources, professionalism and skills. In order for the intercultural question to pass from emergency to project, it requires educational work based on the relationship with the other, on the promotion of a full development of people starting from an articulated and complex pedagogical proposal, not addressed only to a specific social group but projected as a common approach and proposal. On these trajectories it is necessary to continue to research, to reflect on the good practices in the social, educational, health and legal fields, and to understand how both services and people can redesign themselves and their responses by decoding the different realities from the intercultural perspective.

References

Abbri, F. (2002). *Contesti di alterità.* Cosenza: Brenner.

Amnesty International (2014). *Sintesi conclusiva. Vite alla deriva. Rifugiati e migranti a rischio nel Mideterraneo centrale.* Roma: Amnnesty International Sezione italiana.

Augé, M. (2017). *Qui donc est l'autre.* tr. it. *Chi è dunque l'altro?* Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore, 2019.

Battistelli, F. (2016). *La sicurezza e la sua ombra. Terrorismo, panico, costruzione della minaccia.* Roma: Donzelli.

Bauman (2002). Z. *Intervista sull'identità.* Roma: Laterza Editori. Roma: Edizioni minimumfax.

Beck, U. (2013). *La società del rischio: verso una seconda modernità.* Roma: Carocci.

Bolognesi, I. and Lorenzini, S. (2017). *Pedagogia interculturale: pregiudizi, razzismi, impegno educativo*. Bologna: Bononia University Press.

Cambi, F. (2008). *Intercultura: fondamenti pedagogici*. Roma: Carocci.
Catarci, M. and Macinai, E. (eds.) (2015). *Le parole chiave della pedagogia interculturale: temi e problemi nella società multiculturale*. Pisa: ETS.
Dubosc, F. O. and Edres, N. (2017). *Piccolo lessico del grande esodo. Ottanta lemmi per pensare la crisi migrante*.
Eco, U. (2001). *Costruire il nemico e altri scritti occasionali*. Milano: Bompiani.
Fiorucci, M. (2011). *Gli altri siamo noi. La formazione interculturale degli operatori dell'educazione*. Roma: Armando Editore.
Geertz, C. (1988). *Antropologia interpretativa*. Bologna: il Mulino.
Giusti, M. (2017). *Teorie e metodi di pedagogia interculturale*. Bari-Roma: Laterza.
Grandi, F. (2017). *Rifugi e ritorni*. Milano: Mondadori.
Güngör, D. and Strohmeier, D. (eds.) (2020). *Contextualizing Immigrant and Refugee Resilience: Cultural and Acculturation Perspectives*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.
Kermani, N. (2015). *L'impeto della realtà. Sulla rotta dei rifugiati attraverso l'Europa*. Rovereto (TN): Keller Editore.
Latouche, S. (1993). La planète des naufragés. La décroissance avant la décroissance. tr. it., A.
Luatti, L. (2006). *Atlante della mediazione linguistico-culturale. Nuove mappe per la professione del mediatore*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
Luatti, L. (2011). *Mediatori atleti dell'incontro. Luoghi, modi e nodi della mediazione interculturale*. Gussago: Vannini Editrice.
Mantegazza, R. (2006). *Manuale di pedagogia interculturale: tracce, pratiche e politiche per l'educazione alla differenza*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
Morin, E. (2011). *La Voie*, tr. it. *La via. Per l'avvenire dell'umanità*, pref. M. Ceruti. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore, 2012.
Musaio, M. (2017). Società migrante e valori interculturali. In G. Mari and T. Pysiak, *Education, Society,Values. Educazione, Società, Valori*. Milano: EDUCatt, 53-71.
Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Coltivare l'umanità. I classici, il multiculturalismo, l'educazione contemporanea*. Roma: Carocci.
Piller, I. (2017). Becoming an Intercultural Mediator. In *Intercultural Communication: A Critical Introduction*. Edinburgh: University Press.
Portera, A. (2013). *Manuale di pedagogia interculturale: risposte educative nella società globale*. Roma-Bari: Editori Laterza.
Reggio, P. and Santerini, M. (2014). *Le competenze interculturali nel lavoro educativo*. Roma: Carocci.
Ricoeur, P. (1993). *Sé come un altro*, tr. it. Milano: Jaca Book.
Sen, A. (2017). *Un desiderio al giorno per una settimana. Sulla libertà, lo sviluppo e la formazione*. Milano: Mondadori.
Sharma, S. and Lazar, A. N. (2019). *Rethinking 21st Century Diversity in Teacher Preparation, K12 Education and School Policy*. Cham: Springer International Publishing. Imprint: Springer, 2019.
Sirignano, F. M. (2019). *L'intercultura come emergenza pedagogica: modelli e strategie educative*. Pisa: ETS.
Todorov, T. (2009). *La paura dei barbari. Oltre lo scontro delle civiltà*. Milano: Garzanti.
Triandafyllidou, A., Modood, T. and Meer, N. (eds.) (2012). *European multiculturalisms: cultural, religious and ethnic challenges*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Vercillo, E. and Guerra, M. (eds.) (2019). *Clinica del trauma nei rifugiati: un manuale tematico*. Milano-Udine 2019.
Zangeneh, M. and Krenawi A. A. (2019). *Culture, Diversity and Mental Health Enhancing Clinical Practice*. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Resumen

Repensar los fundamentos y prácticas de la educación intercultural en una era de inseguridad

INTRODUCCIÓN. En el mundo globalizado y multicultural, los desafíos de los encuentros y las relaciones con los demás son cada vez mayores. La pedagogía intercultural desarrolla sus reflexiones en torno a estos problemas, actualizando continuamente sus significados y propósitos. **MÉTODO.** A partir de una reinterpretación de los fundamentos pedagógicos de la relación entre identidad y alteridad, este trabajo tiene como objetivo perfilar el papel y propósito de una pedagogía intercultural en relación con el marco de inseguridad que caracteriza a la sociedad multicultural actual. **RESULTADOS.** El entretejido entre el análisis teórico sobre los presupuestos de la pedagogía intercultural y la consideración de las diversas manifestaciones de riesgo, especialmente en lo que se refiere a la condición de vulnerabilidad que viven los refugiados y migrantes, permite esbozar nuevos propósitos educativos para una auténtica promoción de la relación con los demás. **DISCUSIÓN.** Como resultado de la reflexión, surge la necesidad de una interpretación continua de la educación intercultural en relación con los escenarios cambiados, para la formación de profesionales educativos y pedagógicos, utilizando la mediación intercultural para prevenir situaciones de conflicto y promover las condiciones de vida y educación para todos los que vienen de otro país.

Palabras claves: *Pedagogía intercultural, Inseguridad, Alteridad, Relación con el otro, Mediación intercultural.*

Résumé

Repenser les fondements et les pratiques de l'éducation interculturelle à l'ère de l'insécurité

INTRODUCTION. Dans un monde globalisé et multiculturel, les défis des rencontres et des relations avec les autres se multiplient. La pédagogie interculturelle développe ses réflexions autour de ces problèmes, en actualisant continuellement ses significations et ses finalités. **MÉTHODE.** A partir d'une réinterprétation des fondements pédagogiques de la relation entre identité et altérité, cet article propose d'esquisser le rôle et la finalité d'une pédagogie interculturelle en relation avec le contexte d'insécurité qui caractérise aujourd'hui les sociétés multiculturelles. **RÉSULTATS.** L'entrecroisement entre l'analyse théorique des postulats de la pédagogie interculturelle et l'analyse des différentes manifestations du risque, en ce qui concerne la condition de vulnérabilité vécue par les réfugiés et les migrants, permet d'esquisser de nouvelles finalités éducatives pour une promotion authentique de la relation avec les autres. **DISCUSSION.** À la suite de la réflexion, la nécessité d'une interprétation de l'éducation interculturelle en relation avec les scénarios modifiés émerge en vue de la formation de professionnels de l'éducation et de la pédagogie utilisant la médiation interculturelle pour prévenir les situations de conflit et promouvoir les conditions de vie et éducation pour tous ceux qui viennent d'un autre pays.

Mots-clés: *Pédagogie interculturelle, Incertitude, Altérité, Relation à l'autre, Médiation interculturelle.*

Author Profile

Marisa Musaio

Associate professor in General and Social Pedagogy—Department of Pedagogy—Catholic University of Sacred Heart of Milan and Piacenza. Her main teaching are: Theory of Helping Relationship, Care Pedagogy and Adults Pedagogy. The lines of research are framed within a Social Pedagogy and Health education, highlighting interest on educational poverties and inclusion, intercultural education and citizenship in suburbs contexts, creativity education, art, aesthetics and pedagogy of beauty.
E-mail:marisa.musaio@unicatt.it
Correspondence address: Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore. Largo Gemelli, 1. 20123 Milano, Italia.